

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 May 2006

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling) took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ROBERTS, Hon. T.G., DEATH

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): It is with considerable sadness that I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Terry Roberts, a minister and a member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service; and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

In February this year, we lost a fine parliamentary colleague, minister and friend with the passing of Terry Roberts. Just a few weeks after his 60th birthday, Terry succumbed, after a long battle, to cancer. He was a man of compassion and decency. He was widely loved, admired and respected, and his sense of humour was as dry as a parched, old creek bed. Terry made a major contribution to this state during his 20 years in parliament, and I was very proud to have him in the ministry from 2002.

Terance Gerald Roberts was a true son of the South-East, being born in Millicent on 28 January 1946. After schooling in Millicent, Mount Gambier and Sydney, Terry embarked on a rich and varied pre-parliamentary career. He spent many years at sea working as a ship's engineer and watchkeeper, in the process visiting many fascinating and impoverished parts of the world, including Africa and South America. Perhaps foreshadowing his role as minister for correctional services, he once worked at a parole and pre-release centre in London. On his return to South Australia he was a metal and forestry worker, and he became heavily involved in trade unions and the Australian Labor Party.

A parliamentary career beckoned for Terry, but it did not come easily. In 1979 he unsuccessfully contested the seat of Victoria, which was later held by one of Terry's local footballing colleagues, Dale Baker. In 1982 his bid for a seat in the Legislative Council went much better, such that they even put his name on an office door in this building. Terry attended—I think even voted—at his first caucus meeting, but in a subsequent recount of votes, Terry fell just short and was denied again. Terry eventually gained a place in the upper house. I well remember entering parliament with him in the 1985 state election. We entered this parliament on the same day. Terry's maiden speech covered a range of topics, all of which would remain central to his work and his beliefs over the following two decades: the need for social change; the importance of protecting the disadvantaged in our society; the plight of Aboriginal Australians; industrial democracy in the workplace and worker participation in management; and the future of manufacturing and farming. All these topics remained in his heart and in his head.

I came to know Terry best when he, Phil Tyler and I were elected to the parliamentary Public Works Committee. That committee, which was chaired by the late Keith Plunkett, included Liberals such as the Hons Ted Chapman, Murray Hill, David Wotton and Peter Dunn. For four years we travelled the state together—sometimes other states—as we made site inspections and held public hearings on various infrastructure projects. All of us on that committee, regardless of politics or background, became good friends. We worked

hard and we had a lot of fun in so doing—travelling together, staying overnight in country pubs, enjoying many Wiener schnitzels, telling yarns and drinking many beers, and, with Terry and Ted both punters, always discussing the *Form Guide*. We came to know one another well.

What shines through in my memories of Terry? On the serious side there was his deep commitment to working people. He knew where he was from and he knew whose side he was on. He brought with him a worldly experience from his years at sea. He was fascinating. He would tell stories of visiting ports in South Africa and the docks in London. Of course, he also had a wisdom and valuable regional perspective as a result of his upbringing in the South-East. In a committee that included eccentrics, storytellers and practical jokers, Terry's wit and insightful commentary on events left a deep impression—because he would quietly send us all up. He would talk about his time at sea, his love of horseracing and golf, and his inexplicable love for the Collingwood Football Club.

I mentioned at his state funeral service our three celebrated aircraft incidents. We left Adelaide one morning in a light plane and shortly after take-off from Adelaide Airport on our way to Mount Gambier the young pilot—people were asking whether he had a licence because he was so young—announced that he would have to make an emergency landing because of total instrument failure. There was no electricity on board. The next day, after going down to Mount Gambier in another plane, we were in a second plane with another pilot. As we took off from Mount Gambier Airport the luggage compartment in the nose of the plane blew open, which destabilised the plane. It also destabilised me because in my luggage was tens of thousands of dollars worth of federal Labor's polling—or certainly polling from another state. I was concerned about how I would explain the loss of this polling and whether I would have to search through the pine forest around the airport to see whether I could retrieve it. Of course, it not only destabilised the plane but also forced yet another emergency landing.

Because these things seem to come in threes, I especially remember a plane trip to Roxby Downs. We were looking at a reference to the Public Works Committee for the building of a road between Woomera and Roxby. Ted Chapman had spent most of the previous night in the high rollers room at the casino. I am sure he would not mind my saying that he did not look great, and as soon as he got onto the plane he fell into a deep sleep. I also fell into a deep sleep. We were woken over Woomera by Terry who told us that the undercarriage was jammed; that it would not come down; and that we might be forced to make a belly landing at the air force strip near Woomera. We thought that Terry was joking—but he was not! We had to fly around Woomera to burn up some fuel in order to minimise the risk of an explosion if we were forced to make an emergency belly landing.

Finally, Ted Chapman (who was the hero of the hour) was sort of lying on the floor, helping the pilot to crank down the wheels of the plane. We were all waiting for the click, but we could not confirm that it was really locked in, despite some positive thumbs up from people below on the runway. It is amazing how focused and bipartisan we all became. I am not sure whether we sang *Coming in on a Wing and a Prayer*, but, certainly, it felt like that. During a most anxious hour, it was Terry who found humour in our predicament by writing a series of mock *Advertiser* headlines, which included 'Future ministers lost in air tragedy'; and even one he handed to me with a wink, 'Future premier cut down in his prime'.

But then we all agreed that the most likely headline was none of these. These were all being handed around on pieces of paper by way of Terry's gallows humour. We agreed that the headline should read, 'Fierce factional battle erupts in ALP over preselections'. We thought that was a dead cert. We landed safely and, in order to celebrate, we had this idea of taking over—in a bipartisan way—a local community radio station which was working on the nearby base. We decided that we would use this to promote the federal Labor Party and the state Liberal Party. This was one of those pranks that we would get up to. We literally took over this radio station, much to the amusement and bemusement of the Americans who were running it. Then, to calm down, we drank too many beers at the Woomera Club. But it was Terry's wry sense of humour in a crisis that won the day. I think that, probably, Ted trumped us all by getting on the radio nationally (on 2GB and 2UE), claiming that I had offered to save the rest of my colleagues by using the only parachute available in order to lighten the plane's load!

Terry Roberts was a quiet achiever, holding shadow and ministerial portfolios from 1994 right through to his death. In opposition, he played a leading role in the upper house fighting the privatisation of ETSA—something which he felt really strongly about. Similarly, he doggedly fought against industrial relations legislation which he felt would disadvantage South Australian workers. Terry was passionate, of course, about regional development, and he valuably brought rural concerns to the shadow cabinet table and then to the cabinet table.

Most of all, Terry will be remembered for his four years as a former minister for aboriginal affairs and reconciliation. It was a natural fit, because no-one cared more deeply and no-one was more committed to advancing the cause of indigenous people than Terry Roberts. Whether it be practical measures to improve health and education, native title or the protection of Aboriginal heritage, Terry reached out. He did not just walk across the bridge of reconciliation, he spent every day helping to build that bridge. Aboriginal people could relate to his quiet sincerity, his infinite patience in negotiations, his ability to walk the land with them and then to sit down in the dirt to listen rather than talk. He would sit for many hours, for as long as was needed, to gain people's trust to truly understand them and their arguments.

I will always remember our sleeping in swags in a dry creek bed (I think that it was called Talking Creek) near Umuwa on the APY lands—a part of the state that Terry always loved. He warned us about camping on a camel trail. He said that there could be herds of camels coming down the track in the middle of the night. Also, he told us that we had to put our boots at the bottom of our swag inside our swag so that the dingoes, which were roaming the area, would not steal them. I remember our drinking billy tea around a roaring fire under a sky lit up by stars and meteorites, and then being kept up all night by Terry's prodigious snoring, which would have kept any camel or dingo at bay. It sounded like the engine room on one of his cargo ships! It was great to see so many Aboriginal people at his state funeral, coming in buses and cars, making their way from all parts of the state and beyond the state to salute someone whom they loved and respected.

Terry's compassion and selflessness shone through to the very end. In January this year, just one month before his death, Terry bravely attended the dedication of the memorial in the parklands to the victims of atomic testing in South Australia's Outback at Maralinga during the 1950s and

1960s. Terry was very thin and gravely ill at this point—I think many of us were shocked—but he made the effort, which was not lost on the service veterans and Aboriginal people, and their descendants, who were there on that warm Sunday morning in North Adelaide.

I will never forget my last meeting with Terry at the Mary Potter Hospice. Terry's humour and commitment were still intact, and he joked about feeling much better now that he was on painkillers designed for race horses. I could not quite understand that but, of course, he was a great punter and he thought that was a very positive sign. He was also positive about his future but wanted to do the right thing by the Labor Party. Many of us in the Labor Party strongly felt his presence during the recent state election campaign. Indeed, I was proud and pleased to dedicate my speech at the ALP campaign launch at the Norwood Concert Hall to Terry and his memory.

Terry Roberts was the calm in every storm, the voice of reason and reasonable behaviour. Rather than blow his own trumpet, he instead quietly beat the drum of social justice in everything he did. With every path he crossed he left people aware of his integrity, and he left them feeling better about themselves and about the world, because Terry was a punter who really cared about the punters. So, on behalf of members on this side of the house, and I am sure on behalf of every member of this parliament and all of the staff in this parliament, I extend my deepest sympathy to Terry's partner Julie and to his beloved sons Nick, Tim, Harry and Tom. He will be very much missed.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal Party, I second the Premier's condolence motion and express our sincere regret at the passing of Terry Roberts, a former minister of the Crown and member of the Legislative Council, and wish to place on record our appreciation for his distinguished service to the parliament and the people of South Australia. I know, Mr Speaker, that you will convey to Mr Roberts' family our deepest sympathies and appreciation for his significant contribution to the state.

Terry Roberts was born and raised in the South-East and as a young man he spent several years at sea travelling throughout South America, Africa and on many oceans in between. Upon his return to the South-East, Mr Roberts was very active in the local community. He started work in the forestry industry, and it was there he became more involved with the union movement prior to his extensive parliamentary service. Mr Roberts joined the Labor Party some 38 years ago and first contested the seat of Victoria in 1979, which I understand now encompasses much of the current seat of MacKillop, but was unsuccessful. He then ran for the Legislative Council but a tight contest result in 1982 saw Terry again miss out, and the Premier has referred to the fact that he went to one or two caucus meetings on the assumption that he had got across the line. It must have been tragic for him to miss out in those circumstances. In 1985 he was elected to the Legislative Council, and then successfully returned.

From the beginning of his parliamentary career, Terry Roberts earned the respect of his peers and people on all sides of politics for his candour and belief that everyone deserved to have their say. After being involved in numerous committees and serving as a shadow minister for nearly eight years, Mr Roberts became the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, amongst other ministerial appointments, following Labor's election victory at the 2002 election.

During his time as minister, it was often remarked that Terry Roberts would walk the land when making decisions about Aboriginal issues and was a strong advocate for reconciliation. A quote from the upper house is that Terry Roberts used to say you need more dusty bums and less shining bums, a reference to sitting down and talking to the Aboriginal community. *The Advertiser* reports that one of Terry Roberts' main achievements was the number of sacred sites added to the Aboriginal Heritage Register under Terry's management. This was greater than under any other former minister, and I am sure that Mr Roberts' legacy will be talked about for many years to come.

While Terry Roberts and I have at times had different views, given that we are from different political parties, it was, indeed, an honour and a pleasure to have known him. On behalf of the Liberal Party, I would like to say how much we enjoyed Terry's presence as a member of parliament and how much we respected his contribution to the parliament and to the people of South Australia. Like many on this side, particularly in this house, I came to know Terry through things such as the parliamentary cricket game, in which Terry was an active participant, over coffee in the members' lounge or as a result of discussions as members of various committees. I can say very sincerely that Terry Roberts was one of the most genuine politicians one would like to meet if one was involved in politics. He was a most sincere and a most valued member of parliament. On behalf of the Liberal Party, I offer our most sincere condolences to Mr Roberts' partner Julie and four sons, Nick, Tim, Tom and Harry.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I wish to make a few brief comments—I think the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition (as will other speakers) have covered many aspects of Terry's life. Like most of my colleagues, I knew Terry for a long time; for most of the active years in which I have been a member of the Labor Party. One of Terry's characteristics and features I will always remember is that you never had an argument or a cross word with Terry and you never experienced, as one sometimes does in politics, the clash of moment or the clash of comments or the clash of thought that sometimes occurs as a result of the tensions involved in politics.

I recall that, when I first entered politics and was seeking to position myself in the seat of Semaphore to become a member of parliament (it is no great moment in Labor Party history), there was a period of tension with respect to that electorate because there were other people who also sought preselection in that seat, and Terry factionally lined up with my opponent in that area. However, throughout that entire period (and there were moments of tension between various individuals), Terry and I never had a cross word. He, in fact, could look at you and even though I knew that he was perhaps strongly supporting my internal opponent, he would still be very polite, friendly and warm in the way in which he dealt with me.

Throughout my time in this house, as a member of the shadow cabinet and, obviously, as Treasurer of this state, sitting around the cabinet table with Terry for four years, I know that Terry had some very difficult portfolios. Let us make no bones about it: to be correctional services minister in any government is not an easy portfolio. The demands and pressures on the system are such that it was a very difficult portfolio for Terry to manage. Much has been said about his Aboriginal affairs portfolio (and I will touch on that briefly), but there is no question that corrections is a difficult portfolio

at the best of times. Terry managed that very difficult portfolio extremely well, particularly given that, when it came to the allocation of resources, the correctional portfolio always was—and probably always will be—up against it. Terry handled that portfolio well, and never at any time did we have cross words.

With respect to the Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation portfolio, again, Terry was able to manage a difficult portfolio to the extent that, as has been mentioned, significant increased funding has flowed through, particularly to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands, as a direct result of Terry's passion and doggedness in pushing forward a strong argument to cabinet, to government and to me as Treasurer, which saw us agreeing with Terry that it was important that those funding increases be provided.

My long lasting memory of Terry will be of a gentleman, of someone who never had a cross word with me or with people around the cabinet table—or, if he did, it was very rare, very quick and never with the degree of strength that often happens amongst individuals, be it in the cabinet room or elsewhere in the parliament.

Terry was a great contributor to this parliament and showed all of us that you can do this job with great character, great humility and great politeness, which people like me should reflect on in terms of how we conduct ourselves. I want to put on the record that it is sad losing Terry, and he is one person whom I will miss. I say to Julie his partner, in particular, and also and importantly to his sons Nick, Tim, Harry and Tom, that they can be very proud of their partner and father.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): There is at least one thing that Terry Roberts and I have in common: we both call Millicent our home (and our birthplace). Notwithstanding that we came from the same community, Terry was a few years older than me and I did not really get to know him until latterly, principally when I came here and joined him in this parliament. Terry was born in Millicent in 1946, and we have to understand a little bit about that community in those days, in Terry's formative years in that town and community, to understand Terry Roberts. Unlike just about every other rural town in South Australia, particularly in those days, Millicent was a multicultural community and an industrial-based community. That is, I think, the situation that Terry grew up in and what probably formed his views of life and the world around him as he grew.

As has already been mentioned, he had a great love for sport of all kinds and was a great participant in sport. He was a fine footballer, played A-grade for the Millicent football club, and played cricket for many years in Millicent. He loved his cricket. Also, in latter years he was a very keen golfer. Terry was always known around Millicent as 'Rough'. People just talked about 'Rough' and everyone knew who they were talking about, but it was only quite recently, in fact at the service held in his honour at the Convention Centre following his death, that I learned where Terry got the name.

His brother sent a letter that was read out during that service, which said that, when they were small boys, their mother was ill at one stage and they were sent to live with a relative in Penshurst in western Victoria. In the local community there, those two new boys to the town were being knocked around a bit by the local bully, and Terry sorted him out and from that day on was known as 'Rough Stuff'. If you walked anywhere in Millicent and mentioned the name 'Rough', everyone in that community knew who you were

talking about. I had always assumed that it was something to do with his behaviour on the football field, so, Terry, I owe you an apology for that one.

Terry learned his trade at what was then in Millicent the Apcel mill, now known as KCA, Kimberly-Clark Australia, and made strong friendships there. One of the things that struck me following Terry's untimely death was that the *Advertiser* wrote one article and referred to him as an intellectual. I thought about that and thought: I am not too sure that Terry would have regarded himself as an intellectual. However, one of the stories relayed at the service was by Trevor Medhurst, who started his apprenticeship with Apcel on the same day as Terry and who told some terrific yarns about Terry in a quite light-hearted manner. One of the yarns was that Terry started reading books by Tolstoy, Dostoevski and a whole heap of people whose names both Trevor and I find difficult to even pronounce, and he said, 'We started to worry about Terry, so we made sure that every time we went somewhere in the car we sat him in the front so we could keep an eye on him.'

As I said, he loved his golf. In recent years, before he left Millicent and moved here to Adelaide, he could be found every Saturday morning at the Millicent Golf Club. I believe that they even kept his golf clubs in the boot of the ministerial car so that he could take the opportunity when it arose to play one of his then favourite sports. Terry Roberts will be remembered for a long, long time as one of Millicent's favourite sons. He will be affectionately remembered, particularly in the Somerset or the Sportsman's, as 'Rough', and he will be missed. He will be sadly missed by many close friends in the Millicent community. I sincerely offer my condolences and those of the people of the Millicent district and the electorate of MacKillop to his partner Julie, their sons, Tom and Harry, and his older sons, Nick and Tim.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I want to speak briefly to this motion and to add my condolences to those passed on by other members to Julie and the boys. I met Terry Roberts in the mid-1980s when he was first elected to this place and I was a staffer working for the then minister for education, Greg Crafter. I had a fair bit to do with Terry in those days when he represented Greg at various events and I guess I got to know him reasonably well. You could describe him as an old-fashioned lefty, a radical in his views, but in his personal behaviour and demeanour he was very much the opposite: a very gentle person.

It was an interesting combination of qualities: radicalism of thought, but gentleness of behaviour. Those qualities equipped him very well for the job of Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. He was able to bring to that portfolio a very strong understanding of the needs of Aboriginal people and also the capacity to listen, understand and identify with people who did not want fast solutions but who did want someone to listen to them. I think that is why the Aboriginal community, in particular, was so well represented at his funeral.

In the last four years I got to know Terry in a different context, because he represented me (as the minister for the environment) in the other place and we had quite a lot of legislation to put through both houses. I would deal with it in this house and then pass it on to Terry. Sometimes the bills were complex, running for hundreds of pages with hundreds of amendments, and I would seek an opportunity to brief Terry. I think the most I ever got out of him was about five minutes to say what the bill was about and he would say,

'That'll be all right.' I was very nervous, but he would go into the council and stick to the line faithfully all the way through and not put up with any nonsense, just work his way through it. He would not become at all unsettled or rattled by the process of dealing with legislation in a not necessarily friendly environment. I learned quite a bit from him about how to go through that process, and I thank him for the support he gave me as the minister assisting the minister for the environment. As has been said by other members, Julie and his sons should be very proud of their partner and father.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I would like to pass on my condolences to Julie and the boys. I concur with what a lot of other members have said: Terry Roberts was a fine man. I got to know him through the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, and it was a pleasure to have known him; he was a really decent man. Everything that the other members have said could best be summed up in the term: Terry's *palaru wati wiru*. That means: Terry Roberts was a decent man.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises): I would like to speak briefly to this motion. I acknowledge all those who have spoken before me and, obviously, I agree with their comments. I knew Terry for about 20 years, and all through that period I found him to be a very genuine human being, a very easy person to get on with. I got to know him better when I came into the parliament. I think it would be pretty close to the mark to say that you could not find any other member of parliament who got on better with each and every other member of parliament irrespective of where they came from, both politically and geographically.

As others have already said—the member for MacKillop, in particular—Terry was a proud Millicent man and a very good sportsman. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I, too, got to know him better through the parliamentary cricket matches, which he took extremely seriously. In his younger days, he was a very good footballer and cricket player and, in more recent times, a serious golfer. As others have already said, he was a very keen punter, and we used to share quite a lot of stories on the Monday about who had won in various states, and so forth, and it surprised me how much he knew about racing and how closely he in fact followed it.

Similar to my colleague, the former minister for the environment, Terry also shepherded through legislation for me in the Legislative Council, and I had an identical experience. Despite complicated pieces of legislation, whether it was the Fair Work Act or the Safe Work Act, Terry did not much need or care for a briefing, or to go into too much detail about what was in the legislation. He gave me the same message as he gave to the member for Kaurua. Terry was always very laconic, and was always successful in making sure that he was able to shepherd that legislation through.

I well remember having discussions with the member for Morphett, who asked me, down at Adelaide Oval at a SACA function back some months ago, how Terry was, and it was a great pity that we saw him slip away considerably. What struck me was his strength of character all through that period. Whenever you spoke to him, whether it was in or out of the cabinet room, he was always very confident and very gutsy in the way he handled his serious health problems. I remember having a discussion with the member for Morphett, and he shared with me on that evening a number of stories

about Terry and parliamentary committees, and those stories will always stay with me.

Could I also express my sympathies to Julie and the boys, Nick, Tim, Tom and Harry. They have a lot to be proud of. I am sure that Terry would have been successful at any portfolio. He was a fantastic listener, he could get on with people and he was a great communicator. They were some of his strengths, and I am sure that with strengths like that—being able to listen to people, being able to digest an argument, being able to communicate with people, whether it be in the delicate portfolios of Aboriginal affairs or correctional services—he would have succeeded in any portfolio. The parliament of South Australia has lost a great South Australian.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Terry Roberts was a genuine, old-time, left-wing Labor man, and we would do well to remember him, especially because there will not be too many more like him coming into the parliament. I knew him through work on the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. Through his work there as minister, it was plain to see that he had a genuine regard for Aboriginal people, indeed, for anyone who was getting a raw deal in our community. When he took on the ministry for Aboriginal affairs he probably did not realise that he was going to have so much to do with mining, particularly undermining, but he did his bit and did it well. Aboriginal welfare has improved over the past four years largely thanks to him. At the very least, a spotlight has been put on past inadequacies. Terry Roberts genuinely did his very best to see that those inadequacies were overcome. My condolences to the family. May he rest in peace.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I also rise to give my condolences to Julie and the boys, and to say that we all mourn and miss Terry enormously. It is interesting when you look at the time of someone's death and realise how much you learn about the way they lived their lives. It is true that when someone passes it is often inevitable—and we all know that we will die—but to die at the peak of one's powers in office in government as a minister when you have a young family, and you have so much before you, is both cruel and shocking for all of us. Death in many ways is the stuff of legend, it is the material of heroic acts, and, in many ways, the essence of bravery, and I do not just mean about those who die on the battlefield; I mean those who die from serious illness.

Terry approached the last months of his life with an extraordinary degree of bravery and heroism. He died, I think, offering so much to all of us around him. He was, above all, stoic, calm, generous and kind. When you think of death and being in hospital and ill you use the word 'patient', as if it is the name of the job you have. In fact, patience was what Terry showed so often. As in his dealings with Aboriginal people, he was able to sit, be calm and patient, wait for things to happen and, at the same time, spread a degree of peace around him. Although people were deeply worried and mourning that his loss would occur soon, through his calm and peaceful approach to his life he managed to help and support them in the worst moments of his life. In fact, I often spoke to Terry about illness, sickness and hospitals, but, interestingly, he never spoke about himself. Basically, he spoke about his family, their illnesses, his children, their visits to hospitals and how hard that was. The energy he put

into talking about his own illness was very small. He was forever brave. In fact, the one thing he loved more than his portfolio, indigenous people, the union movement, his political views and the ALP was always his family. He would want them to be well, safe and comfortable into the future.

Of the things I remember most about Terry is, I think, his quality that is so rare amongst us: Terry never spoke unless he had something worthwhile to say. It always served you well to listen to him because he said something wise and sensible and, at the end of it, as the Treasurer said, there was never acrimony, ill will or ill temper. There was always a smile because he always left a curve at the end of a conversation: a bend or a twist that made you laugh at yourself. He will be sadly missed. He spoke ill of no-one and none of us could speak ill of him. He was a kind, generous and humane man who loved his family more than anything else. When we remember him, we all will smile because we loved him. We send our affection and love to his family.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): It is with sadness that I rise to pay tribute to Terry Roberts. Terry was one of the truly nice guys of politics, and it was my great honour to have the opportunity to speak at Terry's memorial service; and I think everyone from the various sides of Terry's life learnt a lot about the man and the way in which people across this state thought of Terry Roberts. The service was a fitting tribute to a very decent, likeable and highly respected man. His commitment to the Aboriginal affairs portfolio was always obvious, but people at the service that day saw the respect and gratitude of the Aboriginal community. They would be left in no doubt about Terry Roberts's contribution, the way in which he went about it and the passion he had for Aboriginal people.

Terry was never an attention seeker. He would quietly and efficiently perform all his tasks without much noise being made. His love for the South-East (as the member for MacKillop said) was always obvious and never diminished. He and I had mutual friends in the South-East and he was forever reporting to me what they were doing. Certainly, the South-East played a big part in Terry Roberts's life. Terry was always cheerful and friendly around Parliament House, never taking politics beyond the chamber. Many members in this place greatly enjoyed Terry's company. Certainly, he will be missed not only by the Labor Party but also across the whole political spectrum, and this place will be poorer for his parting. We all admired the courage with which Terry fought his illness while he continued to try to complete the jobs he had set himself within his portfolios. It was an honour to know Terry Roberts. I pass on my sympathy to Julie and his family on their sad and premature loss. I also pass on my thoughts to his friends and his staff. I know they thought very highly of Terry.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): It is my privilege also to honour the contribution made to this parliament and to public life by the Hon. Terry Roberts. For nearly 10 years Terry had responsibilities in this area of Aboriginal affairs, first, of course, as shadow minister and then four years as minister. I am conscious, as the new Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, that I follow a man who enjoyed extraordinary respect within the Aboriginal community. I know that Terry commenced much work, and it is proper to respect his memory by continuing that work, and I pledge to do that.

Terry's vision ultimately was one of optimism. Terry could always and only see the very best of human nature. That is the attitude he took to his politics; certainly, it is the attitude he took to the question of Aboriginal affairs. Some would say it is the attitude you need if you are going to be a socialist; and, certainly, Terry was a socialist and a deep optimist. He acknowledged that, while there were many challenges in Aboriginal affairs, he never ceased to see the importance of telling the good stories—the things that were successful about Aboriginal culture and the Aboriginal community.

During his term as minister, Terry had many proud achievements. As mentioned earlier, an additional 68 Aboriginal heritage sites were registered during his time as minister. He was known for walking the country with traditional owners before making a decision, especially when that decision involved disturbing what was found to be a site of significance. He thought that it was appropriate that he hear the stories and pay his respect before making a decision which would have an effect on an area of significance for Aboriginal people. He gained respect by his willingness to sit down and listen to these stories that were so important to the traditional owners.

I know that one of his proudest achievements was the Aboriginal Economic Development Seminar and Expo, which was held in June last year. One again, he regarded that as a way in which he could showcase the undoubted talent and creativity that exists within the Aboriginal community. Another of his proud achievements was the launch of our policy in relation to Aboriginal affairs, *Doing it Right*, which has at its basis respecting Aboriginal people and ensuring that the wider South Australian community respect the Aboriginal people in the way in which we carry out our affairs.

Of course, Terry re-established the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, where he strove for bipartisan support in relation to these important questions. In relation to the APY lands and the extraordinarily disturbing outcomes that we have witnessed in those lands, Terry's abiding interest was to ensure that everything we did to try to help paid proper respect to the people who were on those lands. He was always concerned to ensure that we did not in any way rob people of their dignity by the way in which we tried to help. That was his abiding contribution to the way in which we sought to assist in the Aboriginal lands area.

Many members would probably know that Terry Roberts used to hang out with my father in the upper house. They were good mates. They were joined by a love of another pursuit of the optimist, the love of the punt—racing, betting on horses. Terry and my father, of course, would be known to shoot across the road to the Station Arcade where the TAB existed. Obviously, they would plot together to seek to make their fortune. I am told that Terry's brother provided tips, but there is no known record of any of those tips running a place in any of the years that Terry was in parliament. It does demonstrate that Terry was an optimist. I think that one day the member for Elder described punting as purchasing hope. Terry purchased a lot of hope during his time as a member of parliament. I know that it was one of his abiding interests. Of course, Terry was also a shop steward—I think a shop steward in the same factory where his brother was a manager, if that is right. I think that it is described as one brother trying to run the factory and another brother trying to close down the factory. His abiding interest was the welfare of working people.

I knew Terry for a little over 20 years. I spent quite a lot of time around the corridors of the Legislative Council watching how this place operated, and it was after that experience I decided that I wanted to be a member of the House of Assembly—no, that is not true. But it is certainly the case that I had a lot to do with Terry during those years. I can remember one particular occasion when I had a personal upset. I remember sitting down in one of the lounges in the Legislative Council, and Terry's kindness and gentleness was something that I will never forget. Terry had kind eyes. If you thought you were in trouble you always knew you could speak to Terry and you would have a shoulder to cry on and he would look after you. So I think Terry's gentle approach to the world is something we have all witnessed, and he was a genuinely lovely man.

I say in closing that I am in awe of his partner Julie's speech at the funeral service. How anyone could be so brave and allow us the insights into her life with Terry and the lives of her sons is extraordinary, and I pay tribute to her. I hope we can do something in the future which pays an appropriate honour to Terry's service in the Aboriginal affairs portfolio, and I dedicate myself to that task. To his family, I say that you should be proud of your father. His commitment to making South Australia a better place was undoubted and you should be very proud indeed.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I wish to add to the condolences of my colleagues and also support the motion of the Premier and the leader. It is strange how we often stereotype people, particularly before we come into this place. Terry was here five years before me and I was active within the upper levels of the Liberal Party. I had this person painted as some leftie from the unions, a heavy duty person, without even knowing him. When I came here in 1990, I soon learnt how wrong I was. I served with Terry for eight years on the ERD Committee and for seven years I was chairman. The advice, support and friendship that he gave me will always be remembered. The Hon. Stef Key, the Hon. Karlene Maywald, the Hon. John Dawkins, the Hon. Mike Elliott, Terry and I made up that committee. It was an excellent committee—I would say, one of the best. The Hon. Michael Elliott kept us all on our toes—he was fairly tricky to deal with—but a bit of advice from Terry, and support from Stef, would usually manage to keep us just in front of him, particularly when the media were around. I remember fondly that he called me Ivo. I do not know why, but he called me Ivo.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I heard the interjection, and it is reciprocated. To the new members on both sides in this place, I give some advice. Remember that, if you treat people fairly, you will have as many friends on that side of the house as you have on this side, because we are all here with a job to do. Nobody could be more opposite than Terry and me. We are from opposite ends of the spectrum. I think back with great clarity to the advice he gave me. We shared many private moments, and they will remain private. Suffice to say, to those who know, yes, I will miss the phone call on Boxing Day. I think the Hon. Stef Key knows what I am talking about. Those sort of things bring home the person he was, and he never forgot.

He was a fine negotiator. I was caught in the crossfire between the Hon. Dorothy Kotz and the Iga Warta community. We had just returned, with the Hon. Graham Gunn, from a tour up there and we learnt first hand of the problem that was brewing. I went to the minister and got a

rev up, and I happened to see Terry and I asked him what the resolution was. Well, the problem had been resolved, and in a quiet manner. It was often overlooked that Terry was a very fine negotiator. Terry was, indeed, a very caring, sharing person of great integrity. As has been said, he was a quiet achiever. We remember him with great fondness. We were all shocked to hear of his illness, and the courage he showed by battling it right to the end was an inspiration to us all.

We met Terry's partner Julie on several occasions. He once said to me, 'I am very much in love with Julie, but I think she votes Liberal. I don't know, nor do I worry.' Together they were a fine unit. He certainly married into a very good family, which had its roots in Millicent. To Terry's wife Julie and their sons Nick, Tim, Harry and Tom, I offer our sincere condolences. Terry is gone, but he will never be forgotten.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): It is with great sadness that I speak today: Terry was a very good friend. He was certainly very loyal to those about whom he cared and to the values of the Labor movement, and he was well known for sticking by his word. Terry loved his family. He always spoke of his great love for his oldest sons, Nick and Tim. He was exceptionally proud of the men they have become and that they have his values. He loved his Julie and he loved Harry and Tom.

I will always remember an occasion when Bob and I were driving back from Murray Bridge and we received a telephone call from Terry. He said, 'Guess who's pregnant?' I said a few names and Bob said a few names, but—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: We guessed that there may be a few. There was something really special in his voice, so I said to him, 'Are you pregnant?' and he just burst out laughing. He sounded like a naughty schoolboy, and you could just hear in his voice, 'Look what I've done.' He was so proud of himself. Terry had a great sense of humour, which was infectious, and he liked to take the mickey out of us if he thought we were getting a little too serious or going off the mark. He was a good listener, and he was patient in his debate. He never belittled anyone but, with great skill, he always worked through the issues.

Terry's career has been covered, which obviously is a great credit to this very lovely man, so I want to share some of the personal aspects of his humour and his character, which I had the pleasure of being a part of. As I said, Terry was a good friend, and he was certainly the most enjoyable company. During the days of my first term—I had not been here very long—he absolutely insisted that we join a delegation of members of parliament from around Australia and overseas and go to Tahiti (I was really excited) and protest over the French nuclear testing on Mururoa Atoll. It was an experience that I have never forgotten, and some of it is as vivid in my mind now as it was then.

I learnt a great deal about Terry during that trip. He had a great ability to judge situations for what they were or what they could become and, regardless of all that, he always maintained his sense of humour. We had been there a little while and the calmness of the island started to erupt after the first test had occurred on Mururoa Atoll. The situation became quite volatile. For the first time, in all the years that I had known Terry, I saw a real tenseness in his being. The news of the French Legionnaires coming onto the island concerned him even more. I just thought that he was being a

fuddy-duddy but I learnt differently: they scared me, I can tell you. So, I understood what he was talking about. Terry's biggest concern was for the local people: he was worried about their wellbeing.

During that trip, one morning about 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock I was woken by this loud banging on my door. It was Terry, saying to me 'Get dressed, pack your bags and wait.' I said to him 'Why is that?' and he dragged me across to look out the window and said, 'Look at that.' Coming down the hill were all these trucks, a convoy of trucks, and you could hear them rumbling; it was echoing everywhere. He said to me, 'The legionnaires have landed', and he just turned and walked out of my room. Of course, I dutifully got dressed, packed my bags and sat and waited. At about 6 o'clock in the morning I thought: what's going on? So, I went up to his door and knocked, and this very sleepy fellow opened the door. I said to him, 'I'm packed: why are you still in your pyjamas? What's going on?' And he said to me, 'I thought we might be whisked away by the legionnaires and I thought you needed to be ready, because you had more to pack than me,' and he just turned round and went back to bed!

After a while, when the news of the first test on the atoll seeped out into the community, the local people began to protest and the situation became really volatile. Fires were set in 44-gallon drums across roadways to block them, and the only means of transport were the very occasional taxi rides through the back roads or on foot. Several of us one evening decided we would take a taxi back to our accommodation, but you could not go through the main road, you actually had to go through the hills. During this taxi ride, the taxi nearly slipped down the side of the mountain several times. It was really rough and rocky, and Terry absolutely vowed from that time on that he would never catch another taxi again but would walk. And, in fact, he did.

I was amazed that, for someone who did not like a lot of walking, he could walk several kilometres. During that particular taxi ride we saw how the local Tahitians lived in cardboard boxes on the sides of hills. It would be misty and raining, but that was how they lived. They were hidden away, out of sight of the tourism industry, and he really despaired of the life those people were living. Perhaps I will not tell you about the swim in the ocean.

Members interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: It was really hot over there, and a few of us decided that we would have a little dip in the ocean, so we went off to have this dip. My foot scraped over a sea urchin, the spiny thorns went into my foot and it was extremely painful. One of the local fellows came up and had a look and he said, 'The local remedy to fix that is for someone to pee on the infected area.' And he said that this should happen straight away. The look on Terry's face was absolutely priceless! He looked at me and then he looked at the fellow and said, 'Where can we buy some pain-killers?' He assured me that that remedy would only work on local people. Some days later we were walking past a hospital that was obviously not for the French but for the Tahitians, and he was absolutely appalled by its condition. He said to me, 'Lucky you didn't have to go there. No wonder the bloke suggested that I pee on your foot: it was probably safer.' However, it was too late: I was in great pain.

On another evening we were standing on the side of the road among the local residents and a convoy of trucks came charging past. Terry yelled 'Run!' which we all did. In the back of the trucks were legionnaires with full body shields and, as they went past, they threw tear gas canisters out at us.

Of course, everyone dived for cover. When they had gone, Terry came out from behind this huge boulder holding his sandal in his hand. Amid all this chaos and confusion that was going on, all he could say to everyone was 'Look: the strap on my sandal's broken. Where can I get it repaired?'

When he heard that the locals had set fire to the airport, he said that we should go and see what was happening; he was so impressed with the way the situation was evolving. The legionnaires were firing tear gas canisters up the hill at the local people and the local people had rocks and were throwing rocks down at the legionnaires, and occasionally they would pick up the tear gas canisters. I never knew that, regardless of his sporting achievements, Terry was such an agile fellow. He was doing an interview with Murray Nicholl, I think, and suddenly I heard him say, 'Oh shit, gotta go,' and he took off. Some tear gas canisters had lobbed down at his feet and he had to run off to dodge them. He kept saying: 'They fire guns and all these folk have are rocks.' He would always stand up for his beliefs, and he was full of admiration for those people.

It was an amazing trip. I remember we went past a French lingerie shop, which was being looted by local people. There were military police holding up garments and looking at them, but what Terry found so amusing were the fellows looking at the lingerie magazines. There were military police everywhere and chaos, but they were standing there looking at these magazines comparing the pictures, and Terry was standing in the middle of the road roaring with laughter and making comments that perhaps I will not share with you here. He had great concern for the conditions in which the Tahitians lived. He went out of his way to talk to union representatives and families, and he gave good advice and offered ongoing support. He was genuinely concerned about their quality of life and their safety, and he made many good friends who were grateful for his support.

That sense of justice was displayed in his role as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. He was exceptionally proud of that portfolio. He admired the people and he worked hard to bring about the best results in terms of their welfare and rights. That was because he genuinely cared. He would become frustrated at times, but he never gave up, despite the difficulties. He will be a great loss to this parliament and to those of us who knew him. We will miss his sense of humour, his ability to look forward, his way of slowly, yet persistently, manoeuvring around obstacles in his quest to make sure that those people had the best that he could provide. He did not manipulate the truth; he said it as it was, sometimes with great skill, which meant that you had to go away and think about what he had said and, when you did, there was always a message in his words.

His friends will always miss him. We will miss his sense of humour, his wise counsel, and mostly we will just miss chatting with him. He fought a good fight in life, and he always did things for a reason. He took many wounded birds under his wing. He made all his decisions with compassion, care and love, and he was a rare man with good and genuine beliefs whom we will really miss. We extend our condolences to the family. He was a man of whom to be exceptionally proud, and we are certainly very proud to have been associated with him.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): I would like to add my remarks to this condolence motion, having known Terry Roberts for many years. I remember meeting him with the

Hon. George Weatherill at a policy research group meeting, which was attended by a number of people including Richard Mills, Ted Gnetenko, Mick Tumbers, George Young, Anne Levy, and, later, Frank Blevins, Carolyn Pickles and Susan Lenehan, just to name a few. Gay Thompson was another of those people. We were determined in those days to make the election campaign 'Fraser's last long weekend', so you will know how long ago this was. It was a very big campaign and it was the start, certainly from my involvement with the ALP, of progressive politics: having a forum within the party which was organised and eventually moved into the factional system.

I was looking through my photo album recently. Like the member for Florey, I have taken photos, particularly of campaigns and events in South Australia. Terry features very much in those photos, as does Richard Mills, Peter Duncan and Nick Bolkus, and a number of members on this side of the chamber. It is interesting to see, just from my photos, that Terry was involved with very many different progressive campaigns, such as with industrial relations. As a trade unionist he was always at those rallies and involved in campaigns. I know that later on when I worked at the Working Women's Centre, he and Noel Trehane from the Food Preservers Union were very keen to make sure that issues for women and for working families were actually on top of the agenda, as well. I remember the late Hon. Jack Wright being involved with those campaigns and being very supportive, as was the Hon. Frank Blevins. We had some consistency with that campaigning and also an inheritance of making sure that we pushed for the most progressive industrial relations, health, safety and welfare and workers' compensation legislation.

Terry was also associated with the May Day Committee in South Australia, and it is fitting that today, the day after May Day, we are acknowledging Terry in this place, because it was something that he certainly believed in, and he practised his support and commitment to the international workers' cause. He was involved in trade union training. I remember him in the early days of the trade union training authority being involved with the late David Ruff in making sure that the metal workers—the AMWU as it was in those days—it has had a number of different acronyms, but that is one I remember most of all—making sure that shop stewards, like Terry, had an opportunity to have trade union training.

There have been a number of other causes. I remember, before I got into this place, being invited to a number of meetings with different friendship groups. Sometimes they were very awkward occasions, but I do remember this very clearly, and there are some other members in this place who will remember Terry's association with the Australia Cuba Friendship Association and some of the difficult meetings we had with us having very poor language skills in anything other than English, and certainly the delegates not being able to understand or speak English. So, it was very much meeting of fellowship, but very much charades to try to explain the policy that we were involved in.

I remember the member for Torrens and Terry going overseas. I remember campaigning on that issue and hearing the tall stories, some of which the member for Torrens has just told us about what happened on that particular campaign. I also remember the people who were involved for a very long time—over 25 years—in supporting East Timor. Terry was one of the early members of that particular organisation along with our very own Andy Alcock, who has been an activist with many other people in South Australia, so there

has always been that connection. I think part of it was that Terry's views did have an international perspective, and that was the area about him that I always respected.

In the very early days of the Working Women Centre when I was there, which would be the late seventies, early eighties, I remember Terry and Liz, and Doug and Chris Melvin, Jane Tassie and the Martinellas, just to name a few, who supported the child-care campaign that we had in the South-East to try to get more work-based child-care. Terry and Doug Melvin took responsibility for making sure that we had access to the places and the media that we needed in the South-East. That was over 25 years ago, and I know that Terry was maybe not a SNAG, but he certainly did have progressive personal politics, and I remember, like the member for Schubert, when we first heard about Julie and his telling us on the ERD Committee that this was a very special woman and that he was determined to have a relationship with her.

Although we got to meet her, we heard a lot about his admiration and respect for her. As minister Weatherill has already said, Julie's account at the state commemoration service for him was very funny. I think the member for Schubert and I will remember Terry's account of that meeting and relationship. I know that Terry was very proud of his family. He would often talk about his four children, particularly the older children because, when I had responsibilities in the youth area, he was very keen to ensure that young people also joined the Labor movement and had the support they needed to be able to have their voice heard.

One of the areas about which I probably disagree with some previous speakers is Terry's sense of humour. He did have a great sense of humour—and I always admired that. Sometimes I did not understand his humour, I have to confess. As the member for Schubert said, there were a few occasions—and I think the member for Chaffey would remember this, as well—when we were not quite sure where the joke was going but it ended up being funny all the same. My real memory and friendship with Terry was in relation to different campaigns. I was always heartened by the fact that Terry was a progressive person. He actually lived what he thought. I see him as a role model for many people who share progressive politics.

I will end with something that reflects Terry's sense of humour. I remember talking to him last year about his and my admiration for the program *Little Britain*. A lot of people hate *Little Britain* as a British comedy program, but I must say that it is something that appeals to me; and certainly Terry would talk about it as well. Terry reminds me of Daffyd, the chap who is the only gay in the village. I do not say that because of anything to do with Daffyd's sexuality but, rather, I hope it is not the case that Terry is not the only progressive trade-unionist socialist with environmental politics left in this village.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): I offer my condolences to the family of the late Terry Roberts—a good man. My relationship with Terry was as a fellow MP, first as an ALP caucus member, then as a colleague shadow minister, and then for three years sitting next to him around the cabinet table. He was a decent and most compassionate man with a quiet but sunny disposition. He was also a lot of fun. He had this beautifully understated dry sense of humour. He was sharp witted and he tended to favour the good one liner, which always fell into one of two categories; it was either self-deprecating or quite a devastating but very funny blow

to one of our colleagues. It was always delivered in a very quiet voice, and you had to be sitting next to him a lot of the time to catch what he was saying. I am very pleased that I had the opportunity to enjoy the honour of sitting next to him because quite a few of Terry's finest quips remained 'in jokes'. It still makes me smile as I remember the cheeky smirk from a very clever Terry.

What I would like people to know most about Terry is his heartfelt dedication to the people he dealt with in his beloved Aboriginal affairs portfolio. It was without a doubt his favourite part of the job. He always had a good story or two to tell about the interactions that he had with the people he met during his time in that portfolio. Terry and I shared a passion for improving the lot of Aboriginal children and our jobs did bring us together on a number of occasions on that task.

Testament to his dedication to that goal was the fact that, as his illness took greater hold, whenever I asked what I could do to lighten his load (and, of course, I was thinking of things such as taking over some of his workload, or, perhaps, helping a little with his children who happen to be similar ages to my children), he always said to me, 'I don't want anything for myself. What I really want is for you to keep fighting for those Aboriginal kids.' That is what he cared about. He devoted so much of himself to his work and to the Aboriginal affairs portfolio. He was a most passionate and consistent advocate for Aboriginal people; and, as anyone who attended the funeral service for Terry would have realised, they loved him, too.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I want to pay tribute today to a great mate of mine, Terry Roberts. Unfortunately, I missed his funeral. I was not able to be there because I had a commitment in Coober Pedy which I had to attend. However, while driving to Coober Pedy, I was really quite touched by the respect shown by the ABC towards the Hon. Terry Roberts that morning, because it regularly reported on the funeral service and what was happening. I was able to feel that I was a part of that service even though I was not present.

I do not have a lot to add about the Hon. Terry Roberts, because much has been said today. I had the privilege, good fortune and opportunity to say to Terry many of the things that have been said today, and to say the things that I felt about him, his role and the impact that he particularly had on Aboriginal lives in this state because, at Christmas time last year, Terry held a function in his office and I was invited. Also, it was a celebration of Terry's 20 years in parliament. Kyam and his staff did a wonderful job organising that function. Of course, it was full of humour, because it was Terry talking about his 20 years in parliament.

Some of us had an opportunity to say those things to Terry. I am really pleased that we were able to say them because so often things are said after people die. You wish that you had that opportunity to say those things to people. That afternoon we did, and it was a great experience for me. He was a great man and he was a great minister. He had a very genuine rapport and empathy with Aboriginal people, and I think that is probably his crowning glory and heart. He really did have that rapport with Aboriginal people.

He was not a bleeding heart. He understood better than anyone the good and the bad that is involved. Certainly, he understood very well the factions in the Aboriginal community. I suppose that, coming from the Labor Party, he had a very good grounding and some prior knowledge in that. I think they actually beat us at that! Terry always understood

that and always listened to more than one version of any event that happened, and he was able to carry on very well because of that.

He was very much respected. When people die, there is always a lot of hypocrisy, you hear stories and people say nice things. No-one bad ever dies. They are always great family people, they are always wonderful people and they all do very well. However, in this instance, what was being said about Terry was true. He was most respected by the Aboriginal people. He had that genuine respect from Aboriginal people. When you travelled around with him, as I did with the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, you saw the respect shown to him by the Aboriginal people. They were pleased to see him, not only because he was the minister. They were honoured that the minister had come to visit them, but they were pleased to see him. So many times people came up to him, put their arms around him and said, 'Hello, brother,' and he responded.

I remember going to the Ceduna Hotel, and Harry Miller came up and was so pleased to see him, as were so many other people in that community. Wherever we went, people knew Terry Roberts. They loved and respected him. They threw their arms around him and said, 'Hello, brother,' and it was always wonderful to see. We went on a number of trips with Terry to different Aboriginal communities in the last four years, and we had some incredible experiences during those times. Unfortunately, Terry was not able to go with us in the last 12 months or so. He tried very hard to go with us as often as he could but, unfortunately, he had to miss out at times when he was particularly sick. But when he could go, he made the trip.

We camped in all sorts of accommodation and went to all sorts of places in the state. In particular, we were up north at Ernabella and camping in what I would not call five star accommodation. We stayed in a little cabin, and there were four beds in one room and a sofa in another. I was lucky enough to score the sofa and the others had to sleep in the other room. We were warned about this accommodation. We were warned that there would be a lot of noise at night, that there would be people racing around in cars, and there probably would be sniffers and fighting, etc., and we would be kept awake by this noise. We did not hear any of that, but we were kept awake that night by Terry's snoring. I was fortunate enough to be on the sofa, but it was only three feet from Terry's head. It was an experience, and somebody else mentioned that it was an experience never to be forgotten. After that, we voted that we would all make sure that Terry had accommodation that was a long way from the rest of us.

Much has been said today about the fact that he was a country boy and grew up in Millicent in the South-East, and that was his roots and he was a country boy at heart. I have to question this, because one thing that I will never forget about Terry is that he had absolutely no sense of direction. I know that because we were on a trip up north and there were two car loads and we were going from Umuwa, in the middle of the lands, south to Fregon to meet. We had an hour to get there. So, the car with Terry, who was not driving but was in charge, took off and left, and we followed afterwards. We drove to Fregon, which was about a 40-minute trip, and we sat and waited. We had tried to catch up with Terry's car on the way but we could not, and we thought that they must be planting the foot. We sat at Fregon and waited and waited, and about 2½ hours later Terry turned up. I think the Hon. John Gazzola and Kris Hanna were in that car. Anyway, they turned up, but we wondered what on earth they had been up

to and what had happened to them. Terry knew exactly where he was going and knew the road, so they headed along this road and they drove and drove, and after about an hour Terry started to wonder a little bit about whether they were headed in the right direction, and the others started to question him. Then they turned up at a place called Amata.

What members may not understand about this is that you drive along the road and there is only one road and it is a straight road and you keep going, and it is heading west. You know it is heading west, because it is where the sun is. You know when you are heading south, if you are a true country boy, because you look to see where the sun is. He had managed to drive for about an hour and a half without working out where the sun was and that he was heading west and not south. So, of course, after that, I never gave much credit to his country background because I thought that was unforgivable for a country boy.

Another incident happened when we were at Marla, and it made Terry laugh until he cried. It was one of the funniest things I had ever seen. We were sitting in the pub at Marla having a quiet drink (and it was a quiet drink) and there was a chap who was a contractor on the lands sitting with us, and he had been talking to us. The Hon. Robert Lawson walked in and introduced himself to this fellow, who was a bit rough and ready, as someone in that part of the state can be. The fellow said, 'Who are you?' and he said, 'I am the Hon. Robert Lawson.' He replied, 'Oh, Liberal—' expletive, and I cannot say the word that he said. Terry and the rest of us erupted. Poor Robert looked shocked and stunned at this comment made about him. It was not particularly malicious, I do not think, but it was hilarious at the time, and Terry never forgot it and frequently brought it up with Robert and made Robert blush every time.

As I said, when someone dies we all say nice things, but I think there are genuine things that we can say about Terry. Terry and I spent many hours in discussion about the APY lands and the events of the last two or three years in the APY lands. I have to say that we were right, Terry, and I want to thank you for the votes that I received there in the recent state election.

Terry displayed the same dignity during his illness that he displayed in carrying out his other roles—and that is an aspect that has not been mentioned today; his dignity. Other things have been said but, certainly, he was very dignified throughout his illness. Terry was very positive. I shared a number of ups and downs with him in respect of his illness when different news arrived. He carried on continuously. He tried to work for as long and as hard as he could, and he still made every effort he could with respect to his job and to the Aboriginal people in this state.

He was so proud of his family—Julie, Nick, Tim, Harry and Tom—and they can be so proud of him. He also thought the world of his staff, and I know that they thought the world of him. Kyam, John, Richard, Josie and David, you have lost the best boss that you have ever had the privilege, or will ever have the privilege, to work for, and I know that you feel it also. I know that Jonathan Nicholls, the Secretary of the Aboriginal Lands Committee, had great respect for and great rapport with Terry, and I know that if he could speak today he would. I also pass on his condolences. I lost a great mate in this place. He looked after me from the day that I arrived. This place really owes a great deal to the Hon. Terry Roberts, and we will miss him.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): The last time I spoke to my good friend Terry was just a couple of days before he died, and I was very disappointed that I did not have the opportunity of seeing him in person. I had heard that he had lost a lot of weight and so, like any good Italian, my solution to his getting better was to cook him an Italian meal. While I was speaking to him he was very up-beat and funny, as always, and he insisted that it be a core election promise from me that I would cook the meal. On the Friday night, the night before he died, I bumped into Peter Buckskin, and we were both exchanging our news about Terry. Peter also said that he had just seen Terry and that he was looking really well, and we talked about the fact that I was going to cook a meal for him. So, I was shattered the following morning when I received a telephone call to say that Terry had died.

As the member for Giles said, Terry was a great friend to me. He certainly looked after me. I was often frustrated, as always, and emotional in this place, and Terry was always a very calming influence on me. Much to the consternation of his staff, I would often install myself in his office, even if he was having an important meeting. If I had something to say, Terry was always very patient and happy to listen to me. I have promised his boys that I will still cook a good Italian meal in memory of Terry, and also for his staff. Terry was a great individual, and he will be missed by us all. He was a true gentleman and someone upon whom we could all model ourselves. I extend my condolences to his family.

The SPEAKER: I also offer my condolences to the family of the Hon. Terry Roberts. My heart goes out to his partner, Julie, and to his boys, Nick, Tim, Harry and Tom. Terry was a true gentleman of South Australian politics and a great advocate for the most vulnerable people of our state. I will provide the Hon. Terry Roberts' family with a copy of *Hansard* with the relevant sections of today's proceedings. I now invite members to support the motion in the customary fashion.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 3.35 to 3.45 p.m.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCIES

The SPEAKER: I lay on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two houses held today for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. A.J. Redford, at which Stephen Graham Wade was elected. I also lay on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two houses held today for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the death of the Hon. T.G. Roberts, at which Bernard Vincent Finnigan was elected.

CITY OF HOLDEFAST BAY

A petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the Minister for State/Local Government Relations to suspend the council for the City of Holdfast Bay and its administration and install an administrator to undo the amalgamation of the former cities of Glenelg and Brighton prior to the next local government elections, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

OAKLANDS PARK RAILWAY CROSSING

A petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to complete the building of a road/rail separation at the Oaklands Park railway crossing within four years and guarantee that the Marion Interchange does not hinder the building of these roadworks, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

SCHOOLS, HAHNDORF PRESCHOOL

A petition signed by 71 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to provide two child size toilets for the Hahndorf Preschool, was presented by Mr Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

- Remuneration Tribunal Determination—
- No. 4 of 2005—Salary Sacrifice Arrangements
- No. 5 of 2005—Conveyance Allowances
- No. 1 of 2006—Auditor General, Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner, Employee Ombudsman, Ombudsman and Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner
- No. 3 of 2006—Members of the Judiciary, Members of the Industrial Relations Commission, State Coroner, Commissioners of the Environment Resources and Development Court
- No. 4 of 2006—Conveyance Allowances
- No. 5 of 2006—Ministers of the Crown and Officers and Members of Parliament
- No. 6 of 2006—Ministers of the Crown and Officers and Members of Parliament

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

- Whyalla Steelworks Act 1958, Schedule 3—
- Environmental Authorisation Variation
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Mining—Royalty

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

- Economic and Finance Committee, Response to Inquiry into National Competition Policy
- Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Report 2004-05
- Essential Services Commission Act 2002, Review of—
- Report 2005
- Water and Wastewater Prices in Metropolitan and Regional South Australia—Transparency Statement 2006-07
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Public Corporations—Port Adelaide Maritime Corporations
- Public Finance and Audit—South Australian Centre for Trauma and Injury Recovery Incorporated
- Superannuation—Overtime Allowance

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

- Adelaide Cemeteries Authority—Charter
- Architects Board of South Australia—Report 2005
- Adelaide—Port Augusta Scheduled Airline Route, Award of Route Service Licence—Report
- Development Act—
- Development Plan Amendment Reports—
- Burnside, City of—Historic (Conservation) Zone No 2 Plan
- Charles Sturt, City of—District Centre (West Lakes) Zone Building Height and Design Plan

- Holdfast Bay (City) Development Plan—North Brighton Coastal Plan
 Onkaparinga, City of—Local Heritage (Quidhampton House) Plan
 Playford, City of—Munno Para District Centre Plan
 Walkerville, Corporation of the Town of—Walkerville Development Plan—Heritage Places and Areas Plan
 Section 49(15)—
 Removal of a Significant Tree at Julia Farr Services, Marlborough Street, Fullarton
 Port Operating Agreement (Port Adelaide), Variation of—
 Agreement between the Minister for Transport and Flinders Ports Pty Ltd
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Development—
 Clarification of Public Notice Categories
 Land Management Agreements
 Miscellaneous
 Public Notice Categories
 River Murray
 System Indicators
 Harbors and Navigation—
 Application for Licence
 Port Adelaide
 Whyalla Swimming Enclosure
 Motor Vehicles—
 Demerit Points
 Qualified Supervising Drivers
 Road Traffic—
 Approved Photographic Detection Device
 Declaration of Hospitals
 Emergency Workers
 Expiation Fees
 Vehicle Standards
- By the Minister for Energy (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Electricity—Small Customer Accounts
 Gas—Small Customer Accounts
- By the Attorney-General (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—
 Public Advocate, Office of—Report 2004-05
 Dangerous Area Declarations—Statistical Returns—
 1 July 2005 to 30 September 2005
 1 October 2005 to 31 December 2005
 Road Block Establishment Authorisations—Statistical Returns—
 1 July 2005 to 30 September 2005
 1 October 2005 to 31 December 2005
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Co-operatives—Applied Provisions
 Coroners—Fees for Appointed Coroners
 Criminal Assets Confiscation—Forms and Declarations
 Electoral—Forms
 Expiation of Offences—
 Expiation Enforcement Warning Notices
 Prescribed Forms
 Guardianship and Administration—Constitution of Board
 Partnership—General
 Security Investigation Agents—Security Agents
 Summary Offences—
 Dangerous Articles
 Prescribe Serious Criminal Offences
- Rules—
 Magistrates Court—Arrest Warrants
 Supreme Court—Listening and Surveillance Devices
- By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.D. Hill)—
 Animal and Plant Control Commission—Report January—June 2005
 National Environment Protection Council—Report 2004-05
 Southern Adelaide Health Service—Report 2004-05
 Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002- Report 1 October 2005—
 31 December 2005
 Regulations under the following Acts—
- Ambulance Services—
 Elections
 SA Ambulance Service Rules
 Controlled Substances—Identification of Authorised Officers
 National Parks and Wildlife—Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park
 Native Vegetation—Exemptions
 Natural Resources Management—Regional NRM Levies
 Physiotherapists—Qualifications
 Physiotherapy Practice—Elections
 Podiatry Practice—Elections
 Public and Environmental Health—Notifiable Diseases
 South Australian Health Commission—Compensable Fees
- By the Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises (Hon. M.J. Wright)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 State Procurement—Community Welfare Funding Arrangements
- By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. M.J. Wright)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Construction Industry Long Service Leave—
 Corresponding Law
 Dangerous Substances—Security Sensitive Substances
 Explosives—Security Sensitive Substances
 Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—
 Prescribed Scaling Factor
 Scales of Charges
 Scales of Charges for Chiropractors
- By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—
 Hospitality Subjects
 Subjects
- By the Minister for Families and Communities (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Children's Protection—Definition of Department
- By the Minister for Housing (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements)—Aboriginal Housing Authority Board
- By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—
 Advisory Board of Agriculture—Report 2004-05
 Citrus Board of South Australia—Report 2004-05
 Dairy Authority of South Australia—Report 2004-05
 Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia—
 Report 2004-05
 Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Report 2004-05
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Aquaculture—Division of Leases and Licences
 Fisheries—Protected Fish
 Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
 Meat Food Safety Advisory Committee
 Participation in Citrus Industry
- By the Minister for the River Murray (Hon. K.A. Maywald)—
 South Australian Water Corporation, Direction to—
 Pursuant to Section 6 of the Public Corporations Act 1993
 Regulations under the following Act—
 River Murray—Referrals to Minister

By the Minister for Science and Information Economy
(Hon. K.A. Maywald)—

Bio Innovation SA—Report 2004-05

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations
(Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
City of Adelaide—Elections and Polls
Local Government—Long Service Leave
Local Government (Elections)—Ballots and Returns
Local Government Finance Authority—Prescribed
Local Government Body
Local Government—By-laws—

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. J.M.
Rankine)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Building Work Contractors—Fees
Consumer Transactions—Consumer Contracts
Liquor Licensing—
Brighton
Clare Dry Areas
Kensington Road Lookout
Maitland
Naracoorte
New Year's Eve
Normanville
Peterborough
Port Adelaide and Semaphore
Port Augusta Dry Areas
Removal of Persons From Licensed Premises
Victor Harbor

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. P. Caica)—

Rules—
Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000—Rules—
Prescribed Minimum Risks.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS LAWS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Australia's High Court will begin hearing the South Australian government's challenge against the federal government's new industrial relations laws on Thursday. We have taken this case to court to protect South Australians from the federal government's laws which will effectively take money out of the pockets of working families and strip them of their job security. In the last financial year the rate of working days lost in South Australia per 1 000 workers fell to six, compared with 23 in 2003-04. That means South Australia is ahead of all the other states in this important area and it gives us an incredible edge. In Victoria, where federal awards apply, we see about nine times more industrial disputes than here. It is that sort of competitive edge which helped our state to win \$10 billion worth of defence contracts in the past 11 or 12 months. Why would we want to put all that at risk for the sake of a federal system which clearly does not work in the interests of South Australia, South Australians workers or South Australian families?

The new laws are not only unfair to employees but would also represent an administrative and bureaucratic burden to employers. In addition, the adversarial culture of insecurity that would be promoted by these laws would work strongly against what we need: a framework of trust, a focus on higher skills, and a partnership between employees and employers. I call upon the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Davenport, to put state before party and join us in supporting

South Australia's challenge in the High Court, because this challenge is very much in South Australia's best interests.

Our state has an outstanding track record in industrial relations. Our case (prepared by the Solicitor-General, Chris Kourakis QC) will claim that the federal legislation which uses the corporations power in the constitution goes well beyond the powers granted to it under the constitution. For example, the legislation says that just because a contractor does business with corporations that is enough of a connection to allow their laws to apply to the contractor. I am told that this stretches the constitution to breaking point and is a recipe to give Canberra unfettered power.

Churches, retirees, pensioners, unions, the welfare sector, and disability organisations have all spoken out against the federal government's new work laws. I think it is important to act in the state's interests, to put state before party. I am pleased that Mr Kourakis, the Solicitor-General, will represent South Australia in court as he represented us in the Federal Court in our challenge against the imposition of siting a nuclear waste dump in South Australia. I hope the opposition decides to stand with us in the fight to uphold the rights of South Australians workers.

WELFARE, FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The state government is changing the way it provides services for the most vulnerable people in our community. As Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Reform, my own Department for Families and Communities is leading the way with a generational change in the way in which services are administered, governed and delivered.

The state's housing agencies and disability agencies will be brought together to form two new divisions—Disability Services SA and Housing SA. As part of this reform, Children, Youth and Family Services will be renamed Families SA. We have always acknowledged the need for new investment in housing and disability. That is why we announced our \$145 million State Housing Plan; that is why we increased disability funding by \$92 million in the last budget and at the election promised to spend an extra \$31 million. We will invest in these crucial public services, but we cannot continue to invest in a fragmented system.

In the past, disability services and housing services have been provided by the state government through a range of agencies. While each agency has been dedicated to providing support, there have been overlaps, gaps and confusion. In disability, services now provided by the Intellectual Disability Services Council, Julia Farr Services and the Independent Living Centre will be delivered by the same staff through Disability Services SA. This cut in overheads and bureaucracy in the department will leave more money for better services. The government will create a single waiting list for people needing specific services such as accommodation or respite. People with disabilities and their carers will spend less time fighting their way through the system and more time enjoying their lives. I am pleased to inform the house that the Chief Executive of Julia Farr Services, Robbi Williams, will lead this process of change for the government.

In housing we want to ensure that people needing help with housing can get help from a single place—and that place

will be Housing SA. While the Housing Trust will retain a central place in our housing system, we need to acknowledge that its role has changed. It is now a provider of high needs housing—and our new system will reflect that. The trust will have an important focus as an urban renewal authority to ensure its homes meet the needs of its current tenants. We will create a new affordable Housing Trust. The new affordable Housing Trust will recapture the early ambitions of the Housing Trust to meet the housing needs of low income workers and families. We want to give the young people of today the same start that the trust gave to their parents and grandparents. We will continue to provide a specific service for Aboriginal South Australians through the Aboriginal Housing Office within the new Housing SA. Community housing tenancies will still be managed through individual community housing organisations, and the new Office for Community Housing will be the regulator and funder of that sector. These far-reaching reforms deliver a Labor agenda: better services to the most vulnerable people in our community.

QUESTION TIME

MINING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Other than Labor's attempt to use the upper house to prevent the Roxby Downs mine commencing, will the Premier advise the house of any instances of the South Australian upper house impeding progress of the mining sector or stopping the mine proceeding? It was reported on radio yesterday that, in opening the 2006 'Paydirt' SA Resources and Energy Investment Conference, the Premier commented that the future of the mining industry depends on the abolition of the upper house.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I did not actually say that. Perhaps if the opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Hang on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Hold on a minute. What was said—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased that you are supporting Roxby Downs. It is really good. I looked around and I thought, 'Where are the Liberals?' But Roger Goldsworthy was there. Good old Roger. We owe so much to him. What I did say was that we would be introducing the new development bill, which was amended on 160 occasions, I am told, by the upper house.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We are talking about the economy. If you had come along—you were welcome to come along. You have to put in the hard yards in these jobs. It is no good sitting back. Turn up and listen.

SCHOOLS, CEDUNA AREA

Mr KENYON (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How is the Ceduna Area School progressing following a review of student behaviour management procedures at the school last year?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for

Newland for his question. I know that he has an interest in education and behaviour management, and it is appropriate that he ask this question. A review of the behaviour management strategy at the Ceduna Area School was carried out after a longstanding community dispute spilled over into the schoolyard and caused severe disruption in many areas of the school. Local leaders, school representatives and parents came together to address the issues and to propose a range of local solutions as a community with the support of the District Director of Education.

I gave the school community all the support I could. I supported the District Director, because I know that the professionals and the teachers are the best people to deal with issues on the ground. They worked together using their judgment and experience, together with a willingness from the community to cooperate and support improvement within the school. The independent survey, which was carried out in December after several months of this program, showed clear evidence of improvement in the areas of student stress, morale, self-esteem, connection between students and teachers, students' motivation to learn, safety and parent involvement, as well as student welfare and support.

I commend the Ceduna Area School for this progress. However, at the time, I must say that there was considerable, divisive and political point-scoring from the then shadow education minister, which, in some regards, hindered progress. At the time, the school was accused of running an apartheid system, and that was mischievous, irresponsible and inaccurate. The media carried these programs and articles around Australia. In addition, articles appeared overseas, which brought disgrace and shame on our community by listing activities in Ceduna and claiming that we had apartheid.

This material was published in Indonesia and around the world; and, whilst one national media commentator noted, 'How could one politician get it so wrong?', it is also worth noting that the Australian Press Council upheld complaints and pointed out that much of the information given to *The Advertiser*—which was found to be faulty and which the Editor confirmed—came from the shadow minister as one of its sources of information on which the articles were based. Whilst community debate on these matters is important, it is also important that politicians get the facts right, that they do not spread misinformation, and that they do not damage either our public education system, our state or our country in the eyes of others, because spreading misinformation can bring everyone into disrepute but, most of all, it undermines our education system.

MINING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Premier. Given the Premier's statement that the upper house is anti-mining and should be abolished, why, during the most recent state election campaign, did Labor direct its upper house preferences to the Greens, who had vowed to shut down Roxby mine and not support others?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Is that it? Is this what we have been waiting for? Is this the new Leader of the Opposition and the dynamic duo? Look at them! Look at their body language! Talk about a marriage made in Vegas in the Elvis Presley Chapel!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: Mr Speaker, the point of order is relevance. The comments of the Premier had nothing whatsoever to do with an answer to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Relevance, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Premier back to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let me quote relevance:

'I haven't decided yet but I certainly won't be accepting this ticket,' Ms Isobel Redmond said. 'I am resentful at any suggestions a deal has been stitched up.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Premier has had his turn. We will proceed with the next question. The member for Morialta.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HIGH SPEED CAR CHASES

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): My question is to the Attorney-General. How has the government responded to the call from the Police Commissioner of late last year to make people engaging in car chases with the police guilty of a criminal offence?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I would first like to congratulate the member for Morialta on her smashing victory in that electorate—just short of 58 per cent of the two party preferred vote, and she won all booths, other than Magill, including Norton Summit (a booth which I notice the member for Heysen lost, along with many others). Mr Speaker, as members will be aware, last November, the Police Commissioner (Mr Hyde) drew attention to police officers having engaged in more than 300 high speed chases of people suspected of committing criminal offences in the past nine months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General has the call.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Police Commissioner made the point that people provoking such high speed pursuits were putting too many lives at risk, including not only the police involved but also members of the public who may become third party casualties of such reckless conduct. The Police Commissioner went on to say that, by classifying such conduct as a traffic offence attracting penalties of up to \$1 250, the law, as it currently stands, did not reflect the seriousness of the offence. Yes, there are offences of manslaughter, causing death by dangerous driving, and reckless endangerment but, where there is no physical harm caused, there needs to be a more serious offence applied, and the Rann government agrees with the Police Commissioner.

The member for Bragg is right, that Labor changed the law in response to the Kapunda Road Royal Commission to make drivers who cause death or serious injury while evading police face the prospect of life in gaol. We say that people who engage in high speed pursuits with the police are often attempting to avoid arrest for other crimes and are so recklessly indifferent to the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, other motorists and police that they deserve to be charged with a serious criminal offence, whether or not they were lucky enough to avoid causing injury or death to other road users. Labor will introduce legislation so that people engag-

ing in high speed chases by the police will be treated as though they have committed a major criminal offence rather than a traffic offence, as the current law stands. I hope that we can convince the member for Heysen, the Liberal opposition, the Independents and the minor parties to join with us in supporting this important legislation, which is proposed at the request of the Police Commissioner.

MINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Premier. In view of the Premier's comments yesterday, can he confirm that it is the government's desire to abolish the upper house due to section 43 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, which stipulates that a resolution of both houses is required to be passed to allow mining in any national, conservation or recreation park?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Can I just say that the Leader of the Opposition misled the house before in quoting something from a speech that was never said. Maybe if you people get off your backsides and do some work—

Ms CHAPMAN: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and turn up to mining conferences you will find out. But I wonder what Mitch Williams said, who challenged the party's dream team—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —of Iain Evans—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will take his seat. I presume the deputy leader's point of order is about the allegation of the Premier that the member for MacKillop had misled the parliament.

Ms CHAPMAN: Sir, can you seek an apology in relation to that matter?

The SPEAKER: The allegations of misleading the parliament need to be moved by substantive motion. In the meantime, the Premier will have to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sir, I am happy to withdraw the statement. But I will give a copy of the speech to the Leader of the Opposition—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —because I know he has got Julian Swinestead—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will take his seat. I think it is best if the Premier proceeds with his answer to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, sir. I will obtain a report for the honourable member, and I will give him a copy of my speech. I will also give him a copy of what he said: 'The last person you want as deputy is someone who wants to be leader.'

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think it is best that we just move on.

OUTBACK EMERGENCY SERVICES

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Health. What support is the government providing to Outback emergency services?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Giles for her question. I think that she and the member for Stuart will be interested in the answer. The state government has committed \$100 000 annually to conduct first aid training courses in our state's Outback communities. The

program has been initiated by members of Outback communities, who are often the first on the scene in an emergency. The funding will enable ongoing training and annual refresher courses in the 16 Outback locations. The first course has already gone ahead at Yalata in the Far West, and others will take place soon in Marree, Oodnadatta, the Challenger Mine, Tarcoola and Marla/Mintabie. Other locations will receive the program later in the year, and they include Mungerannie (a place where I spent sometime about four years ago with the honourable member for Stuart), William Creek, Oak Valley, Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs, Woomera, Nepabunna, Leigh Creek, Lyndhurst, Cadney Park and the Beverley Mine. There is a great demand for the training and, so far, training places have been filling quickly.

This is a program run in cooperation with the Royal Flying Doctor Service, so it is my pleasure to report to the house that, earlier this afternoon, I had the pleasure to commission the refurbishment of the Flying Doctor's Adelaide hangar facility. That new facility will provide greater patient comfort, improved access for ambulances and greater efficiencies in all areas of the Royal Flying Doctor Service operations. Since the early 1990s, the RFDS took responsibility for all fixed wing emergency flights across this state. There has been a 10 per cent increase in the number of patients transported into the Adelaide base. Nationally, the service had contact with 230 000 patients last year. This is an average of one person every three minutes.

Finally, the government is particularly proud of its work to secure the future of the Flying Doctor Service's other base at Port Augusta, with a \$350 000 contribution to its \$2 million upgrade. The government is also providing \$2.3 million in this financial year for services out of Port Augusta, which is an increase of \$1 million over the previous year. I commend the services of the Royal Flying Doctor Service to the house, and I am sure all members would agree with that.

MINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Was the Premier's assertion during yesterday's opening of the South Australian Resources and Energy Investment conference that the upper house needed to be abolished really aimed at deflecting attention from the mining sector's recent public criticism of the government's lack of infrastructure spending to support the industry in South Australia?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): What a shame the honourable member did not turn up and hear what members of the mining and resources sector said about our government compared to other governments, but he does not like hearing the truth.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, this has no relevance to the question.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is accepted. I draw the Premier back to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think I have answered the question.

DISABILITY HOUSING

Ms FOX (Bright): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What housing assistance is being provided by the government for people with a disability in the inner southern suburbs?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): It is a great pleasure to hear the honourable member's dulcet tones asking that question. Recently, I was very pleased to announce a new development for people with an intellectual disability in the Mitchell Park area. The project comprises nine new two-bedroomed homes. The houses in Walter Avenue are part of a \$1.76 million project between the government and a housing association called Housing Spectrum. They are built on land formerly owned by the Housing Trust, which included, until they were redeveloped, an ageing group of cottages. Those homes are aimed at young and middle-aged adults with intellectual disabilities, looking to leave their parents' homes.

The houses have been specifically designed so that they are suitable for single adults learning to live independently. They are close to public transport and allow easy access to places of employment. With the anticipated success of this project, we hope to continue this partnership with Housing Spectrum on future projects. Housing Spectrum houses more than 300 tenants with disabilities in 270 properties around the southern metropolitan and Fleurieu regions. This partnership is very similar to the approach we are taking with a range of disability service organisations. This project will involve a collaboration between a community housing group and the government that is also supported by Minda and Life's for Living, two other partner organisations that provide independent support for people with a disability.

There are other features of this development, including some green-friendly initiatives, but this answers the question most commonly asked of us: where does my son or daughter live when I can no longer care for them? It is a crucial question we have to supply the answer to, and this is part of the answer.

MINISTER'S REMARKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Given the comment by the Minister for the City of Adelaide that members must get their facts right, does she stand by her comments on ABC radio on 26 April 2006 that the role of the Minister for the City of Adelaide is very similar to that of the minister for the north, and is the minister aware that there is no minister for the north?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for the City of Adelaide): It was an interesting interview, because there was a fair view amongst the interviewers on that program that the Minister for the City of Adelaide should be in some way controlling the City of Adelaide's outcomes, development, planning and a whole range of issues, and I feel very strongly about supporting the primacy of local government. I feel very strongly that I support local—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I support the primacy of local government to organise issues in local areas that relate to the business activities of their constituents. I have said that the minister's role is to negotiate, to be an advocate, and to work towards good outcomes in the city of Adelaide by being able to take issues immediately to cabinet and by checking that decisions made by cabinet in general do not contravene, contradict or undermine good outcomes in the city. That sort of role is similar to the role that has been carried out very well by my cabinet colleagues as ministers for parts of the state. I might have said that it is very similar

to regional development, north and south: it makes no difference. The issue is quite clear: I am not the Lord Mayor, any more than I am the mayor of any local council; my role is to work from within cabinet.

NATIONAL YOUTH WEEK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Youth. What were some of the highlights of National Youth Week 2006, and what contribution did the government make?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Youth): I thank the member for Florey for her question and congratulate her on her outstanding victory in the recent election. My very first function as a minister was to have the privilege of launching National Youth Week activities, which were held between Saturday 1 April and Sunday 9 April. The week was a huge success. It provided an opportunity for the promotion of the talents and skills of young people in our community and the contributions they make. Young people were involved in every stage of Youth Week, including the planning, implementation, management, participation and evaluation of all activities. This year's theme was 'Just add you'. It focused on celebrating young people's individuality and diversity.

A joint initiative of commonwealth, state and local governments, Youth Week is coordinated by the Office for Youth. I would like to thank and congratulate the Office for Youth, because they coordinated it in such a way that it came under the ownership of the young people: they coordinated and implemented their own programs. This was a terrific initiative. The government committed \$100 000 in grants to 49 local councils and 11 non-government organisations to run 100 activities in South Australia for young people aged between 12 and 25 years.

Events this year included the Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander Youth Expo. This expo gave young Aboriginal people an opportunity to express their ideas and views and to raise areas of concern through an open mike forum. Young Aboriginal people were able to access education, training and employment information and health and community service stalls, and they got to meet elders and local personalities and listen to other motivational speakers.

Other successful events held this year included: a speak-out; a battle of the bands; youth photographic exhibitions; a performing arts workshop; hip-hop demonstrations; community mural projects; indigenous performance; and youth voice workshops on leadership, mentorship, public speaking and youth advocacy. Information expos provided a range of information on health, education and other issues affecting young people. As the member for Finnis would be aware, this year also saw the biggest youth expo ever held on Kangaroo Island.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: There were good ones everywhere. National Youth Week provides an excellent opportunity for our young people to exhibit their skills and share their knowledge. The participation and achievement of young South Australians in Youth Week 2006 shows that many young people have the kind of skills and attributes that are valued by our work force. Of course, they are not only valued by our work force; those attributes are of great value to our community.

Youth Week allows young people to have their issues of concern made known to the broader community and it also gives us a chance to listen to young people and acknowledge

and celebrate their achievements and the valuable contribution they make to this state. The government will continue to listen to the voice of youth and provide support to help empower them to actively participate in all aspects of community life.

REBURIAL OF REMAINS

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the government amend legislation to allow the reburial or cremation of Sophie and Joseph Dauncey? In June 2005 a crypt at St Georges was unearthed, and two bodies—those of Sophie and Joseph Dauncey—were discovered. Current legislation prevents them from being buried or cremated and their bodies remain in a storage unit awaiting reburial approval.

On 14 September last year, I wrote to the Attorney-General requesting that legislation be amended to allow these people to be laid to rest. I again wrote to him on 13 December asking for the amendment, offering any assistance to effect the change. I wrote a third letter on 23 January this year, and, notwithstanding numerous telephone calls, I still have not received a reply to any of my letters, and I seek that this matter be attended to.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I am aware of the matter, and officers of my department have been investigating. My most recent advice is that the remains found on the site by the developer, I am told, have been exhumed and are now safely stored. They cannot by law be disposed of by cremation or reburial without our making a legislative amendment. My officers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —have researched the matter to see if this is absolutely necessary, because it would be better not to bother parliament if we could rebury the remains without a legislative amendment. But, alas, it is absolutely necessary, and I—

Ms Chapman: You've known that for months.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We haven't been sitting during the relevant period. I do not see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has asked her question; the Attorney-General is answering it. I strongly suggest that she sit back and listen to the answer. If she has other questions, she is at liberty to ask them. The Attorney-General.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: These legislative amendments will have consequences for stakeholders, so I am consulting the funeral industry, and I will endeavour to present those amendments to parliament soon. I suggest the member for Bragg would have been better off campaigning rather than ringing my office incessantly, otherwise she might not have lost the Beulah Park booth.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr PICCOLO (Light): My question is to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations. How is the South Australian government working to improve consultation processes with local government on decisions that impact on local communities?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for State/Local Government Relations): I thank the honourable member for his question, and acknowledge and congratulate him on the

very long contribution he has made to the community of Gawler in his involvement in local government for that area. I think it is something like 24 years that the member for Light has been involved in local government. Can I also take this opportunity, sir, to congratulate you on your position, and also the member for Reynell who, I understand, is the first female Deputy Speaker in this house.

This government has led the way in forging strong links between state and local governments. In 2004, a state/local government relations agreement was signed by the Premier and the then chair of the Local Government Association the late John Legoe, who was highly regarded, and I know will be sorely missed. This agreement was followed up with a schedule to the agreement signed in November last year setting out annual priorities for joint action by both state and local governments. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of my predecessors: the Minister for Housing, in establishing the Ministers Local Government Forum; the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries for the preparation of that particular agreement; the Local Government Association, particularly Mr Legoe, as I said; and the current chair, John Rich, and his chief executive, Wendy Campagna.

This state has been a national leader in defining how we work together respectfully and collaboratively. This has been further enhanced with the signing of a landmark intergovernmental agreement involving all three levels of government—federal, state and local—on 12 April this year. Importantly, this agreement is a commitment to achieving an open and productive relationship between the three spheres of government, recognising their different roles and responsibilities and hence their relevance to the communities they serve. It promotes greater transparency in the financial arrangements between the three levels of government in relation to local government services and functions.

The Rann Labor government is committed to meeting its strategic target of greater alignment of policy deliberations, coordination of activities and more strategic approaches between state and local governments. Only by working together to build a cooperative and respectful relationship will we achieve better outcomes for our communities.

YALATA SWIMMING POOL

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders.

Members interjecting:

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Thank you, Mr Speaker—and I am still here.

Members interjecting:

Mrs PENFOLD: Labor Party down 3.3 per cent!

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

Mrs PENFOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation give a firm date for the completion of the swimming pool at Yalata that was supposed to be completed before the summer of 2005? Swimming pools have been shown to improve school attendance and the general health of children in outback communities, providing urgently needed positive activity to help them from falling into unhealthy practices. Grave concern is currently being expressed over a reported incidence of petrol sniffing at Yalata. Petrol sniffing is particularly injurious to health, quality of life and general wellbeing of young people who need positive activity.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): There is no doubt that

the concerns the honourable member raises about Aboriginal communities, and the pressing need to improve service delivery in those communities, are shared by the government. I will have to check the particular detail about which the honourable member is talking. I am aware that a pool, which is about to be completed at Mimili, certainly has been delayed. A swimming pool and multipurpose centre has been a shared initiative of both the commonwealth and state governments in the Yalata region. We are now receiving some advice and clarification from the Yalata community about its particular needs for that area. I understand that we are getting some preliminary expert advice and guidance in that area. This is an area which has attracted funding through a commonwealth program and which I think is called Communities in Crisis—or a name of that sort. I know we are seeking to attract funding to meet the needs in that particular community.

I think the answer to the question is that the pool and the multipurpose centre are still in the design stage. I think that the costs associated with constructing any infrastructure in these remote regions is often much greater than first anticipated. I think the present concern of the people who are doing the design is how, with the money that has been found by both the state and federal governments, they can meet the needs of the local community for both a pool and multipurpose centre. The ambitions of the local community are somewhat greater than the money allocated for that area. We are in the discussion phase, but we do acknowledge that pools have made an important contribution, especially when they have been linked in certain circumstances to school attendance policies. We understand that has made a positive difference in some remote and regional communities. We share the honourable member's concern and, to the extent that there is some impatience about the delays that are occurring in this matter, we have resolved to work as quickly as we can to reach a resolution of these issues.

OAKBANK EASTER RACING CARNIVAL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): Will the government support the request put forward to the Minister for Tourism by the Oakbank Racing Club with a view to ensuring South Australia is at no risk of losing the iconic Oakbank Easter Racing Carnival? The Oakbank Racing Club has written to the government requesting support for future Easter carnivals. Financial pressures have been accentuated by other issues, such as requests from the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner and the Independent Gambling Authority, and the increasing legal risks for the volunteer base that organises the event.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I think that, probably, this question should have been directed to me as the Minister for Racing. The member for Frome asks about a request made by the Oakbank Racing Club of the government in regard to its ongoing viability. I think that this request has been made more than once, but I would need to check that. The government's position—and I would have thought that it would also be the position of the opposition as it brought the legislation into the parliament—is that, as a result of the corporatisation of the racing industry, it is a well-known fact and an expectation that the racing industry (now having been established through an act of parliament brought about by the former government to corporatise the industry) runs its own

business; and, obviously, it is able to do so as a result of being corporatised.

If the Oakbank Racing Club is able to make out a case (as, of course, was made previously by both TRSA and the SAJC when we moved the Adelaide Cup Carnival) in terms of special circumstances, obviously, that can be looked at and assessed. However, generally speaking, it is the expectation of the government that, as a result of the racing industry being corporatised, a request of that nature should have been made of the corporate body, which, of course, is Thoroughbred Racing SA. I would expect that, as a first port of call, the Oakbank Racing Club should be working through its corporate entity (that is, Thoroughbred Racing SA) if it is seeking financial assistance.

SCHOOL ROAD SAFETY

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Why does the government continually refuse to take action to improve road safety at the Nairne school crossing and the Woodside main road intersection at Nairne? I have raised this issue with the government on a number of occasions over the past 3½ years by correspondence and media articles, with the government taking no action to improve what is an extremely hazardous road safety matter. The situation is so serious now in relation to the safety of children at the school crossing that the parents are refusing to allow their children to act as traffic monitors at the crossing.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to pick on the member for Kavel in particular, but an explanation of a question needs to be an explanation: it cannot be an offering of argument in support of the question. It must confine itself to the facts. It is something that has crept into explanations, which I do not think assists in the decorum of the house. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): In regard to the particular issue, I will refer the question to the Minister for Road Safety. I assume that we are referring to a case said to exist for black-spot funding, or some such similar funding, which is now the responsibility of the Minister for Road Safety. However, the question asked what we were doing about road safety, so I put on the record that this government, in its previous four years, has done a tremendous amount in road safety, and the facts speak for themselves. I refer to the tremendous work of Sir Eric Neale and the Road Safety Council, and to the very many amendments, many of them the work of the former minister, the member for Taylor. Most of all, it is highlighted by the 20 per cent reduction in casualty crashes as a result of the introduction of 50 kilometre speed limit default limits, which followed on with a reduction—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That was yours, was it? That was followed on with a reduction in compulsory third party premium payments. As I said, the facts speak for themselves. It was interesting that, during the election campaign (in one of the shallowest pieces of political opportunism), it was suggested that, without any consultation, the Liberals would reintroduce 60 kilometre zones in some of those 50 kilometre zones, which have contributed so much to road safety.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Who advocated that?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, one of them is not here any more. In fact, a lot of them are not here any more, but we should not reflect on that.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Who was that guy? He used to be minister for police.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I can't remember, but I point out that we have just as many dairy farmers as they had. It was one of the shallowest and most opportunistic things. I respect the fact that the member has concerns, and I will refer them on. I think the most sensible part of this opposition's campaign was about road funding. The bottom line is, mate, that they did not listen to you.

Q FEVER

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Can the Minister for Health inform the house of the current status of the availability of the Q fever vaccine for the general public and, in particular, farmers? I have been informed that the Q fever vaccine is currently in very short supply and is only available to those who work in meat factories. Many farmers have contacted me and are most concerned that they have been told by their doctor that they have a high risk of contracting Q fever and then cannot get access to the vaccine. My own brother, Richard Venning, lies paralysed in Queen Elizabeth Hospital with a serious condition which had its origins when he contracted Q fever. We know of other similar cases.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Schubert for his question, and I am sorry to hear of his brother's illness and I hope he recovers swiftly.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not currently. This is previously. I am not aware of the supply of that particular vaccine but I will happily and swiftly get a report for the member.

ROAD GUARDRAILS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Will the Minister for Transport undertake to review the process by which decisions are made as to the placement of guardrails? I have a constituent who resides on Upper Sturt Road, which is obviously a major thoroughfare for commuter vehicles, buses and heavy trucks. On eight occasions since May 2003, accidents have resulted in the front fence of the property being destroyed, yet the Department of Transport refuses to install any guardrails along that stretch of road, in spite of numerous requests from myself and members of the family who reside in that house who are concerned, for obvious reasons, about their safety.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for her question. Certainly one of the things we will not do is take decisions out of the hands of experts and put them into the hands of politicians. That is something we steer away from. I am happy to refer the question to the Department of Transport. Again, it is more likely to be a question for the Minister for Road Safety in the Legislative Council. We are happy to have them provide information as to why those decisions were made and on what basis. One of the things I am very careful to do as Minister for Transport is not to set things such as speed limits but leave that to experts according to a set of objective criteria. I think that is the right way to do things.

BLUE-GREEN ALGAE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises now provide the house with an explanation as to why SA Water failed to test toxicity levels in water delivered to its customers

from the summit storage after SA Water's laboratories had identified rising levels of *Anabaena circinalis* (or blue-green algae) in water samples from that reservoir between 17 and 26 December 2004? On 28 November last year, the opposition asked the minister a question in relation to SA Water's failure to test the summit storage for increasing toxic levels of blue-green algae in December 2004. The minister stated that the occurrence was unacceptable and that he was seeking a report.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises): I will check on that for the member and bring—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, if that report is now in the office I will ensure I get that to the shadow minister and make it available. I am not 100 per cent certain whether that report has been made available but, if it has, I will ensure that the shadow minister gets a copy.

O-BAHN SAFETY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the government assure taxpayers that the O-Bahn system is safe to use? The O-Bahn drivers have made public claims that a range of safety concerns linked to the O-Bahn system are putting community safety at risk. The government has publicly acknowledged that it is aware of the concerns. On 24 April this year, an O-Bahn bus crashed into a drain near Klemzig station, which put an additional focus on these safety concerns.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Oh, deary, deary me. I do congratulate, however, the member for Waite, because not only has he been reinstated on the front bench but also he has moved up to third spot after his one-handed assault on the leadership. It just goes to show that who dares does not always win—but at least he ran a place! I am sure that Colonel Rambuka will have another attempt—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —at the single-handed charge at some point in the future.

The SPEAKER: The minister will return to the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Waite has been out, with no basis, scaring people about public transport. That is what he has been doing: he has been running around saying that it is not safe. We saw him with his medals telling everyone that it was not safe. I did not publicly acknowledge it: it is better if one does not. What I said was that those issues have been raised, and our advice (if the member had listened) was that there was nothing to the safety issues. He quoted the recent bus crash as being an example of the O-Bahn's being unsafe when it was on the news last night, I think, that the incident in question was as a result of the bus driver texting a message on his mobile phone, which is not something that we require of bus drivers. We do not require bus drivers to send SMS messages while they are driving a bus. That bus driver has since resigned.

To suggest that our O-Bahn is unsafe because you cannot drive a bus and text a message at the same time indicates that the member for Waite does not really understand much about this portfolio area. I do not think there is any safe way to drive a bus, whether an O-Bahn or not, and send a text message at the same time. We will be making sure that that is understood. We will not be going out to change our O-Bahn so that it is safe to drive a bus and send a text message at the same time, because I do not think that is possible.

TRAIN FLEET

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is again to the Minister for Transport. Will the government guarantee that TransAdelaide's 2000 class trains are safe? On Friday 21 April, a quarter of Adelaide's train fleet was withdrawn from peak hour services at short notice. TransAdelaide spokesman Mr Bill Watson confirmed: 'The trains were withdrawn from service because of concerns about their safe operation.'

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Something the member for Waite will have to understand is that sometimes one does things because they are prudent. The incident in question (and I am not an engineer) was something to do with one of the shafts in the train in question. The prudent thing to do was to make sure that that issue did not arise with respect to all the trains of that same class, so they were taken off the line for a short time, and it was found that it did not. That is the prudent thing to do. If the member had bothered to make a most cursory investigation, he would have found that out very simply.

The truth is that the member for Waite has been running about telling people that it is not safe to travel on the buses or the trains. I advise the member for Waite that, not only is it not true—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He has been running around saying that the buses and the trains are not safe, and that we put up the price of electricity in Roxby Downs (another thing he got profoundly wrong, and I will explain all that to him later). He has been running around saying all that. Can I advise the member for Waite that patronage is up on buses, trains and trams. Just like the election campaign, the public of South Australia does not agree with him. While patronage is up something like 4 or 5 per cent, they obviously do not disagree with him as strongly as they did in the election, where we took something like 15 per cent off them. It is so wonderful to hear a voice from the member for Bright that is not an annoying, whining pain.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He was a wonderful guy, brave Sir Robin, was he not? When danger reared its ugly head, he was out of here in no time quick. But he was advising them all later that he would have won the seat if he had hung on, of course: he would have held off the 15 per cent. That was the sort of person he was.

It is absolutely irresponsible for the member for Waite to be running around trying to tell people that the buses are unsafe, the trains are unsafe, everything is unsafe. Had he made the smallest inquiry he would have found that the trains were withdrawn for prudent reasons. It is just like the question the honourable member asked about Roxby Downs electricity, but I will bring that back for him later. We will bring Roxby Downs back later.

ROADS, DUKES HIGHWAY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Transport explain to the house why, after completely rebuilding the Dukes Highway between Bordertown and the Victorian border, the speed limit on this section of highway is at 100 km/h while the speed limit on the rest of the highway, all the way between Stirling and Bordertown, is at 110 km/h?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I would have thought that, after the lengthy correspondence between us on this subject, the honourable member would have understood this. I did note the honourable member's pathetic, desperate misleading of the public during the election campaign. What he said was that he had been advised that this was the first step in a statewide 100 km/h speed limit, which was an absolutely blatant election fabrication. This was a man who knew which way the tide was running and was desperate. He was told that that was not the case. If he did not suffer from short-term memory problems he would remember that about 15 minutes ago I said that I do not set speed limits: they are set by departmental experts, based on objective criteria.

That is the case down there. I know that it is frustrating to have to travel at 100 instead of 110 km/h. The member for Stuart finds it frustrating travelling at 110: he thinks that 130 is a much better speed limit. I know that they are a broad church in the Liberal Party when it comes to speed limits, but during the election campaign not many of his colleagues were prepared to endorse the member for Stuart's contribution. Not many of his colleagues agreed with him on the 130 km/h speed limit. As the honourable member knows well from a series of correspondence, the 100 km/h speed limit is set by the chief executive of the Department of Transport. I have asked him what those grounds are, but it is certainly not the tremendous fabrication presented by the honourable member during the campaign as the introduction of a 100 km/h speed limit across the state.

ROADS, SPEED LIMITS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): The Minister for Transport has stimulated another question in my mind, which gives me great pleasure, because I think that the minister has got confused between two different roads.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: On a point of order, this is question time and not grievance.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for MacKillop will proceed to his question.

Mr WILLIAMS: This is a serious question. In light of the minister's most recent answer, can he assure the house that he has confidence in the people who do set speed limits in South Australia, when the 17 kilometres between Bordertown and the Victorian border, a straight section of road, have just been upgraded to the highest standard at a cost of \$15 million, yet the rest of the road, between Bordertown and Stirling, has a speed limit of 110 km/h? I am talking about the Dukes Highway between Adelaide and Melbourne, not the Princes Highway between Meningie and Salt Creek.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I certainly have far more confidence in those officers setting the speed limits than I do in anyone on that side—or, for that matter, politicians in general—setting them. Certainly, anyone on that side. Let us face it, it might be 100, might be 130, and Gunny would go higher if he could get away with it. He would love to tear across that Eyre Highway at about 160 km/h.

An honourable member: He would be like *The World's Fastest Indian!*

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: *The World's Fastest Indian*, yes. I have far more faith in officers setting the speed limits than in anyone on that side of the chamber, and I am very grateful that they do it.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations. Is the government considering introducing legislation for compulsory voting for local government elections?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for State/Local Government Relations): The proposal to bring in legislation for compulsory voting has not been raised with me by anyone.

RECREATION PARKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What recreation activities currently allowed in recreation parks will not be allowed when recreation parks become conservation parks as proposed by the government? The government conducted a short consultation process during the election period into a review of national parks classification. The review process proposes that recreation parks be abolished and reclassified as conservation parks.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): This is really a question about the environment. I will answer the question on behalf of my colleague in another place and certainly refer the question to her so that she may amplify some of the points I make. One of the last things I did as minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We'll still be able to play petanque in the conservation park. One of the last things that I did as minister for the environment was to initiate a review of the classification names of parks in South Australia. I have always believed that the current arrangements are confusing because we have national parks where you can mine and we have some national parks where you cannot mine; we have conservation parks where you can mine and some where you cannot; and we have a whole range of other things for recreation parks. In my view, all the parks should be for recreation of one sort or another, and all the parks should be able to be used by the people in some form or another.

I asked the department to conduct a review of the names of our parks and to base them on international IUCN standards. We put it out for consultation. The proposition is not to stop people recreating in parks; it is really about the name of the park. There will be planning arrangements in place which will make it clear what kind of recreation you can do, in what sort of circumstances, in which parks. It is not our intention to stop people recreating in parks. The suggestions made by members on the other side on more than one occasion are an absolute nonsense, and they know it.

FLOODING, SOUTH VERDUN

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Will the Premier explain the details of the \$1.5 million funding commitment in relation to the Verdun flooding issue? Given the Premier's interest in the flooding issue at Verdun, having on one occasion visited the site of flooding in the area, the details of the funding commitment announced just prior to the election are scant to say the least.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I would be very happy to get a report for the honourable member.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I just heard that six questions have been answered. Can I just say this: if you keep quoting me incorrectly from things that you are making up, I will keep quoting verbatim what you said about each other. We have hundreds of pages here. We really enjoyed your opinions of each other.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This one says: 'As far as I'm concerned it's like getting back on the train we've just had a train wreck in.'

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will take his seat. The Premier is not answering the substance of the question; he is debating.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION, HAHNDORF

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is to the Minister for Transport.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Have you got a deprivation problem, Kevin?

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You don't know anything about this, mate.

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It's evident that none of you do. Will the minister advise when a serious commitment will be made by the government to remedy the traffic congestion problems (caused, in the main, by heavy vehicle transports) that occur regularly in the main street of Hahndorf? Although the main street of Hahndorf has recently been resurfaced, the problem of heavy vehicle transport traffic causing significant congestion continues to be a matter of real concern to the local residents and the many thousands of tourists who flock to this iconic tourist destination.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I can certainly understand, being formerly a marginal seat holder myself, the passion that those new marginal seat holders on the other side have for their electorates. I have been asking the Department of Transport for something in my electorate ever since I was elected, and I have not got it yet, so I do know that these things happen.

The issue of the management of heavy transport through Hahndorf is broader than Hahndorf, of course, as passionately as the local marginal seat holder may feel those views. We attempt, with limited resources from the commonwealth, to manage heavy vehicles and freight, and this state has made huge commitments to new investment in that regard. It would be of tremendous assistance if we can take a bipartisan approach to the federal government for a greater share of AusLink funding. We would love to be able to solve all the problems in traffic and freight in South Australia, but unless we get a better share of the national cake that is not likely. In the meantime, we will prioritise those according to statewide interests in freight, safety, and those sorts of matters. I appreciate the member's concern. The best thing we could do, and I would be happy with this, is if we went together to Canberra and asked for more money from the feds.

Q FEVER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: During question time the member for Schubert asked me a question about Q fever. I am advised of the following: CSL Pharmaceuticals has ceased production of Q fever vaccine as it was the sole manufacturer of this vaccine worldwide. There is currently no alternative supplier. The commonwealth is seeking expressions of interest to attract a new supplier. If a supplier of vaccine can be sourced, the commonwealth will seek jurisdictional support to implement an ongoing national Q fever management program.

South Australia has a long history of working with the livestock and meat processing industries to raise awareness of the disease burden of Q fever in specific occupational groups. South Australia will continue to work cooperatively with the commonwealth to manage the risk of this disease. Should a potential supplier of vaccine be found, it is understood that the continuation of the vaccine program will be subject to successful negotiation and security of vaccine supply.

EUROPEAN GREEN CRABS

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: On the first sitting day of the 51st parliament I was asked a question by the new member for Goyder, whom I must congratulate on his victory. I think that he will add much to this place. He was enormously well respected throughout local government circles. I indicated that I knew very little about crabs in general and nothing at all about the European green crab, but I did indicate that I would bring back a response to the question in a timely manner. I can indicate to you today, Mr Speaker, that the European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) was first reported in Australia in Port Phillip Bay, Victoria, in 1900, but it is considered likely that it was introduced to Australia in the 1850s.

It was first reported in South Australia in the Port River in 1978, and the Coorong and Onkaparinga estuaries since 1985. The crab has also established colonies in Tasmania. The crab was reported at Edithburgh on the Yorke Peninsula in late 2005, although it is likely to have been in that location for some time. Anecdotal information indicates that the species goes through boom and bust cycles, being found in a location in significant numbers and then becoming rare in the area. Importantly, I can indicate that, while the species is well-established, it is not considered to be a pest of significant economic concern. South Australia is a signatory to the intergovernmental agreement on the National System Prevention and Management of Marine Pest Incursions, a structure created to provide effective and cost efficient processes for preventing emergency response and ongoing management and control of marine pest incursions.

Management of the crab, as well as a range of other introduced species, is presently being considered at a national level through that body.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ROADS, COUNTRY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise on the subject of country roads and their maintenance, particularly South-East country roads. I remind the house that, whether or not we realise it, most South Australian families are touched in some way by road trauma. The fact is that it is costing lives every day. We simply must do something about roads. Although speed, fatigue and inattention are key causes of accidents, a cocktail of these things, together with the condition of a road, is what ultimately kills people. It is when they run off the road or into an object on the road, or hit an object beside the road, that people die or are injured. On average, between 90 and 100 people are killed on South Australian country roads each year. Many of those are killed in the South-East. It was a particularly bad year in 2005 when 65 fatalities occurred on country roads, compared with 50 for the same period in the previous year. Most of these rural crashes involve drivers losing control on the straight or on bends, and about 38 per cent of such crashes involve vehicles which run off the road or collide with rigid objects, such as trees, poles and embankments, or which roll over due to uneven roadsides.

I draw to the attention of house work which has been done by the RAA and other industry bodies on this subject and which points to the fact that significant reductions in crash types can occur if investment is made in the installation of safety barriers, the removal of specific roadside hazards, resurfacing of roads, sealing of shoulders, advisory speed sign refurbishment, line marking and guide posts, widening or replacing bridges or culverts, widening shoulders, providing overtaking lanes, and, later, duplicating and improving alignment. Regrettably, South-East roads, in particular, suffer from neglect in regard to most of these areas. The Dukes Highway is a very good example. South Australia must come to some arrangement with the federal government to ensure a strong funding bid is submitted in order to allow upgrading of the Dukes Highway to occur. It is really up to the state government to lead the charge; it is really up to the state government to make our bid.

About 30 overtaking lanes have been built to address horrific crash rates and steadily increasing volumes. Interestingly, commercial vehicles account for 29 per cent to 45 per cent of all traffic on the highway. There are estimates from the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics that rail would decline significantly on this route and freight traffic by road would increase to as much as 7 355 kilotons by 2020, resulting in road freight doubling. Ultimately, duplication of the road will need to be considered and it will need to be funded by Auslink. In the meantime, other work totalling \$2 million to \$3 million needs to be done to improve road alignment and remove substandard rest areas. I think the RAA rated it six out of 10. Of course, other roads in the region, particularly the Riddoch Highway, need greater levels of protection for motorists from roadside hazards. The Riddoch Highway needs the construction of an additional 10 overtaking lanes; and duplication, eventually, of the Riddoch Highway, to bypass Penola and Mount Gambier. It would require estimated funding of about \$411 million to address these deficiencies. I think the RAA rated this particular highway at five out of 10. Of course, the Princes Highway, which needs major work, was rated by the RAA at

3.5 out of ten. It needs lane widening to 3.5 metres, eight additional overtaking lanes, improvements to the shoulders and increased levels of protection for motorists—\$30 million worth of work.

Quite frankly, the house needs to be aware that the South-East roads are in a shocking state. The demands are increasing. I will be going to the South-East soon to consult with the local member, inspect the roads and talk to local government about what must be done. The state government cannot avoid having to invest more in roads. If AusLink funding is required for certain Auslink roads, then it must lead the charge to Canberra to argue for that funding. It is up to the state government—because it is to the government to which people look—to show leadership to make sure that South-East roads are safe to drive on and that they can take the strain of freight, commuter and tourist traffic. It is most important.

WORKPLACE SAFETY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): As I rise today to make my first contribution in the new parliament, I acknowledge that we meet on Kauria land and pay my respects to the indigenous people of the Adelaide Plains. As alluded to earlier this afternoon by the member for Ashford, it is May Day Week. I was privileged to be a part of the march on Saturday and the dinner last night. Unfortunately, I will be an apology for the Workers' Memorial Ceremony, which will be held at Port Adelaide's Black Diamond Corner on Sunday. I urge all members who are able to attend, particularly as workplace safety and injury has become finely focused to us all in the past few weeks.

In South Australia several people have died in workplaces in the last fortnight. A labourer in his late forties was working in a three metre deep trench at Munno Para Downs, the walls of which collapsed around him and killed him. Earlier, a road worker was crushed to death by heavy machinery while working on a private property near the Gawler River. These tragedies have inflicted great grief on the families of the men in question. Not long after those two accidents, another man died when he was sandwiched in a dumbwaiter at St Paul's Recreation and Entertainment Centre.

Indeed, that was a tragedy which I am sure Workplace Services is working hard to investigate; and, while I am assured that there is no underlying connecting factor, it is terrible to have three accidents in the space of a week in South Australia. Nationally, of course, we have all been transfixed by the continuing and sad saga relating to the death of Private Jake Kovco; and, while the circumstances of his death are still in contention, I suggest that it is also a workplace accident. Most recently, for the last few days we have all watched for the fate of the miners in Beaconsfield, Tasmania. As we know, one of those miners passed away. Again, it was another workplace accident in that most dangerous of occupations, mining. However, we are hoping very much to bring two miners to the surface. I commend the workers of the AWU who are spending almost every waking moment working on a way to get those men back to the surface safely. To all the families and everyone affected by these workplace accidents, both by the deaths and the life-changing injuries that often happen in workplace accidents, I offer my condolences in the hope that, in the future, other workers will fair much better.

I would like to draw the attention of the house to the fact that 28 April is the International Commemoration Day for

Dead and Injured Workers. I refer to the SA Union site. My staff has supplied me with the 2005 information, so I am not sure whether it has not yet been updated. However, Australia's workplace death rate is worse than that of Great Britain, Japan, Norway, the Czech Republic, the USA, New Zealand, Poland, Slovenia and Canada. In fact, we have the same number of deaths per 100 000 workers as Romania. I think that the example there is that, perhaps, we could do a whole lot better.

Worldwide, the International Labour Office estimates that at least 1.9 million to 2.3 million workers die every year from workplace causes, the biggest occupational killer being cancer. In Australia, there are 380 new workers' compensation claims every day. About 300 workers are killed in workplace accidents each year, with another 2 000 dying from occupational diseases, such as asbestos-related cancers. In South Australia in 2004, 19 South Australian workers died while they were at work. Already in the financial year 2004-05, 13 had died at the time of this report.

This, of course, does not take into account those who will be dying from asbestos exposure in the future. We now have the highest proportion of mesothelioma per head of population in the western world. Studies show that unionised workplaces are safer workplaces, and that is something we have been talking about a lot in the media lately with regard to the new IR legislation. Unions continue to fight to prevent workplace deaths and injuries and for proper compensation for those who survive. Better and safer workplaces can be achieved by strict occupational health and safety laws that are properly enforced, elected workplace health and safety representatives with effective entitlements and the introduction of industrial manslaughter legislation in South Australia. While that may appear to be a contentious issue, I hope this house will be able to spend some time in the not too distant future looking at preventable causes of workplace accidents and looking closer at the manslaughter legislation.

MINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Today in question time the Premier claimed that he was either misquoted or quoted out of context and refused to answer questions on those grounds, but I will read from the precis of yesterday's news services from 5AA, as follows:

The Premier has tied the future of mining in South Australia to the reform or abolition of state parliament's upper house. Premier Mike Rann has opened the largest resource conference ever held in the state saying mining will give South Australia a massive economic shot in the arm for the next four decades. He told delegates that the success depends on the restructured or demolished upper house.

Mr Kenyon: You are not quoting him directly.

Mr WILLIAMS: I may not be quoting him directly. I am quoting from the precis from 5AA. I am glad that the Premier has offered to give the opposition a copy of his speech notes, and that will be terrific. I also ask him to give us a copy of any conversations or any other contact that he or his staff had with the reporters of 5AA, because I can certainly say that the comment that the Premier 'has opened the largest resources conference ever held in the state' really smacks of this Premier. I guarantee that is what he said, because everything this government has done has been the largest, the best or the first, and that is exactly what this report states the Premier said yesterday. So I am looking forward to the Premier's forwarding to me a copy of his speech notes, but I would also like him to forward to me the details of any discussions he

had with anybody at 5AA which brought about that particular news item. It is worth noting that that is the only news service that I am aware of that picked up that particular story.

It is interesting, because this happens to be the Premier's modus operandi, particularly with regard to the vexed question of mining in South Australia. We all know the Premier's history with regard to uranium mining in South Australia and, in fact, we were reminded only a few weeks ago when the South Australian *Stateline* program ran a segment about uranium under the headline 'Should South Australia go nuclear?' It ran some file footage and quoted Mike Rann and some words that he wrote in a document back in 1982 where he said that concerned citizens should boycott BP because of its involvement with the Olympic Dam project.

So Mike Rann was a strong anti-uranium advocate, but now he would have us believe that he supports uranium mining in South Australia. What he said on that same *Stateline* program was:

I believe the current national ALP policy is anachronistic and therefore is likely to be changed.

It is anachronistic, by definition. It has been around for years. So he has not told us anything there. 'And therefore is likely to be changed.' If this Premier is so keen to see more uranium mining in South Australia—and he should be—and his government is actually giving taxpayers' money to uranium explorers who cannot, under his government's current policy, open a new uranium mine in South Australia, why does he not get out and lead the debate? Why does he not take the argument to the other Premiers? We know that former premier Gallup in Western Australia was dead against changing the policy. I am not sure what the new premier's attitude to that is. We know that Premier Beattie in Queensland remains totally opposed to the policy. We know that Kim Beazley (the federal Labor leader) has been opposed to the policy, although now he would have us believe that he is shifting his position. However, he has not articulated that. He said, 'I will come back at the end of the year and say something about it.'

It is time the Premier actually said what he meant. It is time he articulated the future for South Australia. It is time that the Premier led the debate to change not only the anachronistic but also stupid no new uranium policy of the Labor Party for the future of South Australia. It is time that he got behind those companies to which he is giving money to explore for uranium and told them straight out that he will support them, if and when they find uranium (and I would say that it is more 'when' than 'if'), with the relevant licences to open and operate new uranium mines in South Australia. That is what we need from this Premier if he is to be any sort of leader or statesman.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS LAWS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I rise today to speak on a matter of public importance, that is, the Howard government's extreme and divisive industrial relations changes, which will threaten the working and family lives of Australian workers now and well into the future. These laws go to the very heart of the long held Australian tradition of a fair go. They are nothing more than an insidious attack on the Australian way of life. They destroy rights to overtime, penalty rates, holiday pay, redundancy pay and other rights that generations of Australians have fought so hard to win over the last 100 years. The Howard government clearly does

not believe that the notion of a fair go is a policy requirement in this area.

Many Australians have lost their job security as a result of these new changes. Up to 4 million Australian employees in businesses of up to 100 employees now face the prospect of going to work each day not knowing whether they will have a job at the end of it. Employees working in nearly all private businesses across the country can now be sacked unfairly under the 'operational reasons' clause, with no legal recourse whatsoever. We have recently seen the chaos this created with respect to the Cowra abattoir workers.

The Howard government's approach will reduce the living standards of Australian working families. It has sidelined the independent umpire, the Australian Industrial Relations Commission. Many of its current roles, such as ensuring agreements meet a decent minimum standard and awarding increases in the minimum wage, have been stripped from the commission's responsibilities. Instead, the government's so-called Fair Pay Commission will now be responsible for increases in the minimum wage. It is very important to note that the government has removed the legislative requirements that the minimum wage be fair and that it must have some cognisance of prevailing living standards. Indeed, the federal Treasurer's own department predicts that the pay of people who rely on the minimum wage will fall in real terms as the Fair Pay Commission awards smaller increases, which means that Australia's lowest paid and most vulnerable employees will suffer a decline in their disposable income. It also means that pensions that are set on the benchmark of 25 per cent of male total average weekly earnings will be severely reduced.

The government also has abolished the safety net known as the 'no disadvantage test'. Under the new laws, all agreements will no longer have to meet an award standard of 20 conditions, but a paltry five. We all remember when, at the launch of the Liberal Party's IR policy in Brisbane on 28 September 2004, the Prime Minister was asked whether he was planning to reduce the 20 allowable matters. He said, 'No, they were working quite well, thanks very much.' Once again, he has gone back on his word. Now, with the stroke of a pen, things important to working Australians such as penalty rates, overtime, meal breaks, annual leave loading, shift loading, redundancy pay, allowances and certainty of hours or rostering can be removed. Overall, the outcome of the government's extreme IR legislation will be about one thing: removing choices from employees and giving more power and control to employers.

The Labor Party totally opposes these new IR changes. The Liberal Party clearly does not, and never will. The former leader of the opposition (Hon. Rob Kerin) is on record as saying, 'I don't think a High Court challenge is the right way to go.' We can only hope that the new leader of the state opposition will have a different view and support our challenge in the High Court. By rubber stamping their federal colleagues' new laws, the state Liberal Party is taking Australian workers down the slippery, low wage, low skills, low morale path. The Australian Labor Party at all levels will continue to fight for the rights of ordinary working Australians and their families. We believe in the right to a fair go for every Australian. Our state has an outstanding track record in industrial relations. This court challenge is very much in South Australia's best interests, and we look forward to the opposition's support.

ANZAC DAY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): The Anzac legend was born in 1915 at Gallipoli, when 8 000 Australians lost their lives in a nine-month campaign. However, the Anzac spirit lives on. It is important that we honour that spirit and those who sacrifice so that we can enjoy the freedom and the quality of life that we have. Some made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives in the cause of freedom. The sacrifices made by others are less evident but nonetheless real: the months and sometimes years of absence from family, missing seeing the growing years of their children, and the mental and physical scars of war. There is currently war and terrorism in many parts of the world, places where people are living with the grief and anguish, courage and comradeship, pride and despair that war brings. Anzac Day gives an opportunity to those of us lucky enough to live in this wonderful part of the world to reflect on the wars that have affected us and our families and to remember with pride those people who made sacrifices and who are still making sacrifices to enable us to live as we do.

I am sometimes concerned that we do not always value what we have, despite what we see happening in other parts of the world on our televisions daily. The Gallipoli campaign is becoming synonymous with Anzac, and it is heartening to see the large numbers of young people, particularly, who are making the pilgrimage to Gallipoli and who are attending the marches across Australia on the day. Our family remembers France and the Somme where, on 25 April 1918, a 19-year old soldier, David Carman (my uncle and my father's brother) was killed on the Hindenburg Line. The previous year, 1917, his older brother Roland was killed on the Somme, and the year before that, in 1916, a second brother, Clement, was also killed. Back in South Australia, the family farm was sold, and the families and friends grieved.

Twenty-one years later, in 1939, a sister of these three young soldiers, Ruby, and the youngest brother, Kenneth, known as Jack, who was my father, joined up to fight in the Second World War. They were away from their homes, families and friends for six years. I often think of their mother, Elizabeth, after whom I was named, and wonder how she and her husband David coped. The anguish that families, friends and colleagues feel when they lose a family member in such or similar circumstances was brought home to us most recently with the death of the young Australian service man in Iraq.

In our home, as in many households, very little was ever said about the wars. People were expected to get on with life. However, I do not think that this was good for them, particularly for their mental health, nor is it good in my view for the younger generations who have not experienced a war. Remembering gives us all a chance to come to grips with what has happened. I remember clearly once, while delivering Meals on Wheels, commenting on a photo of an elderly gentleman I was visiting, taken when he was a handsome young man in uniform. He promptly dissolved in tears. He said that he had coped while he was busy working but, now he was old and alone, it was all coming back.

For those who have not experienced war, Anzac Day gives the opportunity to realise the full horror and to do what we can to prevent it in the future, and to give thanks and support to our current young men and women who are involved with peacekeeping forces and who are helping in disaster recovery. It is good to see the change of emphasis from the glorification

of war to one of struggling to keep peace and to helping others in their times of greatest need, creating goodwill and understanding while still recognising the need for strong, well-equipped services to protect us if required. Anzac Day gives us all a chance to stop our mad rush and to think about the sacrifices that have been made and are being made by all involved in war, including the current one: not just those who died but those who survived and could not speak, those who wait at home and wonder if they will ever see their loved ones again. It also gives us time to enjoy the camaraderie that is a special bond between people who have shared these particular stresses together, such as in war.

ACTIVE8

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): I was very pleased to receive this booklet from the Thebarton Senior College, which is located in the seat of West Torrens. I know that the member for West Torrens is very attentive to the Thebarton Senior College, as am I, but I was particularly pleased to receive information about one of their projects—which I think is a fantastic project—that runs through the Office for Youth active8. In this particular case we have not only married the Thebarton Senior College's fantastic work, but also the active8 program, along with the area of community gardens. The booklet that I have been provided with was written by one of the new arrival classes at Thebarton Senior college.

As members would be aware, this is a major provider of English language education to adult migrants in South Australia. Most of the students who go to Thebarton College are supported by humanitarian programs for refugees. These students were happy not only to be involved in this project but also to make sure that their families had an opportunity to look at growing vegetables, in particular. The emphasis on this particular project was growing vegetables and trying to source plants that were available in their homelands. The booklet which came out of this is being used not only as an English reader but also to encourage people to think very seriously about community gardens. I am very pleased that in the neighbouring electorate of Unley there is the Fern Avenue Community Garden. Just recently, in fact last year in spring, we had our first community garden open up in the Ashford electorate, run through the community in Goodwood but also the Goodwood Primary School.

Getting back to this particular project, we had a number of participants. Deng Atiop Achuot, Elizabeth Akol, Aminata Conneh, Mamiky Donzo, Mohamed Arfaye Hassan, Shabana Haidari, Esther Chandia Poni, Mary Thon, Chi Yin, Ngiewei Deng Yiyieth and Sarah Yousuf were involved in producing this very good booklet. One of the things in the booklet—which I must say has been very well put together with the assistance of the Thebarton Senior College staff and particularly the principal, Kim Hebenstreit—are photos of opportunities through active8 whereby these students had to learn public speaking, and also first aid.

I found, certainly in following up on active8 projects throughout the state, that the partnership between the Department of Education and Children's Services, the Office for Youth, local community organisations—whether it be St John's Ambulance or the CMF—students get an opportunity to do elective subjects in a fun way, whether it be through sport, whether it be first aid, or whether it be, in this case, a community garden. This gives people not only an opportunity to learn English but also an opportunity to do something productive. The garden also got involved in designing

scarecrows, and there is quite a bit of detail in this booklet about how the school was involved in the Go Organic competition. Some of the products of the garden were spinach, parsley, snow peas, lettuce, spring onions, okra, garlic, chilli, cucumber, tomatoes, African spinach—and so the list goes on. This was not only very much supported by our local community in the western suburbs, but it was an opportunity to learn some new skills. It made sure that the community spirit, which is very strong in the western suburbs, could be followed up.

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I move:

That the member for Fisher be granted leave of absence from 2 to 11 May to attend to Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending on 30 June 2007. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This year the government will introduce the 2006-07 budget on 21 September 2006.

A Supply Bill will be necessary for the first few months of the 2005-06 financial year until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and received assent.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill.

The amount being sought under this bill is \$3100 million.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to \$3100 million.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (THROWING OBJECTS AT MOVING VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

Before the last election, the Labor Party gave an election pledge in these terms: new legislation will be created to target rock throwers. It will be an offence to throw a missile at a moving vehicle. The offence will attract a maximum penalty of five years' imprisonment.

There can be no doubt that throwing hard missiles at moving vehicles, particularly rapidly moving vehicles, is a most dangerous activity and should be met with a criminal offence. In recent times, there have been two manifestations of it. Notoriously, some undetected offender, or offenders, threw large rocks at vehicles travelling at speed on the Southern Expressway.

Detected offenders, often children, have been caught from time to time throwing hard objects at buses on the O-Bahn from bridges under which the buses must travel at speed. In both cases, serious injury or extreme danger has resulted. This kind of behaviour must be met with the full rigour of the law. The purpose of the bill is to propose a criminal offence that will help ensure that is so and to fulfil the Labor election policy. I seek leave to insert the remainder of my second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The criminalisation of acts of endangerment is not new. The general and most serious offences are to be found in s 29 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*. These offences may also apply when the life of the victim has been endangered or an offence results in death. The applicable maximum penalties for this sequence of general endangerment offences (graded according to the harm that ensues) are, respectively, 15 years' imprisonment, 10 years' imprisonment and 5 years' imprisonment.

In addition, s 51 of the *Summary Offences Act* provides specifically:

(1) A person who discharges a firearm or throws a stone or other missile, without reasonable cause and so as to injure, annoy or frighten, or be likely to injure, annoy or frighten, any person, or so as to damage, or be likely to damage, any property, is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$10 000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

(2) In this section—

firearm means a gun or device, including an airgun, from or by which any kind of shot, bullet or missile can be discharged;

throw includes to discharge or project by means of any mechanism or device.

It seems clear, then, that what is contemplated by the new policy is a specific endangerment offence at the bottom end of the endangerment range, but without proof of danger (it being obvious that throwing rocks at a moving vehicle is dangerous). The *Summary Offences Act* offence is too general for the purpose and aggravating it to five years is not a good legislative technique, for it would straddle the summary offences in the *Summary Offences Act* and the indictable offences in the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*.

Therefore, it is proposed that the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act* be amended to include a new offence of throwing a rock, stone, piece of concrete, brick or other hard missile of that kind (but not, say, eggs, tomatoes and other fruit) at a moving vehicle. Where the missile involved is not one of the list, it must be of such a kind that the throwing of it at any moving motor vehicle poses such a significant danger to the occupant(s) of the vehicle or the public that punishment for this offence is warranted. The verb "throwing" connotes an intentional act. It would also mean that, for example, the spray of gravel or pebbles that sometimes arises from dirt roads or dirt shoulders of sealed roads in the course of driving would not be covered—that can hardly be said to be thrown. The offence should be punishable by a maximum of five years imprisonment.

It has been decided not to put the list of things in the Bill. Such a list would be unwieldy and hard to amend to suit any passing fashion of stupidity. Instead, the list will be prescribed by regulation. Such a method makes for ease of making and ease of amendment.

There is a further problem to be addressed. The creation of this offence should not be allowed to load up the charge sheet with one more offence. It should be properly targeted. Therefore, it will be an alternative offence to the general reckless endangerment offences as well as more serious offences of causing harm which may occur as a result of the throwing incident. In that way, it will fill the gap as a middle range offence as intended while minimising the load on the courts and the charging system.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

4—Amendment of section 21—Harm

Division 7A (Causing physical or mental harm) was inserted into the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (the *principal Act*) by section 10 of the *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Aggravated Offences) Act 2005*. It provides for the interpretation of words and phrases used in that Division. The proposed amendment to the definition of *lesser offence* will mean that, if a person is charged with an offence against Division 7A, a verdict of guilt of an offence against section 32A may be available in the circumstances provided for in section 25 (Alternative verdicts) depending on the evidence in the matter.

5—Insertion of Part 3 Division 7B

It is proposed to insert Division 7B after section 32 of the principal Act.

Division 7B—Throwing objects at moving vehicles

32A—Throwing objects at moving vehicles

New subsection (1) provides that a person will be guilty of an offence punishable by imprisonment for 5 years if a person throws a prescribed object, or drops a prescribed object, on a moving vehicle.

A prescribed object is defined to mean an object of a class prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this proposed section.

32B—Alternative verdicts

If at the trial of a person for murder or manslaughter the jury is not satisfied that the accused is guilty of the offence charged but is satisfied that the accused is guilty of the offence constituted by proposed section 32A, the jury may bring in a verdict that the accused is guilty of that offence.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Bright, I remind the house that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and, as such, I ask the house to extend to her the usual courtesies. The member for Bright.

Ms FOX (Bright): I move:

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

May it please Your Excellency—

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

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

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

It gives me great pleasure to move the motion for the Address in Reply. I congratulate Her Excellency on her speech to which I will refer in greater detail later. I first acknowledge that we are on Kaurna land. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to your high office. I know that you will defend the privileges and standing orders of this house. As the youngest Speaker to hold office thus far in this house, you become an admirable role model for many young people who have an interest in the political system. I wish you well for the years to come. I congratulate all newly elected members on their election to this parliament.

It is an extraordinary privilege to speak in this place today. First and foremost, to the electors of Bright I extend my heartfelt thanks. Their confidence in the Labor government and in the leadership of Premier Mike Rann was reflected by a significant swing to the Australian Labor Party in Bright in the recent election. As the first Labor member for some years in this electorate, I am very aware that voters have high expectations. I will try to do my best to serve them with honour and integrity. I also recognise that in this electorate there are 22 437 voters, and that keeping people happy for just some of the time will be a very difficult task. However, as I said before, I will try to do my best.

To the Australian Labor Party, which endorsed me at this election, I am grateful. My family's association with this political party stretches back over 90 years, and I am a passionate believer in the values of equality that this party espouses. Aiming to improve the lives and protect the rights and conditions of working people is a noble cause. This party seeks to provide greater opportunities and a fair go for all South Australians, no matter who they are. I am proud and grateful to the party for its support, from the members of the sub-branch to the Premier. To many of my new colleagues, particularly the member for Croydon and the member for West Torrens, thank you. Your unwavering belief in my ability to win the seat of Bright sustained me through a very long campaign. Without the encouragement of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, the Australian Labor Party would not have won as convincingly as it did in Bright.

Thanks particularly to Don and Nimfa Farrell and their family. I am proud to have been supported in my campaign by a union which is now fighting harder than ever before to defend the rapidly eroding rights of many working Australians. Many people worked on the Bright campaign, particularly from the Flinders University Labor Club. However, none of these people shone brighter than Brad Kitschke. His understanding and his knowledge of the political landscape is astonishing, and I am lucky to have worked with him. Quick-witted, hardworking and passionate people such as Sally Brown, Nick Champion, Megan McFarlane, Ann Colbert, Michael Brown and Rosie Falco sustained me with their insight, perspective and good humour. I also thank the federal members for Adelaide and Hindmarsh, Kate Ellis and Steve Georganas, as well as senators Dana Wortley, Linda Kirk and Annette Hurley for their encouragement and support.

To the newly elected member for Mawson, I offer particular thanks. My employer during the campaign was Loreto College, Marryatville. I am deeply grateful to the staff, students and parents for the ongoing care they showed me. I loved teaching there. Finally, I must thank my parents (who I think are in the house today) who taught me to be who I am—to be passionate, to care and to get worked up about the things in which I believe. They taught me that standing up for what you believe in might not be comfortable but it is right. They taught me to question the world around me, to assert myself and to protect those who might be too weak or too fearful to protect themselves. They have taught me to laugh and to enjoy my life as well. They are both teachers and I have been their keenest student.

I will address three aspects of Her Excellency's speech. The first is her reference to a range of new social measures to be introduced during this government. The second is the strong international representation this state enjoys in the arts. The third is the fundamental justice of our society. There is

no doubt that South Australia has enjoyed a renaissance in the education sector over the past four years. This growth is set to continue with the establishment of new children's centres and trade schools. This government's commitment to education is widely acknowledged by those in the teaching profession and I place that on record. The many teachers I know across all sectors of education recognise that the Rann Labor government puts its money where its mouth is. There are now more teachers in our schools and smaller class sizes. As someone who has taught a class of 16 students and a class of 31 students, I cannot emphasise enough how this can change the way you teach, as well as the way in which students learn.

But, fostering increased confidence in our education sector is not just up to the government. It is never going to be just about smaller class sizes and more teachers. I would like to see the professional status of teachers restored to its previous heights. In some countries when you say you are a teacher there is an immediate respect extended to you, because those societies recognise that you hold the future in the palm of your hand. This is not something that any government can achieve by itself, no matter how good its intentions are. The fact is that there has been a shift in society's perception of teachers—a change in the dominant paradigm that spells danger for education in this country. I cannot pinpoint when it happened. Was it in the 1980s when I was a student? Was it in the 1990s when poor management of state education systems Australia wide resulted in run-down schools and unheard of stress levels? I am sure academics have written whole theses on this cultural phenomenon.

Why did I say that this shift in perception spells danger for education in this country? It is because we need people to want to become teachers. We need our country and our state to be extremely clever. This happens when it is built on the foundations of outstanding schools, and that happens when we have teachers who are proud and excited to be teachers. We cannot legislate for that to occur. We cannot go into teacher training programs and say, 'You will be proud of who you are.' Pride in your work comes from community recognition; and sometimes the community does not realise what teachers do. I call on every person listening right now who has a child in school to think about what their child's teacher does. Being a teacher in today's society is not easy. Once upon a time teachers were teachers. They went to work to share their knowledge and develop young lives to their full potential. Now it is different. Many teachers are de facto parents, nurses, psychologists and counsellors. Being a teacher is harder than it ever was and it seems to command less respect than it ever did. As a government we can only do so much. I call on all communities in this state to consider the vital role that teachers play in our society.

On a personal note, I should add that retraining as a teacher at the age of 30 was at the heart of my politicisation. Education is a common thread running through my family's personal history. Indeed, if it were not for the United Kingdom's education act of 1944—the Rabb/Butler act, as it was then known—I very much doubt that I would be here today. This act, amongst other things, made secondary education free for all students. For my paternal grandparents it opened up previously undreamed of opportunities for their children. My grandmother was a housemaid and my grandfather was a carpenter in the north-east of England. Their children broke through the barriers of class and poverty, using education as a gentle battering ram.

I now turn to the second aspect of my remarks. Her Excellency's speech mentions the government's continuing commitment to the arts in this state. I believe the arts play an important role in society. The arts are not just there to entertain us, although, in an increasingly regulated and serious society, sheer entertainment value cannot be underestimated. The arts as a whole help us to share and explore values. The arts help us to create, to express, to understand and to communicate. Film, song, theatre, opera, musicals, good poetry, writing and the visual arts allow us to hold up a crucial mirror to our society in order to try to understand who we are. In many theatres of war performing artists have given heart and continued faith to our service personnel. On ANZAC Day last week I was deeply moved by the Brighton Secondary School's rendition of *I am, we are Australian*. I was not the only one who had a tear in my eye—a beautiful song can move the hardest heart.

The arts are an essential part of our societal fabric. The arts help many people, perhaps unknowingly, to gain a sense of personal identity or their own place in society. When you read a book you become part of an author's vision. When you watch a film you are drawn into the rich fabric of a storyteller's celluloid tale. This state has produced a number of world acclaimed writers, film makers, singers, actors, poets and painters. This did not just happen. These people did not just come from nowhere. They were given grants, guidance and encouragement—notably from Labor governments, I might add.

Great artistic endeavour cannot happen in a fallow field: it has to be funded and it has to be nurtured. We do not expect creative people to starve in garrets while at the same time call ourselves the festival state. It is wonderful that the Minister for the Arts has decided to make the Adelaide Fringe an annual event, and his decision reflects the confidence that South Australian artists can have in this government. Indeed, the arts are so important to this government that it is the Premier himself who takes responsibility for the portfolio. It is also admirable to see how many successful multi-cultural arts groups proliferate in this state, celebrating all-encompassing human themes and providing links for this family of nations we call Australia.

Finally, I turn to that aspect of Her Excellency's speech where she mentions that in its 170th year South Australia is a richly diverse and fundamentally just society. I believe that this state is one of the fairest places in the world to live. South Australians have high employment, a fair and just legal system and a society which allows us to look after the marginalised. But, there is one arm of government which currently, actively, seeks to undermine this state's good fortune and that of its working people, and that is the federal government. One of my great fears is that under the ridiculously named Work Choices Act families in this state will suffer. At the last count the federal government had spent \$55 million of taxpayers money trying to sell these frankly evil laws to a rightly suspicious Australia. When John Howard decided to get rid of work rights, like weekend shift and public holiday rates, overtime, redundancy pay and allowances, he took direct aim at all families in this state. This legislation will tear at the heart of families from Hallett Cove to Hove, from Adelaide to Alice Springs.

Whose family was John Howard putting first when he conjured up this destructive force? While we in this state continue to create wealth and pay off healthy social dividend from it, what I see in Canberra is a group of arrogant Liberal politicians who seek to destroy fair minimum wages and

decent working hours. Well, thanks but no thanks! Those of us who have the privilege to represent people in the state of South Australia will continue to fight, side by side with our federal colleagues, against the repercussions of these revolting industrial relations laws. The Rann government will push on this Thursday with a High Court challenge because if we do not stand up and be counted, if we do not say no now, the fair and equitable working Australia, of which everyone in this house has been a part, will disappear down the gurgler and we will be left with a medieval, exploitative system that will break the working people of this nation.

With this last thought then in mind, and as a former English teacher, I would like to leave you with a quote from the play *Julius Caesar*—a peculiarly political play. This quote tells us that people have a responsibility to take the opportunities they can to live nobly and honourably, that seizing the moment when the time is right is important. I believe this is the right time for me to stand up and be counted; this is the right time for me to say publicly, 'I love this state, I love this country and I don't want to see it pulled apart by a government in Canberra that has totally lost contact with the people it claims to represent.' Here is this quote:

There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune. Omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat. And we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures.

I thank the house for the courtesy with which it has heard me.

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

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): It is nice to be here for the 12th successive time. I congratulate you, Madam Deputy Speaker, on your election to this important role. Also, I congratulate Mr Speaker on being elected to the most important position the house can bestow on one of its members. I am sure that he will have an interesting, challenging and eventful time. I sincerely hope that he upholds the traditions of the house and protects the rights and privileges of members. Also, I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the manner in which she is carrying out her duties and on the speech which she delivered to this house.

I sincerely look forward to her successors carrying on in a similar manner notwithstanding the ill-conceived remarks of the member for Napier, who remained particularly silent during the election campaign. It is a great pity that he never had the courage to make those comments before the election. I think that he would have had his wings considerably clipped, because the people of South Australia do not share his rather ill-conceived, short-sighted and quite dangerous views. We live in a democracy, and people respect their institutions because they do not want to give governments ultimate power over their lives.

I will give an example of a few years ago when we had the referendum as to whether or not this country should become a republic. I was handing out how-to-vote cards at the Davenport booth at Port Augusta—not an area that traditionally votes Liberal. People came in wearing tank tops and thongs, and they walked straight past the republicans and took the cards that I was handing out. When we counted the vote that night, 75 per cent voted to keep the monarchy, because they did not trust giving politicians total power. They did not like the yuppies who went up there.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, they did not like it. They wanted to maintain the status quo. I look forward to the

member for Napier telling South Australians that they do not need a Governor because, from my experience, communities like a visit from the Governor. They think it is great. I do not know whether the member for Napier gets confused when he drives from the Adelaide Hills to his electorate, but I guarantee members that the Attorney-General does not share his views in relation to the Governor. It will be interesting to hear the contribution of the Attorney-General. Enough of the member for Napier, because, obviously, he is particularly frustrated at being overlooked by others.

We have all been through a most interesting election campaign. Some of the 12 previous elections in which I have been involved have been vigorous and some not quite so. However, this is the first time that I have contested a seat where one side was publicly funded and the other was fighting a normal election campaign. I believe in public funding for political parties but, after the last election when he spent all his money in Stuart (and they were bragging that they spent \$230 000), obviously Don Farrell decided that that was a bad investment.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Like the member for Giles who is a bad investment. Nevertheless, we will deal with her on a later occasion.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, she is a bad investment, and that is why she is sitting in the corner. I suggest that she try to control her corellas, and she may be successful. She may have better luck there than she has had in making progress in the Labor Party. It takes a lot to get me on my feet—I am rather shy—and it really upsets me when someone like the member for Giles tries to sidetrack me, because I have a few things I would like to say. This is an important occasion—

Ms Breuer: What about speed limits?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member did not have the courage to put her hand up and talk about speed limits. I can tell the honourable member that I will advocate for an increase in the speed limits on every occasion I can, because the majority of people in the north—even the police officers—want an increase in speed limits.

This election campaign started soon after the previous election. Obviously Mr Farrell and his cohorts have spent all the money and were not prepared to spend it a second time, so they had to think of another way. They created an office and put the Labor candidate in there so that I would have—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not want to see that happen to another person in South Australia. I do not want to see that sort of political tactic ever pulled on another candidate in South Australia, because not only was it unfair but in my view it was also completely over the top. I have never minded a contest with the Labor Party—it is good fun—and I have never minded a challenge. The only thing I am sorry about is that we did not have a few public meetings like we did in the early days, because I had a lot of fun at those things. I recall the new Minister for State/Local Government Relations organising a public meeting up at Peterborough; she never did it a second time. I do not think she has ever forgiven me.

Nevertheless, this election campaign was interesting because I had three visits from the Premier. On one occasion he came up and gave the city of Port Augusta \$1.5 million—and they still went after him!

Ms Breuer: Well they won't get any more.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: And I will tell you why. We had the cabinet meeting up there—

Ms Breuer: It's going to be pretty rough for the next four years for you.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: As I said to the member for Giles, she sits in the corner; enjoy it and fix the corellas. It is no good trying to poison them. The people of Hawker and Quorn are waiting with bated breath for you to start wringing the necks of the corellas, because your previous minister said we had to gas them or you could wring their necks. You have to catch them—

Ms Breuer: Shoot them, or poison them!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will leave the honourable member in bliss, because while she has a lot to say from the backbench I do not think she is going to progress any further. However, during the election campaign we had three visits from the Premier. We had the AMWU with their motor cars driving all around the electorate and manning the polling booths, we had Che Cockatoo-Collins up there walking down the main street, and we had the maverick MP from Broken Hill, Peter Black (and we know all about him). He distinguished himself in the New South Wales parliament when he said that he was disappointed in himself—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Hubris can be a damaging policy. Enjoy it, but a lot of your colleagues didn't get back in.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I was watching the TV on election night, Deputy Premier—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: As I counted off all your colleagues who lost their seats.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right; and you ticked me off, too.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: I called you a little too early. But I tell you what, it is better being the Deputy Premier than Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: What the Deputy Premier did not realise was that you never got any swing in Port Augusta.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You are right, and I have already apologised to you and eaten humble pie.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I actually did not object to what the Deputy Premier had to say because his colleague, minister Hill, ticked me off. The previous election he had given me one. But there is one minister I want to thank who was most helpful, and that is minister Wright. Early in the campaign, the Premier and the candidate went to Terowie. As anyone knows, when you go to Terowie, the first thing they are going to ask you about is fixing the water. Governments have been promising to do something about it but they get the same answer. So after they went there, I wrote a letter to minister Wright and pointed out the situation, and he wrote back and said that he could not justify subsidising, or further spending taxpayers' money on, an unviable water scheme at Terowie. I thanked him for that, and I sent a copy of the letter to everyone at Terowie because I thought we should let everyone know what the correct thinking was of the government. It was interesting, because the main proponent of water at Terowie had her photo with the candidate and the Premier on one of the pamphlets, so I personally wrote a letter to her so that she would be brought right up to date.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: That is like saying that Stui Dew played a great game last weekend. Stui was best on ground but we still lost.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Can I say to the Deputy Premier—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Look at them! What a motley crew over there!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Can I say to the Deputy Premier that he can call us a motley crew, that is fine. I have been in

this place long enough to know that if he goes out in the lounge and looks at the rogues' gallery he will see lots of people come in here and lots of people go out.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Yes, but you and I are still here.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right and, if I want to, I can come back again. With all the encouragement I am having tonight, I might even change my mind. I will not go away because, in the time I have been in this place, I have been very fortunate—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: They have to get their moment of joy, though. When you get thumped at an election there always has to be something to salvage out of it. They won Stuart and they won Flinders.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not actually think you can compare the two.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What, Flinders and Stuart?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member was never in danger.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Gunny's not arrogant! Give me a break!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am only a simple farmer. Can I say to the Deputy Premier, when one talks about arrogance, I think we should put it in context. The Address in Reply gives members a great opportunity to talk about many issues, and I congratulate all the new members on both sides, because it is an honour and a privilege to come to this place and it is an even greater achievement to get higher office. I say to some of them that they should enjoy it because they will not be here long because, as the political tide goes one way, you know it is going to go out. I remember coming here in 1985 after we got thumped—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: 1985!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: 1985. I remember in 1970 the first time I walked up the steps. I feel a little different tonight than I felt in 1970 the first time I came here. But in 1989 we got 53 per cent of the two party preferred vote, and that is why, unfortunately, we have the silly electoral system we have today whereby we have a redistribution after every election. It is an absolute nonsense.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Let's change it tonight.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You cannot. You have to have a referendum, that is the unfortunate thing, and the boundaries should be changed only after every second election, in my view, because the sad state of affairs is that members in many cases do not represent the area they are elected to represent for very long. They are looking for the next election.

Ms Breuer: And it is sad for the electors in that area.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is.

Ms Breuer: They do not get any attention.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is sad, particularly when you lose good territory and get bad territory. That is a sad set of circumstances. Can I say to the honourable member for Giles that I was really sorry to lose Hawker and Quorn.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: With both hands—and I inherited Kapunda from the honourable member. I think that I won by three. But can I say to the honourable member that some of the Labor ministers, including the Minister for Health, paid a visit. They wanted only to have their photo taken. They did not have time. They shot in and had their photo taken at the hospital. They tried to claim credit for all the money that the local community had raised towards aged care. That particular claim did not hurt me. On a daily basis we had pamphlets going around—some twice a day—and they were claiming credit for everything. One of the things

that pleased me was when they claimed credit for all these small sporting clubs. When I was asked about it on the ABC—and I was hesitant to go on; I worked myself up and got enough courage to go on—I explained that there was such a thing as an active club program, where every state electorate got the same amount of money.

An honourable member: No!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, I got a bit more in the past, because certain members did not put in enough applications; they let their electorates down. I admit that I got \$60 000 one year, and I am happy to make sure of that again if Labor members do not want to put in an application. My electorate is very happy to receive these grants. But what it did do was upset a lot of small sporting clubs that had done all the work, and the Labor Party was claiming credit for it. I was most grateful for that pamphlet, because it actually helped me. It annoyed all these little clubs around South Australia that do such good work.

The final thing about the election is that I was very fortunate to have been supported by my wife and family. When we made the decision 2½ years ago that I would recontest Stuart, I knew it was going to be a full-on campaign. So, I set about leaving nothing to chance. We were driving in excess of 2 500 kilometres a week, from one end of the electorate to the other, making sure that all the issues were brought to the attention of the government and the public. I was very fortunate that I had a team of volunteers who came out to man the polling booths to help and work with me and to promote me. That is how we got over the line. I fought my own campaign; I did not need other people to come up.

Mr Koutsantonis: You didn't want their help, did you, Gunny? You thought they would do it in the city.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: After 35 years, if I am not capable of running a campaign, I should not be there. Let me say to the honourable member that his mate Mr Farrell sent the organiser up to run the campaign. He was up there full time running around, as were his mates in the AMWU.

Mr Koutsantonis: \$6.2 million, Gunny; that's what we spent, just on Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, however much you spent, you weren't successful. All I can say is—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Who devised the election campaign for you lot over there, by the way? Was Lucas the guru for your campaign? And you still made him shadow treasurer!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Can I say to the Deputy Premier, I organised my own campaign, and I decided which issues we were going to take on. We had the Deputy Premier yakking over the radio. When I went out to talk about speed limits, which is a good subject to talk about for the north of South Australia—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Yes; just oppose your party's position.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No; my own individual campaign. Of course, during the campaign, various people came and made various claims. One of the most challenging and interesting claims was, first, the AAA rating, for which they claimed responsibility. They blamed us for privatising certain government assets in South Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am quite happy to own up to being one of those whose views were sought regarding whether we should sell the—

An honourable member: ETSA?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes. I am quite happy to own up, because it was in the best interests of the people of South Australia. We would not have a AAA rating if we did not do so—notwithstanding that I had in my electorate the coal mine and the two power stations. When I spoke to the people who were in charge of ETSA (as it then was) about the generating capacity, their advice to me was, ‘If you want to do what is right for the people of South Australia, sell it while you can.’ Members may have noticed last week that the Queensland government under Premier Beattie is privatising some of its electricity undertakings, because it needs the money to fund other important elements.

There was then mention of the expansion of Roxby Downs. I was a member of this parliament when that legislation was passed and I saw all the demonstrators at Roxby Downs: I saw them go through Port Augusta by the bus load. We had ‘the mirage in the desert’ and that it was an economic stunt, and all those sorts of things. We were told that the claims Premier Tonkin made about this project being bigger than Mt Isa was a mirage in the desert. Today we have one of the great mining developments in the world, which has done nothing but good for the people of South Australia, as is the case with Beverley, and I look forward to the completion of the Honeymoon development.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Patrick, if you keep helping me I will talk for the next 40 minutes, if you want me to, because I know how much you like staying here. All those people who are now employed at Roxby and Beverley, and those who will be employed at Honeymoon, have the Liberal Party in this state and this nation to thank for their jobs. I am very proud to be one of those who voted for that project, because it was in the long-term best interests of the people of South Australia. We had to put up with all that nonsense, and for people to now claim credit for that development (and the ongoing developments) is a bit hard to take. I think it is a pity that the Premier was allowed to get away with all these claims.

Mr Koutsantonis: Whose fault is that, Gunnie? Blame some people.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You had a willing ally in the Editor of *The Advertiser*. It did not matter what was put up; he was going to put a Labor gloss on it.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Did you see that piece they wrote about you in the *Sunday Mail*?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. M.D. Rann: They did a wonderful piece about you in the *Sunday Mail*.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I had to work pretty hard to get that. We had to drive 1 100 kilometres for that story. They approached me; Peter Goers—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Who were the architects of your campaign—honestly? Vickie, you would have been one of them.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I was the architect of my campaign.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Can I say to the Deputy Premier—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: The most inept campaign in living memory.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is all very well for the Deputy Premier to be smug today, but he should remember—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is all right to be smug and full of his own importance. I congratulate him on his win, but can I say to him: just remember, there is always tomorrow. Annette Marner gave him a bit of a send-up on Friday, and again yesterday, I think. It was rather interesting that—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: I think I gave back as good as I got.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, I will give the deputy leader credit. However, I think his blood pressure went up one or two points, because she was fairly determined with her questioning.

This opportunity gives us the ability to talk about a number of issues in our electorate and in the Governor’s speech. Can I say how disturbed I was when the Governor read out that this government really would like to get rid of the upper house. Why would any political party want to go down that track? All governments have been annoyed with the activities of upper houses from time to time but, at the end of the day, I have never met anyone who is always right. If the government has a good policy and program, it will get it through the upper house. Sometimes the government has to accept some changes but, at the end of the day, in a democracy governments should be made to justify very strongly the course of action they want to put in place because, once you change the law, you can affect people in many ways and it is a lot harder to undo it. Therefore, when you pass laws that affect people’s daily lives, there ought to be some checks and balances. If there is no upper house, you have executive government, no matter what anyone says.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You have never liked executive government, Gunny, on either side, have you?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not think they do. I have been in this place and seen ministers on both sides of politics who really believed that the processes they were putting in place were perfect. But, when they are really put to the test and challenged (and that is what the parliament is for—to challenge the executive), they should challenge them strongly and make them justify every course of action they are going to take, because the long-term effects on people can be horrendous.

The real problem is that, once we pass laws, it is not members of parliament who will supervise them. There is a massive bureaucracy out there which, in many cases, is insensitive and has its own agenda and, in many cases, we are legislating for and on its behalf. Therefore, it can impose all sorts of policies and, unless you are fortunate enough to have access to good legal representation, you are helpless and have no alternative but to comply, even if the effects on you are going to be horrendous. The best ideas can be misconstrued and abused, so I am one of those who will vigorously campaign for the retention of our upper house, and the same system we have now, because I think it is a good system. If you look at the composition of the upper house, even though it does not particularly please me, at least the government will have to justify very clearly what it wants to put through that chamber.

The Hon. P. Caica: What pleases you—the federal Senate make-up? That pleases you, doesn’t it?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is the first occasion it has happened for many years, and the people of Australia voted for it.

The Hon. P. Caica: Is it scrutinising federal legislation?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes. The one thing about our system is that the people of Australia will have an opportunity to judge the people who are making the decisions—as they

should. If they do not like what is happening, they will rectify it. There is nothing wrong with the process. For the benefit of the minister, what the Senate is doing in Canberra is slowing down the process and allowing ongoing and further debate—as there should be. The system we have encourages challenges to executive government. People look to Queensland, but what they do not tell you about the Queensland system is that it was not an elected house but an appointed house and, therefore, it was not an effective house.

The Address in Reply after an election is one of those occasions that has given me personally a great deal of satisfaction to have had the confidence of the people of Stuart on this occasion. I knew that the challenge was great and that it would be difficult to win. There were times when I was not sure whether we would make it over the line. I knew that six months ago the polls were saying that we were polling only 48 per cent.

Therefore, I focused on what I believe to be the real issues in the electorate and, fortunately, I got over the line. I want to thank all those people in the isolated parts of the state who have again loyally supported me. Their support is greatly appreciated and I hope that I have repaid that support, because I have really tried to stick up for people living in the isolated parts of the state. Their education needs for their children are something that I have been particularly interested in, as well as the need to improve the road system and to ensure that they have adequate health facilities, because distances are horrendous.

During this last campaign many promises have been made, and I look forward to ensuring that the government honours those promises, such as the sealing of the road between Wilpena and Blinman and the expansion of the renal unit at Port Augusta Hospital. That is of major significance and absolutely necessary. The people who work there are doing a marvellous job, and it is crowded; but it is absolutely necessary. Resolving the land dispute at Port Augusta is something that I hope can be sorted out in the very near future. There is a need to ensure that the road network is upgraded, particularly to Moomba, which is one of the most significant economic roads in South Australia; and a need to ensure that small schools are adequately funded. There is an ongoing program to try to take the school buses away from them.

In the pamphlets he put out, the Premier claimed that the government was supporting places like Spalding, but one of the things that he did not indicate was that we had a tremendous fight to stop them taking the school bus away from Spalding. Whether it was at Spalding or at Hawker, it is absolute nonsense for the government to allow these bureaucrats to go out and want to take services away from small communities. Why would you want to deny the people of Hawker, Spalding, Peterborough or elsewhere a school bus? Why would you want to do that? Why would you want to disrupt those communities? It is just like the crazy people they send out to Marree and such places with tape measures, measuring the class rooms, saying 'You've got too much room for the number of students.' So what? What harm are those buildings doing there?

At the end of the day, if you knock them down they will never be replaced. They are doing no harm, and those communities can use them, and they need them. All these people do is upset the principal, the staff and the school council, and it is an absolutely harebrained activity. I cannot for the life of me understand why they allow them to race round, because they must know that they upset those

communities. Those communities then come to the local member, and so we engage in a battle—a paper war, questions in this place—and I just cannot understand the logic of these exercises. You are denying hard-working people the ability to have a few facilities. It is just like the difficulties people are having to get medical attention.

One of the most demanding roles coming through my office relates to the difficulty that people are having in accessing medical help. They cannot get to Adelaide or to Whyalla because they are aged and they do not have either the financial or the physical means. Therefore, there is a need to provide some sort of system so that those people can actually access the health services that are available elsewhere. It is very difficult to tell people, 'I'm sorry: these are the rules and you don't fit the criteria.' I have had a case brought to my attention only this week where a lady was told she overstayed her time in the hospital. She was in the last weeks of her life and they shifted her out and, within a couple of days, she passed on. That is very distressing for the whole family, and I just cannot understand why, in a modern society where we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars, we cannot provide a few more beds in hospitals to deal with aged people.

I cannot understand. It is one of the most important issues which we need to address, because, if we cannot look after the most vulnerable in our society, what is our role? Why are we paying taxes and charges if these people are incapable of being looked after in their own communities? They should not be shifted hundreds of kilometres. They should be able to be looked after in their own hospital or their own aged care facility. These are important issues. There is a role for the state government to help hospital boards provide aged care accommodation, particularly nursing home type of accommodation, and hospitals. There is an urgent need.

When one considers some of the other areas where government wastes money, I think it is a matter of priorities. Since the introduction of the GST, state governments have had a lot more disposable income. That is a good thing because state governments are there to provide services to the community. They are there to ensure that there is equity across the state. Since they have been given access to this fund they are in a better position to deliver those services, so it is concerning to me that small communities that want to provide these services have to send their citizens elsewhere. I think it is a priority that we need to address.

The other area of real concern is that the Premier indicated in the Governor's speech that he was going to deal with red tape and bureaucracy. I do wish him well, because there are certain departments which absolutely excel. Sir Humphrey Appleby is alive and well. He is in full command and *Yes Minister* has never been more prominent than in certain elements within the Department for the Environment. Just look at the fiasco in freeholding perpetual leases. If you want to see where Sir Humphrey has duded the minister, led them down the track and left them swinging, it is in the freeholding process.

In my time in this place I have never witnessed the nonsense some of my constituents currently have to put up with. If you go up to Cadell you will see old irrigation channels which are having huge values put on them. Most sane and sensible people realise that people at Cadell in the Riverland are battling hard to make a living. To want to charge them thousands of dollars for a piece of non-productive land, which is in the middle of their block, is an absolute

nonsense. To take huge tracts of their land, whether it is on the riverfront or some other area, is just a nonsense.

Not only is it unfair, it is unreasonable and the problem is, in my view, that some people have their own agendas. Whether they are jealous, or whether they have a chip on their shoulder, they are making life exceptionally difficult for the people in question because it is affecting their livelihood. They cannot now sell these blocks unless they agree to the terms and conditions which Sir Humphrey has imposed, which are unfair and unreasonable. Some of the people we have here in South Australia would make Sir Humphrey Appleby look like a junior. He could learn a lot from them.

From time to time these people get my blood pressure up and I have been known to address them fairly aggressively, because at the end of the day when you have frustrated people ringing up, sometimes reflecting on your own breeding and background, you have to pass it down the line to make sure it hits the target. Why would a government not want to simplify the process, get rid of these blocks, clear the matter up and let these people get on with their lives and not engage in endless discussions and meetings and paper trails? I cannot understand why the minister has not said, 'For God's sake, you people, fix these problems', because it is the silliest thing I have ever been involved in, and I have seen a few silly things happen. To give you an example, in my electorate they insulated a school that had been closed for two years. For two years the school had been closed, and the bureaucrats came along and insulated it.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No. That was a place called Mount Wedge. One of the other interesting things is that one minister got very enthusiastic. He said, 'Every school has to have fans in it, in every room.' That was great. I do not know whether or not anyone has been to Cook. If you have been to Cook, you have a two-storey building there—

Ms Breuer: If you are crook, go to Cook.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, there would not be much point going there now; the hospital is not even there. People came all the way down on the train, and they said to the principal, 'We've got to put these fans on the ground floor so many feet from the ceiling.' That meant it was just going to chop off the students' heads. That is what it meant. Then, of course, the principal told me they got very upset. It is the same mentality as if someone had written on a bit of paper, 'You shall do this; it's all been approved; it doesn't matter how long it takes.' It was the same thing as when someone had an idea 25 years ago that we should not freehold these blocks of land. We now have other processes in place which allow sensible controls to stop people misusing and abusing the land, and that sort of policy has gone. But they are still clinging to a little power base, and it is unfortunate, and it is certainly annoying a lot of people, and I know it is annoying the member for Flinders' constituents. I sincerely hope that the new Minister for Environment can sort out this problem, otherwise it is going to take a great deal of her time and effort in trying to pacify these people.

In conclusion, I have always regarded it a great honour to be in this place. When I was first elected I never anticipated that I would stay here for as long as I have. But I am sure that the members of the Labor Party are pleased that I have stayed here this long, because I have tried to be a member of parliament who has brought people's issues to this parliament. I believe that, if you want to get re-elected, do not forget the small issues, the little things. If you want to gain the confidence of people, the small issues that affect people

are important. When you do not have time to deal with those issues, you should not have time to be a member of parliament, because you will not stay long if you forget about those issues. Whether it is dealing with disruptive tenants in the street, where people have no regard for other people's privacy or property, it is terribly important for the rest of the residents, or whether it is people having trouble with SA Water, which is an organisation that appears to have little enthusiasm to extend its network. SA Water is putting millions of dollars into the government coffers, but it certainly does not want to extend its scheme.

One of the areas which is causing a great deal of concern is that, for people who want to subdivide or build a house on a new block, the cost of getting connected to the water scheme is just beyond belief up in the Spencer Gulf and Port Augusta. It is thousands of dollars, and they cannot even get it right. They come along and quote people one thing, then a month later it just doubles. That in itself is a real problem for people building homes. I really think there is an urgent need for some of the government committees to look vigorously at some of these organisations with a view to ensuring that they provide help and assistance to the people who need it.

I am looking forward to serving on a couple of committees during this parliament. The natural resource management legislation took up a great deal of time in the parliament. It had hundreds of amendments. I do not know whether we got it right, but I was told during the election campaign that there had already been a suggestion that there would be an increase of some 450 per cent in the fees. That in itself will be a matter of great interest, because that sort of increase will certainly generate some debate and discussion. The boundaries for the NRM boards are not correct. They need to follow council boundaries. For some unknown reason, the people involved with the administration at this stage cannot see the logic in that but, hopefully, commonsense will prevail and there will be some changes.

There is an urgent need to free up the provisions of the native vegetation legislation to protect the community against the ravages of bushfire. The government moved a little way, but there is a long way to go. As a result of the debate and discussions taking place in the Coroner's inquiry on Eyre Peninsula, let us hope we never have another one of those disasters. Steps can be taken to solve those difficulties and ensure that people are protected against the ravages of bushfires. You have to be pro-active. You have to have decent firebreaks, hazard reduction programs and local people have to have the ability to make decisions and to act quickly when the problems arise, not wait until the next day when it is too late.

I was always taught that you contain a fire as soon as possible. As someone who has had experience at controlled burning—and I have done a bit this year—I know there are two things: first, you have to hold your nerve and, secondly, once you decide to light a block, get the fire going as quickly as possible.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Like the former member, I have lit a few scrub fires in my time. The unfortunate thing is that not enough people have been involved in that process. We would not have the nonsense we have today if they had been.

Mr Koutsantonis: You just have to hold your nerve.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right. When you see an atomic bomb top on it or see the whites of the eyes of the kangaroos escaping the fire, you know you have done a lot of good. I do urge—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Perhaps if the honourable member would like to accompany me one day next year, I will show him how to light a decent grass fire and get some smoke over him, then he will understand what happens when you burn back. Earlier in my contribution I talked about corellas—

Mrs Redmond: Not galahs but corellas.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: There are a lot of galahs around, and they are not all in the paddocks. They are in other places, but we will not go into that. Galahs are a minor problem compared with corellas. If any member does not believe me, they should drive to Melrose where they will see the thousands of corellas which are there at the present time. Now is the ideal opportunity to deal with the problem. There is only one way to fix them: you have to poison some of them. There are too many to shoot. The minister said that you erect nets and gas them. Peter Davis wanted to club them, but he would be clubbing them for a long time, because there are tens of thousands of them. There is only one thing, and that is to have a proper program—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, you do not poison the waterhole. All you do is feed them for three or four days, then give them the right medicine and you solve the problem quickly. You will have a few falling out the sky like spitfires and when they hit the ground there will be a bit of dust, but that is a minor problem. Nevertheless, you will reduce the problem and people will not have to put up with the trees being stripped, television antennas being bitten, bowling greens being torn up or nails being pulled out of roofs of houses—all that will have gone. You will have controlled the numbers to a degree so that they are not a problem. They get too high in the trees. Unless you hotload the cartridges you cannot get close enough to them. You have to put more powder in the cartridges so that you can bang them a bit harder, but people's shoulders cannot take them. The Quorn council bought boxes of cartridges but the people's shoulders could not stand up to them.

Some 20 years ago my personal assistant's grandfather used to deal with the problem at the back of Quorn. I will not say his name. He was a very practical man who solved the problem. Unfortunately, he has passed on and now we have not got practical people up there: they are not quite as game as he was. He knew and I know the mixture: 50 pounds of wheat, a bottle of strychnine and a cup of paraffin oil. I guarantee it will do the job; and the member for Morphet could vouch that it would solve the problem. The government has to do something about the corellas because tens of thousand of them are spreading farther.

Those are a few of the issues with which this 51st parliament has to deal. I came into this place for the 39th parliament. As I said earlier, I did not expect to be here this long. I have enjoyed the challenges and I have enjoyed being given opportunities to travel around the world. I have been very well supported by the people who work for me and my family. This is a great institution. I am looking forward to the next four years. I am looking forward to the new members playing an important role. I have every confidence that the Liberal Party will rebound from the election result and become a better party. It is very important for the people of this state that we are focused and involved in the decision making, because a democracy needs a robust, well-informed and organised opposition.

I assure members that from my perspective I am looking forward to playing a role in it because I want to see this government challenged. I want to ensure that the legislation put to the parliament is well thought out and in the long-term best interests of the people of South Australia. That is why we all are here. Even though we have different points of view, we all are here to ensure the welfare of the people of South Australia is protected. We have a good parliamentary system of which we should be proud, even though from time to time we differ on its functions and role. I do not believe that it is in the interests of the people of this state that we interfere with the institution that has looked after us so well in the past. I say to the Deputy Premier (who has come back into the house) that I look forward to debating the budget. I look forward to the next four years—

Mrs Redmond: And beyond?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, I have probably had a pretty good go. There is a life after politics—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: We might retire together at the same election.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: One of the reasons that I have been able to stay here as long as I have is because I have another side to my life. I have been able to go home to my farm and let the world pass me by. I enjoy doing things in my life and being with my family and my grandchildren—which is an enjoyable time.

An honourable member: And those dogs!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, I have a couple of interesting dogs that are pleased to see me. I am a practical person. I like to fix and service engines, drive around to sweep out the troughs and make sure the kangaroos are not knocking down the fences.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, I have another life otherwise I would not be as good a person. The other very important thing is to see how the foolish laws we sometimes pass are affecting people in real life. It does not matter which party is in power, governments do pass foolish laws which unduly and unnecessarily interfere with people. When I go home my family says, 'What have you people been up to? Are you aware that this silly law means I require a permit?' My son said, 'I have an agricultural science degree and I have to do a course and the people teaching me don't know anything about chemicals. It's a waste of time.'

I make excuses and say, 'Well, people believe they are doing the right thing.' I do not like bureaucracy anyway. It is true. The best bureaucracy you can probably get is certain sections of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, which are an interesting group of people. If you want to get frustrated, go down to North Terrace with a complicated vehicle to register, and see how the blood pressure goes. One day I went down there and I heard the bloke behind the counter say, 'Get rid of this bloke, he's always trouble.' So, we had a bit of a box on.

The next time I went to renew my licence I filled it out very honestly and they looked it and said, 'You'll have to have a medical.' I said, 'What do you mean, I have to have a medical?' They said, 'You're taking these tablets,' which was correct, and they said that it was in the regulations. I said, 'Show me the regulations.' I said that I didn't recall these regulations. For 10 minutes I stood there. I knew they weren't pleased with me. He came out with the regulations and showed them to me. I said, 'It says 'may'; it doesn't say 'shall', and I've spent 30 years arguing the difference.' He said that he would have to check up on it and I said, 'I look

forward to you checking up on it.' Anyway, it cost me \$70 as I had to go and have the test.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, they got me, but I enjoyed the contest. I know how the average person gets frustrated. I could tell you one or two other stories about down there. I went to register a truck once, a semi-trailer and the bloke said, 'What colour is it?' I said that I had not seen it, that my son had asked me to do it, but I said that if it is 'gypsum' it has to be red. He said, 'I suppose so.' They said, 'How far is it between the wheels?' I said, 'You have it on the computer.' They said, 'Oh, no, we can't look at that.' I said that I would have no idea. And 35 minutes later we were still fighting and, fortunately, someone who recognised me came out, they had a bit of a conference and put a stamp on it because I think they wanted to get rid of me. I have always believed that one should actually know how these foolish provisions we pass operate in practice. That is why I have done it. It gets my blood pressure up when I walk down there, but I may help other members of the public who are also having difficulties. I support the Address in Reply and look forward to the next four years.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Newland, I remind members that it is the honourable member's maiden speech to the parliament and I ask members to show to the member for Newland the normal courtesies. The member for Newland.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr KENYON (Newland): Mr Speaker, I offer my congratulations on your election as Speaker of this house. I have no doubt you will make an excellent speaker as you have respect for the history and traditions of this house and the Westminster system, a sense of fairness, a strength of character and the self-confidence to ensure that your rulings are observed. It also gives me great pleasure to congratulate the Premier on an outstanding and historic election win. My win in Newland would not have been possible without him, and it is a vindication of his tenacity, strategy and leadership.

No-one gets here alone; that is as true for me as it has ever been for anyone. More than anyone else in this house you, Mr Speaker, will be aware of the work that went into my campaign. That is mainly because you were responsible for a very large part of it, and for that you have my sincere thanks. I thank my wife Tina. She is beautiful, intelligent and funny.

Mr Koutsantonis: What's she doing with you?

Mr KENYON: I have no idea. We have been married for just eight years now and I would not be here if it were not for her. She keeps my feet on the ground and, quite usefully, calls me unparliamentary names when I deserve it. Politics is not kind to wives and children and she and the kids have put up with their fair share of pressure and separation over the last eight years. I thank her for her support and love.

I also thank Nick Champion, the current President of the state ALP and a good friend of mine. Mr David Feeney ran the best ALP campaign I have ever been involved in, and I thank David and the staff at party office. Corey Harriss, Tung Ngo, Rosie Falco and Chad Buchanan all slaved like demons in their own time to letterbox, print, fold, stuff and attend street corner meetings and undertake all the other hard-slog tasks that are part of an election campaign. If anyone in this place needs election posters firmly fixed to the stratosphere

at two in the morning, I can recommend Tung without a moment's hesitation.

Craig Whithers and Karly (I never did find out her surname) from Queensland both took holidays to help my campaign. There are a lot more enjoyable ways to use one's holidays, so I am grateful for their contribution. Scott Hartwell, his wife Juliette and their children helped with numerous photos, and I remain in their debt. Joe Bennick and his wife Christine were a great and constant help, as were Robert and Julie Chrisanti. Tom Kidman provided my first campaign donation within days of my preselection, as well as helping with the broader campaign, and I will always remember it.

Mr John Quirke, a former member of this place and, in fact, your predecessor in Playford, Mr Speaker, has had a strong influence on my career. I will mention him in greater detail later, but I will thank him now for his assistance during the campaign. The story of my preselection is somewhat unusual although not particularly dramatic, but there are people in it who should be thanked. I would not be here were it not for the impulsive decision making of Michael Brown and the member for West Torrens. Despite my initial reluctance, I am quite pleased with the way it turned out, and I thank them. My wife is yet to forgive them, however.

Also, I thank Don Farrell who has shown a lot of faith in me, sometimes more than I have in myself. Don has provided me with numerous opportunities; I hope that I have used them as he has expected I would. Certainly, I have enjoyed and appreciated them. The member for Florey dragged me all over the electorate, and I thank her. Numerous other volunteers were a part of my campaign. I apologise for not naming them all, but they have my sincere and heartfelt thanks. Finally, I would like to thank the people of Newland for the trust they have placed in me.

I will work for them as hard as I can for the next four years. I should also mention that the Adelaide hip hop band Hilltop Hoods provided musical inspiration frequently, particularly its track *Dumb Enough*; it is somewhat apt! Every member comes into this place with their own story. My story is not particularly exciting, but it is full of people who, for reasons I am yet to fathom, have gone out of their way to help me. My parents have been the strongest influence in my life. Some of you will know that my mother died last year. You should also know that her influence did not.

Mum was a straight talking, courageous and thoughtful woman with whom I think I share a slight naivety about the way in which things really work. She was tenacious, hard working and selfless, and I hope that my next four years—and, hopefully, beyond—would make her proud. I hope that I can be like her. Ever since I began work in politics, mum was never quite sure what I did or even precisely who I worked for. She was more interested in who I was; but were she still around she would have known that I was in parliament and she would have been here tonight. I wish she were.

I am grateful that my father is here. He is a great man. He is also courageous. He has the courage of his faith and his convictions. My dad is a man of great compassion and insight, with the unique ability to put people at ease and to talk to their hearts. I admire his faith, his courage and his humour. His views on life, the universe and everything were handed down on the nightly drive home from work and school, and I hope that I have learned those lessons well. I thank him for his love and support throughout my life, and especially throughout the course of the past eight years.

My brothers James and John-Paul and sisters Ruth and Miriam and their husbands Doug and Joe have been a great support. The late Lindsay Murphy fired my ambition with his confidence in my future. My cousin, Phil Kenyon, showed me how to help people and to have a lot of fun at the same time. My friends at uni—Jamie Gerrard, Mike Crichton, Glen White, Andrew Brown, Nick Gyngell, Justin Lui, Damien Martin and the member for Hartley, among others—all influenced my thinking through numerous debates over beers and coffee.

I have had the great fortune to work for a number of remarkable people in interesting jobs, and all have played their role in shaping me and my career. I have learned from all of them, and I hope that what they taught me (often without realising it) is put to good use. John Quirke is intelligent, hard-headed, insightful and perceptive. He is a consummate deal maker and an excellent analyst. I apologise to him for the sleepless nights that I have caused him and thank him for his help and guidance. Geoff Buckland is one of life's gentlemen. It was a pleasure to work for him. He showed me how effective cheerful disregard can be, and I thank him for it. I think back now on some of the crazy schemes I put to him and shake my head.

The Hon. Kevin Foley is the most courageous person in the government. He may not recognise it, but I have learnt a lot from him. Working in his office was my first experience of working in a truly professional environment; it was a valuable and enlightening time, if not extremely hard work. The Hon. Paul Holloway is another star of the Rann government; his considerable achievements go unrecognised by a lazy media that regard the definition of a good minister as someone who performs well in the media. Paul is intelligent and analytical, a courageous minister who gets things done—and done well—with a minimum of fuss. Working for him has been the best job of my life. I am immensely proud of the work we did in the resources industry, and I was lucky to work in the environment that I did with the freedom to turn ideas into policy. He provided great advice and support throughout my campaign and he has my thanks; I am in his debt.

I have had the great opportunity of working within government for the last four years. Throughout that time I have been able to work with a number of outstanding public servants. They have my thanks for their guidance, tutoring and patience, and I am especially indebted to Jim Wright, Jim Hallion, Paul Heithersay, Barry Goldstein, Will Zacharin, Ray Garrard and the late David Blight. The state is definitely better for these people having been here.

When I started working for minister Holloway I knew one thing about mining—mining is good. It would have gone no further than that without the patient attention of some industry leaders in this state. David Clarke, Robert Champion de Crespigny, Ian Gould, Keith Yates, Derek Carter, Kevin Moriarty, Bob Johnson, John Roberts and Tino Guglielmo, amongst others, have all taken time out from their incredibly hectic days to increase the level of my mining knowledge. I thank them, and those I have neglected to mention, for their time and interest.

Some of you may have noticed a recurring theme in this speech: courage, and its necessary companions wisdom and selflessness. They are traits I admire and they are essential to reform. They are integral to the success of two of my political heroes, Paul Keating and Jeff Kennett, both of whom transformed the societies they served. And there is much to reform. For instance, it is time for the Australian Labor Party

to change its 'no new uranium mines' policy. Time has moved on; we are no longer living through a cold war and the threat of global climate change is too great to hang on to outdated ideological dogma. Developing countries have the right to develop, the right to drag their populations out of poverty, to prevent their populations dying of easily preventable diseases and to improve their educational systems. This brings with it an increasing demand for electricity which can be provided in one of two ways—either coal or nuclear. One choice puts an ever-increasing amount of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and accelerates the rate of climate change; the other, while not being risk free, does not. It is in our interests, both environmentally and economically, that they use emission-free technology and, to be blunt, many countries have only one choice—nuclear power.

Other countries are already making this choice and we should be glad that they are. Coal is not so safe. In China in 2004, 7 000 coalminers died in mining accidents in just 10 months; in the United States every year thousands of people die from respiratory illnesses caused by the combustion of coal, and the average coal-fired power station puts more uranium into the atmosphere every year than a similar sized nuclear power plant. Uranium mining has its risks—mostly for those working in the mines rather than for the environment—but these risks are manageable. We know because we have been mining uranium ever since the ALP introduced its ridiculous and illogical anti-uranium policy. As a result of this policy Australians have missed out on jobs and wealth, and that is all. No environmental outcomes have been achieved, no species have been saved, and no ill has been spared.

Finally, I will address some of the silly furrphies put about by green fundamentalists. One is that we have a moral obligation to take the nuclear waste of countries that use our uranium. What a load of rubbish. No-one argues that we should take back the slag from steel mills that use our iron ore or the fly ash of power stations that use our coal. We are often told that there is no solution for nuclear waste, but that is more rubbish. Apart from the perfectly acceptable solution of burying it, there are two excellent Australian solutions—Synroc and vitrification—and I encourage members to have a look at them. You cannot be an environmentalist and be opposed to nuclear energy; it is at least in part the solution to climate change. If you will not consider it, then you are a green fundamentalist.

I will not take up too much more time but there is one subject I wish to talk about—abortion. Let me say very plainly that abortion is wrong; it is the killing of individual innocent people. There is far too much of it in our state and we are the worse for it. I hope that I would not stand by and watch while another person was killed and I hope I would have the courage to assist that person. I hope I would have the courage to help those too young and too helpless to help themselves.

There are plenty of things to talk about and there are four years to do it in, but I am conscious of a piece of advice that the former Premier of New South Wales (Jack Lang) gave to Paul Keating. He said, 'When you get into parliament, don't think you have a lot of time, because you don't.' Being a representative of a marginal seat, I am acutely aware of the lack of time at my disposal. I am driven by the desire to make a contribution to the welfare of the citizens of this state, and to make in some small way an improvement to our way of life. My goal is to be able to walk away at the end of my allotted time (however long that is) and know that my

electorate and my state are better off because I was in this place.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

Last Thursday, Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson AC CVO MBE, the Governor of South Australia, opened the first session of the 51st Parliament, and I thank her for her grace and dignity on that occasion, on which she was vested with the responsibility of outlining her government's proposals for government during the next four years. I propose tonight to address principally areas of her presentation in relation to health and housing, in particular, mental health. However, may I say also as a preliminary that, in addition to Her Excellency's undertaking duties on behalf of the government last Thursday, she has of course in recent times attended to the responsibility of swearing in the new ministry and executive government, and there are many other duties that she undertakes on a daily basis.

Her Excellency will be concluding those duties later this year, and I was disappointed to note at least the member for Enfield's published position as to the abolition of her office. I do not, for one moment, suggest that he was in any way reflecting on the Governor personally in relation to either her duties or her particular term of office, but it did strike me as rather unusual that it should be done at a time when she was carrying out the very duties on behalf of the government of which we speak and to which we are responding today. More importantly, it was delivered, I think, with some level of naivety, particularly as there has been much consideration given to the role of Governor.

I say, as I have acknowledged in the past, that one day I will welcome Australia's becoming a republic, but I also see a very important role in the continuation of the office of governor in each of the states, and in particular in the smaller states such as South Australia. It will be critical for our survival in a federation that that role is maintained. The office of governor is not just the protector of the royal fish and other interesting anachronisms of historical entitlement and vested responsibility, but he or she, of course, also undertakes other considerable responsibilities which we need to ensure that we protect. In respect of Her Excellency's presentation, I also indicate that I thank her for her reference to those past members who have passed away, and she acknowledged my father, the Hon. Ted Chapman. I wish to place on the record—and this is no reflection on Her Excellency, because I appreciate that she gives her presentation on advice of the government—that he died, in fact, in July 2005 and not as published.

In respect of the matters of health, I note in particular that there are five areas of proposed, impressive (at least, as presented) areas of reform that are to be undertaken. In summary, they are as follows, and I wish to make some brief comment. First, the government will embark on a 10-year redevelopment of the Flinders Medical Centre, as well as the deprivatisation of the Modbury Hospital. At least for the latter, there will be no escape from increased costs, or a cut in services, or both, and I will watch that development with interest. The second reform is to develop a network of GP Plus Centres, which sounds like a good idea, but such centres will be utterly useless unless we have doctors to put in them. The third reform will be to introduce powers in the event of a need to effectively respond to a flu pandemic, which I assume at this stage is to cover the outbreak of a bird flu pandemic, which of course is to be across nations. From a government which appears unable at this stage to even

contain an outbreak of measles and which certainly has a streptococcal germ problem in its public hospitals, I will await with interest the viewing of that legislation.

The fourth reform is to add support to mental health, which I am pleased to hear about. In particular, the government has announced the hiring of 56 new mental health workers, which is terrific, but we do not have any trained people or applicants to do the work and, as part of that, to make Glenside Hospital a hub of mental and related health services. I am delighted to hear that. The campus, which is a campus of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, is in my electorate, but, given that this government announced some 12 months ago that it was ready to sell it and, indeed, cash up the \$80 million worth of proceeds from the sale of the property on which it resides, I will watch that with interest.

Finally, in respect of mental health, I refer to the opening of new and redeveloped facilities, including the Margaret Tobin Centre and the Noarlunga and Repatriation hospitals. Of course, this is simply the relocation of patients from current facilities. These proposals—at least in respect of the Margaret Tobin Centre—should be up and functioning already, and I am saddened to see that they have been delayed for the past four years. Nevertheless, they are the government's keynote proposals in relation to those areas.

In respect of South Australia's current performance in relation to public mental health, it is clear that it has spiralled into crises over the past two years in particular. There are a number of reasons for this. On a per capita basis, South Australia has the lowest funding of any state in Australia. This applies even after the injection of \$25 million in one-off funding over two years by the current Labor government. This compares poorly with our state having the third highest per capita funding under the previous Liberal government. The current government has given mental health services a low priority—lots of talk but little action—and there has been no direction and leadership.

The leadership and direction provided by the late Dr Margaret Tobin has clearly been lost. The clinical plan of June 2000, which united the mental health service towards improvement, has dissipated. Instead, a new bureaucratic mental health structure has been created within the new health regions, with key decisions being made by non-medical administrators. Patients are no longer able to access acute psychiatric services when they need them, due to the running down of staff and facilities. Just as one example, since 2001 the Noarlunga hospital has gone from 20 to 15 psychiatric beds and from seven to 1.8 full-time equivalents. I think those are dangerously alarming statistics.

There is another thing which is telling in relation to keeping in perspective the whole deinstitutionalisation that has occurred over 45 years. It is instructive to consider that in 1960, when Australia had a population of 10 million, we had 30 000 psychiatric beds across our facilities for people in need in this area of mental health. Here we are 45 years later—I am using the 2005 figures—with a population of 20 million Australians, and we now have only 4 000 psychiatric beds across Australia. That is an alarming drop. It is a very simple statistic, which tells us that across Australia there has been the development of deinstitutionalisation.

Regrettably, we have seen no provision for supported care facilities, which needs to be exercised. Many of the existing privately-owned supported residential facilities have been forced to close through a lack of government support and high property taxes. More recently, there have been issues in relation to fire regulations and the like. Hundreds of residents

with mental illness have been forced onto the street to care for themselves. We are not alone in this problem. Sadly, though, South Australia has spiralled down in the last two years. With severe psychotics, this has created unsafe neighbourhoods. Pleas for help and assistance have gone unanswered and crime related to mental health has increased.

Another issue that needs to be confronted is the extent to which emergency departments in major hospitals have become disrupted through the increasing attendance of mental health patients or those under the influence of some drug. There has been a proportional increase in security guards, which diverts resources away from the treatment of patients. Of course, security guards have been necessary to protect staff and patients and, indeed, even people visiting patients. Be under no illusion, Mr Acting Speaker, this only adds a separate entrance for mental health patients or drug-affected persons and will just move the security guards from the front of the building to the side of the building; it will not solve the problem.

I note the government's announcement of the appointment of a commissioner for mental health, and I wish to comment briefly in relation to that. The government announced last week that Monsignor Cappo would be appointed as the Commissioner for Social Inclusion. For the last four years he has been chair of the Social Inclusion Board and, of course, has acted as a member of the cabinet's executive committee. One has to wonder what extra powers he is to be given to undertake these duties and why on earth the government and, in particular, the Premier would have announced that he would have a minister for mental health—namely, the Hon. Gail Gago from another place—if in fact she has any other use or purpose in light of the appointment of this commissioner. Will we create another level of bureaucracy; will there just be further diverted costs? I cannot answer that question, but it sends alarm bells to me that we should go down this track which, effectively, undermines the responsibility and role of the minister.

There is a lack of facilities and resources to treat drug addiction, particularly in young people, and to effectively tackle illicit drug-induced psychosis, with the increased use of amphetamines and a high level of use of marijuana. The mental health services simply cannot cope with the failure of the government's drug strategy. In country communities the mental health services are largely community based and suffering from a lack of trained staff. On a per capita basis, country staff levels are less than half those of the metropolitan area, and substantially below the national benchmark. Experienced mental health nurses are urgently required in many larger country hospitals so that such acute services can be provided locally. This provides much better treatment than sending acute patients to Adelaide, often with police escorts.

Although mental health is the largest cause of disability, there has been no review of the Mental Health Act, despite repeated promises by this Labor government. The key to providing effective mental health services is ensuring adequately highly trained staff. There is a critical shortage of mental health nurses, occupational therapists and other professionals. A specific plan by the state government to provide an adequate number of psychiatrists to ensure effective treatment is clearly overdue.

The total inaction by the Labor government is even further highlighted when compared to initiatives announced by the federal government. There was a recent federal government announcement by the Prime Minister and Parliamentary Secretary (Hon. Christopher Pyne) of approximately

\$1.8 billion over five years. Essentially, this money is to increase clinical and health services, to change some of the rules in relation to psychiatrists to facilitate easier and quicker referral to specialists and transfer to psychologists and mental health nurses to try to support the services by adding in mentoring schemes, to increase the mental health work force generally, to provide new non-clinical and respite services and programs on community awareness and, of course, mental health nursing places. The federal government has a direct responsibility to provide for the services in this area, which are being covered by these programs.

The South Australian government has a responsibility to provide hospital care for mental health patients and also to provide for accommodation. They are the direct jurisdictional responsibility of the state government, and we as a parliament must ensure that it honours its obligations in this regard. So, it was with interest that I read about the Council of Australian Governments meeting. The Prime Minister and the Premiers of each of the states in Australia met on 10 February 2006. They issued in their communique a number of proposals in relation to their objectives, which were to be effectively investigated and committed to before they met again in June 2006. It is important to note that this was a Council of Australian Governments meeting that took place on 10 February 2006.

Interestingly, in relation to health, and mental health in particular, it was agreed between the Prime Minister, our Premier and other premiers, as I have indicated, that there would be a \$1.1 billion reform package to achieve better health for all Australians and that \$660 million would be put in by the commonwealth and \$480 million by the states and territories. To promote good health, disease prevention, early intervention, etc., there would be another of \$500 million—that is, \$250 million from the commonwealth and \$250 million from the states and territories. For care and support in the community, the commonwealth would put in \$96 million, with the states and territories putting in another \$80 million over four years.

As to mental health services, COAG also agreed that, in addition to all the other references I have made, another \$20 million would be allocated in relation to a call centre. There would be improved care in hospitals and residential centres, which included the commonwealth giving the states another \$150 million for them to provide those services to more senior aged people. Another five-year program would be set up, with funding of \$122 million from the commonwealth to the states, to make provision for younger people, their families and carers, and this specifically related to disability.

In this area generally there had been an agreement between the heads of our nation that there would be not only a commitment to make provision for all Australians to be more healthy, skilled and motivated (which was the primary objective to come out of this meeting) but also that they would commit hundreds of millions of dollars to do so. What went wrong between 10 February and the announcement by this government after the recent election that there needed to be a major inquiry into the financial viability in relation to proposed spending of the state? What was it that changed for the government now to announce that its annual \$10 billion budget needed to be put off from what would have been a budget in at least June this year (sometimes it is delayed a little after an election, as it was in 2002) for another three or four months until September?

What is it that should demand that we be asked shortly to vote on a bill to allocate \$3.1 billion to the Public Service just to keep it going? That is a third of the funding we are asked to scrutinise in relation to the budget for the 2006-07 year. Yet we will be asked shortly to vote on a bill to allow almost one third of it to go in without even seeing a budget for that money to be spent. We can talk about the sheer arrogance of the Treasurer and of his government in expecting that the parliament and the people of South Australia should put up with it.

As to the announcement earlier this year that the government proposed that, in relation to health and, in particular hospitals, it would need to put in an extra \$67 million, this announcement was not surprising. The half-year budget had come through—that is, up to December 2005—and the Premier repeated in the parliament last week that it was necessary to review the matter after getting the half-year report and that another \$67 million would need to go into hospital services for the forthcoming period. He told us last week:

The advice that I am given is that the monitoring report from the health department received by Treasury was the January monitoring report received in February, during the caretaker period, which indicated that hospital activity was in excess of what they had advised us for the mid year budget review.

That was in response to some questioning by our leader on what had happened to expose a deficit of \$300 million and why we needed to have the services of some chap rushing over from New South Wales who was some whizzbang adviser from a previous government (it may have been the commonwealth government, and he may have previously been an under treasurer in New South Wales) to remedy that situation.

So, we have what he told us last week was the reason. The whole position is one of absolute, sheer arrogance. We may well be seeing a situation where, at least as demonstrated on radio interviews today and in a recent performance by the Treasurer, he seems to be shaping up to be the Mark Latham of SA Labor. Nevertheless, we as a parliament have to deal with how we manage the money and how we ensure that it gets critically to these areas of health, in particular, that I refer to today. When we put all those facts together, we have the situation whereby in January we have a report prepared, which is provided to the Treasurer in February, of the blowout in hospital services. We have that being used as the excuse for two things.

One is that there needed to be an extra \$67 million allocated immediately to provide for health services and hospital services in this state; and the second is that it could not be disclosed at that point because the government was in caretaker mode. He could not be honest with the people of South Australia and tell them that there had been this massive explosion. He was able to come out and say, 'We need a bit of extra money,' then when he got the report in February he told us that we would need to have a major review and there would need to be a cutting of funding for all the public sector. He then told us that that is the explanation.

One of the things that I find absolutely inexplicable and unacceptable in that explanation is that at the very time the Treasurer is getting advice that the health budget has blown out and they need more money and that the situation is to be reviewed, his Premier is attending the COAG meeting on 10 February this year, signing up to tens of billions of dollars in funding by his government—for and on behalf of the people of South Australia. Therefore, I do not accept the Treasurer's

explanation as to what he was told, why he did not tell anyone, and his pathetic excuse to now put off the scrutiny of parliament on the government's proposed budget until September this year. That is an absolute disgrace. It should never happen again.

Even when the government came to office in 2002, when members opposite had not been in office for some years before, they were able to ensure that a budget was before us and delivered by the end of that financial year and that we were then having estimates in the early part of the financial year. It is reasonable that there would be a month or so's delay in the incoming government: perfectly accepted. Now the government has been there for four years. It has made a mess, it did not know anything about it and, when it found out about it, it did not tell anyone. Now after the election members of the government come out and say, 'We're not going to tell you how we're going to spend our money or how much we are going to spend until September,' three months into the next financial year.

We will not even be able to ask a question of the Premier, the Treasurer or any minister on the proposed spending until October this year. That is a totally unacceptable position and it should never be allowed to happen again. Those members of the Australian Labor Party who are coming into the house as members for the first time ought to make sure that their government never allows this to happen again.

I mentioned the question of doctors, in relation to health and the lack thereof, and I noted with interest today the publication of the proposed private medical school in South Australia. I place on the record that I have no objection to the establishment of a private medical school in South Australia and I do look forward to that occurring, whether it is under Mr Birdseye's proposal as published or that of someone else who is able to comply with the federal requirements. That will be welcomed, because clearly we do need extra educational services for the purpose of training our medical personnel, and I will welcome that.

I highlight the fact that, in this proposal, 70 places that are to be quarantined for South Australians will form the basis of an application for support from the state government; that is, scholarship subsidy funding, just as the government is providing some \$15 million of the \$20-plus million that it has allocated for Carnegie Mellon and the scholarships to train a whole lot of public administration graduates through Carnegie Mellon. So I will await with interest the government's response to this, or any other proposal for an approved medical school, that there will be support in the same number.

As the parliament has heard in the past, I have made it absolutely clear that not only is Carnegie Mellon welcome in South Australia but it has actually been here for eight years. Eight years it has been here, but what has happened, of course, is that the new government has just given it a free home—that is all that has changed—and it has subsidised people to go there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: The ministers ought to get their facts right in relation to this. That university has been operating here and providing educational services for eight years. So wakey-wakey, on that side of the house, and understand this: they are welcome here and they were invited here by a Liberal state government, and we welcome them. Also understand this: if the state Labor government wants to give away \$15 million of more than \$20 million to support more

public administration degrees for South Australians, then they can certainly line up and provide support and subsidies for South Australians who want to study at medical school, to ensure that we have the doctors and services we need. Let us make that necessary commitment and hear from the government to ensure that that happens.

Finally, I wish to briefly refer to the question of housing. There are many aspects of housing which the former shadow minister for housing, the member for Heysen—excellent shadow minister that she was—presented during the last state election by way of proposal. There are many more ideas, that I think were absolutely critical. Apart from supported accommodation, I just wish to highlight the importance of ensuring that there be some attention to how we deal with the high level of demand for low-cost accommodation.

An announcement was made today by the Minister for Families and Communities and Minister for Housing—and I am not quite sure whether that is going to change to Minister for Families SA under the new title announced today but, in any event, we know who we are talking about. He has proposed a restructuring of the three main authorities that deal with housing in South Australia and that we are going to have a one-stop shop and we are going to have a little booklet which tells us where to go first as a guide.

I do not have any problem with that in principle, but it is being presented as a means by which there will be a major saving of cost, presumably in relation to the administration, as the minister announced in parliament here today, and that it will ensure there will be much more money available to provide for services. The opposition has been advised that the chief executive officer of the department of housing has given an absolute assurance that there will be no jobs lost as a result of this restructure, so we are yet to see where the government is going to make any change. It has not announced any amount of money or any cuts, or in relation to—

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

Ms CHAPMAN: No, the interjection suggests that it is for service. That is exactly what is proposed. What is told, though, is that more funding will be available as a result of this new model for services. No identified funds; no jobs to be lost, but we are going to have these new facilities at various regional offices that have been announced.

The other interesting thing in that announcement is that we are now going to have a new single waiting list. Instead of having a list that you go on for three years, when you really seriously need housing, and another list that you go on when you have only a medium need for housing, and another one where you might have to wait 10 years for a house, we are now going to have one list. That will mean that we will be totally excluded from being able to make any assessment, as we have in the last four years, of the spiralling increase in those lists.

I do not doubt for one moment we will be told when we get to estimates, ‘We can’t compare this new list with the old list because we changed the rules. We changed the structure and so we now need to be able to assure everyone that the situation is humming along beautifully, but we can’t compare it.’

I just make the point that when we get to estimates there will be a total concealment of the fact that we are again in this area—just like mental health—spiralling into decay because we have an increased waiting list, we have a reduced number of houses available because this government is continuing to sell them. Just as an example, last year, in the 2004-05 year, that is, the last year of published results—we do not have the

last one yet—we found that there were only an extra 51 people in South Australia who actually got a Housing Trust house, and there are tens of thousands on the waiting list. There are 25 000. In fact, it is way above 25 000 now, so it is really just very disappointing that we should hear the minister’s announcement today about an issue which is critical to this state and very important in complementing the mental health program and ensuring that we have the housing to go with it. I urge the government to look carefully at that aspect again and come up with something useful and decent, and provide the service for those people when we finally get the budget in September 2006.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Thank you, Mr Speaker; it is good to be here again. Mr Speaker, first, congratulations on your election to this high office. I have known you for 15 years, since we first joined the Labor Party together in Young Labor—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, very young Labor. Mr Speaker, I know that you will be a credit to that office and make us all very proud—our first Labor Speaker in 16 years. I want to thank the architects of Labor’s victory in 2006: Senator Minchin and Rob Lucas. In 2002 the then Labor secretary Mr Ian Hunter was approached by Mr Graham Jaeschke for a preference swap—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Jet ski.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: However his name was pronounced. My name is mispronounced, but I get used to do it.

Mrs Redmond: Anastasious.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That’s right; a male’s name, despite what people say; a very manly name in Greek. The deal was going to be that we had a renegade running against us in Enfield. The Liberal Party had a renegade running against it in Hammond. We should exchange preferences and take care of our dirty laundry. The geniuses on the Liberal Party State Executive, Senator Nick Minchin and, of course, that other tactical genius Rob Lucas in another place said, ‘No, no, no; Ralph Clarke is going to beat the Labor Party in Enfield, and we’ll take care of our bloke in Hammond; we don’t need to do this deal.’ Of course, history speaks for itself. Ivan Peter Lewis was elected to the seat of Hammond and, of course, Mike Rann was sworn in some time afterwards. So, to Nick Minchin and Rob Lucas, thank you very, very much.

We all know that the moment that the Premier took office, the people of South Australia all knew in their heart of hearts that the moment he was given the opportunity to lead he would excel at it and that he would be able to convince South Australians that he was good at his job. Their worst fears were recognised, but that was of their own making. And, of course, what is the penalty for this decision? Well, the Hon. Rob Lucas remains in his leadership position as shadow treasurer of the upper house, and Senator Nick Minchin goes on his merry way as a senator in the federal parliament and a senior cabinet minister. Well, what is the punishment for getting something wrong in the Liberal Party? Promotion? Is that the punishment, is it?

I also congratulate the new members of the Liberal Party, the members for Hammond, Goyder, Unley and Finnis. I am sure they will serve well their constituencies. The member for Unley got here by the skin of his teeth, but a win is a win, whether it is by one vote or 2 000 votes. So, congratulations to all those members. Your community has shown confidence in you even though we did not. But I am sure that the next

Labor candidate running against you will give you a strong showing like we did this time. Congratulations to our candidates on this side, the members for Bright, Newland, Hartley, Stuart, Morialta and Hartley who excelled themselves in their campaigns and who were endorsed by their communities. And, of course, the two members who were unsuccessful, Michael Keenan and Amanda Rishworth, fought very brave campaigns in seats they were probably never going to—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know her very well. I am sure our candidate in Mitchell put up a very good fight as well. The unfortunate thing about Mitchell is that, if the Liberal Party did not have such a hopeless candidate and the vote did not go down by so much, we would have won, but unfortunately the Liberal Party, true to form, ran a dead campaign with a hopeless candidate who had no connection to the area. The Liberal Party vote collapsed to unprecedented levels and an Independent got up. That is what happens in seats such as that and, unfortunately, that is what happened. The member for Norwood is much maligned by members opposite and the media. She is always being attacked, called all sorts of names and criticised for her ability to lead her community.

We are talking about someone who was elected as a mayor of that community and who has won three elections in a row in a seat that, quite frankly, should not be Labor—and every member opposite knows it. The member for Norwood won that seat—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: If the member for Unley has decided to interject before he makes his maiden speech, I will happily get stuck into him as well.

Mr Pisoni: You are welcome to.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am welcome to, am I? Excellent.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Has Brindal given you that info on him yet?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He has. I will talk about his Ikea comment a little later as well and his self-interest, because the honourable member is here for everyone, not just his own manufacturing company. The member for Norwood won an election against their star candidate 'Nigel Not-So-Smart'. This bloke was sold the pup of pups. He was told, 'Look, the Liberal Party is back on the precipice of winning the election again. We will run you for our most marginal seat.' Rather than running him for a seat which perhaps he might have a better chance of winning—for example, Bright, or some other southern seat, which is where he is from—they ran him in the eastern suburbs. The first time he appeared on radio to talk about his candidacy, he did not even know that the Orange Lane markets had been closed. This is the type of local campaign the Liberal Party ran.

That is my first point about how appalling their campaign was, but I am not one to gloat. For the first time, the member for Norwood won that seat on the night without having to wait to go to postal votes; that is, without having to go through the painful experience which members opposite—the member for Stuart and the member for Unley—and members on this side have experienced. Waiting for postal votes to be counted is an appalling process. It is something which one never wants to go through. The member for Norwood has had her fair share of that: in 1997 in her upset victory and again in 2002. However, in 2006 there was no such delay; we knew

on the night. In fact, I think we knew by about 7.30 that the member for Norwood had been returned.

Of course, in his own humble way, the losing candidate did not have the courage to congratulate Vini. Instead he said, 'I was best on the ground in a losing grand final.' What arrogance. The example of how to lose graciously is the Hon. Angus Redford. There is a man who knows how to lose graciously. He came out on the night and said, 'I campaigned; I was the wrong candidate in the wrong seat; and I lost. Chloe won fair and square. Good luck to her.' He was big about it. I tell members opposite that we on this side respect him for that. Nigel Smart did not even have the courage to turn up and say, 'Vini Ciccarello, congratulations.' There is no medal or honour in that. They fought a good and fair campaign, and when someone wins you congratulate them.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You spoke to him outside. It was a high profile campaign with a lot of jibes against the member for Norwood. I think she did very well and I am very proud of her. She does an excellent job in her seat. I also thank our campaign director Mr David Feeney who, hopefully, is soon to be senator Feeney. He is a great campaigner. He is the man who orchestrated the defeat of Jeff Kennett. He nicknamed the campaign 'Operation shock and awe', and I think members opposite can appreciate that. Of course, he did not run the campaign on his own. He was ably assisted by Michael Brown who is our acting state secretary until he is elected officially; our party president, Nick Champion, a very good campaigner; and Scott McFarlane, who I understand was one of Patrick's young proteges and of whom I am very fearful. Also, the esteemed treasurer of our party, John Boag, does an excellent job ensuring that the bills are paid and the fundraising is allocated to the right place.

Of course, you cannot have a great election victory without a good foundation on which to build. That foundation was laid down by the Premier and his cabinet. Four years of surplus budgets, four years of good economic management and four years of sensible governance in South Australia gave people in South Australia, probably for the first time in 20 years, a positive experience of a Labor government. There were low expectations in 2002 but we achieved high returns in the four years we were in government and gave people a sense of confidence that we were able to govern. They rewarded us generously.

I thank the people who helped me personally in my campaign, including my former employer Don Farrell (Secretary of the Transport Workers Union), Alex Gallagher, and Stephen Brennan (Secretary of the TCF Union). I also thank the CPU and the Australian Metal Workers Union for the good work they did in our postal vote campaign. I thank my staff in my local office—Betty, Nick and Paul—who did an outstanding job. As members know, we rely on our staff and they do a great job for us. It is a thankless task. They deal with the people who come into the office with unreasonable demands.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I have often wondered how many constituents go to the offices of Liberal members compared with those who go to the offices of Labor members of marginal seats.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Safe Labor seats.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: My seat is marginal. I remember speaking to Graham Ingerson about how many constituents went to his office. He said, 'I get about two.' I said, 'Two a day?' He said, 'No; two a week.' I thought, 'Wow, two a

week! Are they lost? Are they asking for directions?" I know the member for Giles and country MPs have a high workload, but I assume that people in metropolitan Liberal seats—where people are more affluent and mobile—do not need to use the services of their local member of parliament as much as people who rely on their member of parliament to deal with Centrelink matters and other welfare-related issues. We rely on our staff and they become de facto campaign managers. They are the unsung heroes of the democratic process, and I pay tribute to Betty, Nick and Paul for all the hard work they did. I thank my local mayor John Trainer for his great assistance during the campaign. He is always ready to give me advice and words of wisdom. I thank him wholeheartedly for all the efforts he made in my campaign.

I also thank my parents who did a great deal of work and campaigned for me. My mother sometimes finds it very difficult to campaign for the Labor Party: she grits her teeth and gets out there. She does a great deal of work for me and campaigns assiduously for me. Also, Steve Georganos does a great deal of work both in his federal electorate and my electorate. Of course, my father in his own way helps out as much as he can by cooking a barbecue and helping to deliver letterbox pamphlets to the volunteers.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: And painting your house!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And painting my house.

Ms Chapman: They want you to leave home.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: They do not like me leaving home: they cannot keep an eye on me. I want to pay tribute to those former members who have not returned. I know it is difficult to lose, and the worst part about losing is the silence. In my own humble way, I advise members opposite not to forget their comrades who are no longer here—give them a call now and then. The worst part about losing is no-one talking to you anymore and people becoming very distant former acquaintances. That is the worst part about losing. Despite what we do during election campaigns, obviously we want to win and I had a great deal to do with—

Ms Chapman: How often do you ring Ralph Clarke?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Never! I only ring him every now and then to make sure he is still breathing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Just about as often as you ring John Olsen.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. Even though I had a great deal to do with choosing some of our candidates, I feel for some of them. I remember in 1993 when Kevin Hamilton lost his seat to Joe Rossi, I lost all my faith and confidence in any campaigning technique one might have. I do not mean that because he was a Liberal, but it shows that a local member of parliament who works hard for the community and raises a lot of money by walking from here to Darwin and back for the local QEH can be voted out for someone like Joe Rossi. It is not because the local member was not working hard enough or was not appreciated, but sometimes there are other factors in place and you get swept away. When you get swept away in a landslide, it is hard to see the trees for the forest. Often it is not your fault and nothing you could have done would have changed that.

The exception to the rule was the Hon. Graham Gunn who, for some reason we cannot explain, keeps on coming back, despite our best efforts. It is hard to dislike the member for Stuart. In his own special way he is one of the last larrikins of this place—a character. It is hard to have a personality like Graham's and get away it these days. Politicians are becoming more bland every election, although

the member for Newland will break that mould. It is getting harder and harder to have a personality in this place without the media or someone else tearing you to pieces. The good thing about the member for Stuart is that he is beyond the media and beyond public perceptions—he is just who he is.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: I don't need it.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He doesn't need it. He had a very hard time in Stuart and he did win and did beat us in the toughest of circumstances, that is, with a popular Premier, an advertising blitzkrieg campaign the likes of which the people of Stuart have never seen before—direct mail, polling, targeting, the best campaign the seat of Stuart will ever see—and he withstood it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, in retiring. Sometimes humility is the best—something I practice myself. For every family in the Liberal Party that suffered in the campaign and worked hard, an opposite family in the Labor Party worked just as hard. Justin and Carly and their family worked very hard in the electorate of Stuart, dragging their young family around that district. They were very disappointed, having lost by the smallest of margins. My heart goes out to Justin and to his family. I say to Justin that it is nothing personal, nothing to do with the way he campaigned or conducted himself during the campaign. He can hold his head high. We in the Labor Party are proud of the efforts he made. I know that Graham would agree that the wives in the country are the ones who deserve the pay rather than the members because they are the real members.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I know that Ivan Venning does not see any of his salary—it goes to the brains in the family.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am still waiting. The member for Bragg has promised to find me a wife. I admire the young volunteers she has working on her polling booths. They are very attractive young ladies who are obviously accustomed to being kept in a certain way that I could not possibly afford to keep them.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I help a lot of candidates—I was lost. To Justin and to the other candidates who lost, they can hold their heads high because they conducted themselves honourably and I am very proud of all their efforts. As for the next four years, I have noticed members opposite calling us arrogant, saying we are crowing and saying we are out of touch. It has been only a few months since the election campaign and I think the government has been very restrained, personally. It has conducted itself in a very mature way, in a way that replicates the way the federal government behaves in its approach to governing Australia. Our approach is little different in terms of the policy we implement, but I think that we conduct ourselves very well.

With respect to the outgoing ministers, I was very proud of the way in which the members for Little Para and Ashford conducted themselves as ministers and the way in which they retired from the ministry. I think that they can hold their heads high also. I am especially close to the member for Ashford, because it is my adjoining electorate. She often behaves like my mother at functions—slapping me on the wrist and telling me what I should and should not do. I think that she was a very good minister in this place. I remember when she would stand up during question time someone said that it was like pressing the mute button. I think that she did a fantastic job. With respect to the member for Little Para, I

think that health is probably the hardest portfolio any minister could possibly have next to Treasury or being the premier. It is a huge budget with huge demands to manage. I do not think that any health minister would ever please everyone all the time. It is a very hard job. I think that the member for Little Para managed it with distinction.

I am very proud of the reforms that we made in the first four years of our government. It is something about which she can always be very proud. The Menadue report was an especially hard task in terms of changing people's perceptions and attitudes on health. It is not something that you can turn around quickly. I think that the member for Little Para did an excellent job. My aspirations for my seat over the next four years are that, again, we get good government and good financial management from our Treasurer. I expect from our government surplus budgets, I expect from our government good management and I expect our economy to continue to grow.

One person I do not envy in the next four years is the Minister for Transport. He will have some very difficult projects to get up, including the Bakewell Bridge project (which I am very proud of) and, of course, the South Road underpasses. These projects will test the patience of the people of the western suburbs. Those people in the western suburbs will look to their local community leaders for advice and guidance, and I am already expecting the long queues outside my door about delays on Henley Beach Road, Anzac Highway and South Road.

I know how the minister has handled the Bakewell Bridge underpass. The consultation process has gone to great lengths. It has been the best consultation I have ever seen. I am very proud of the Hon. Pat Conlon for the way in which he has handled himself. He has always been available to take a phone call from me about my concerns. Often ministers are very busy and they do not have much time to talk to members about small matters, but Pat Conlon is always ready to hear me about the complaints of locals. He has always been very reliable in getting back to me and making sure that we can get that constituent looked after.

I can see problems, but I do ask for patience. I expect members opposite to be crowing about any delays—especially the member for Morphett—on Anzac Highway and the underpass. I know that it will be a very difficult project to see to completion. The new Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition have been ordained by members from other places. Their marriage is a marriage made in Canberra. In the greatest traditions of shotgun weddings, the deputy leader had a huge smile on her face and the leader had a very grimacing frown. You could tell that he could feel the metal in his back as he was led to the altar.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: It was something he had been avoiding for 10 years.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. One of the bridesmaids in the recent nuptials was not too happy about the arrangement between the members for Bragg and Davenport. I was stunned to hear the member for MacKillop say, 'Why would you make someone deputy who wants to be leader?' Mr Speaker, I can see the TV ads already.

If members opposite think we are just going to sit back here and watch them self-destruct without getting involved they are kidding themselves. They are already on the phones, already talking amongst themselves. You can see the looks in their eyes when one gets up to speak, rolling their eyes behind their backs. We can all see it on this side, but the member for Bragg cannot see the eyes rolling. You can see

the disappointment in their eyes. Then, of course, there is the member for Waite, who is going to wait patiently for these two groups to self-destruct.

I am backing a different horse; I am backing the member for Schubert to emerge as the next leader of the opposition. He is a much under-rated performer; someone who, I understand, rejected high office from his leader; someone who has served the Liberal Party since 1990 and longer; someone who has put his money where his mouth is in terms of the Liberal Party. I think the member for Schubert is constantly being overlooked, and I would not be surprised if he emerges as a late dark horse in the run for the leadership.

But all that matters is who is there at the grand final. Like the Eagles and the Crows, the current two are the front runners, but only five or six games have been played and there are 22 in a season. I cannot see them making the distance. Marriages have a honeymoon period but that honeymoon was over about 30 seconds after the gun was pushed into Iain Evans' back.

Mrs Geraghty: I thought it was a knife.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No; they use shotguns in the Liberal Party. If I know the Liberal Party as well as I think I do, their factional intentions cannot be dealt with in a quiet, professional manner; they usually blow up in the face of journalists, on the front page of *The Advertiser* or leading the headline news with Mike Smithson with some other great little headline about some atrocity being committed in their caucus. I look forward to all these atrocities being committed, because they make great reading and great TV, and I encourage opposition members on the backbench to have their say publicly about leadership tensions. Do not be afraid; remember, the squeaky wheel gets oiled. If you want promotion in the Liberal Party you will not get it by being a good, loyal backbencher and keeping your mouth shut; the only way to get it is to be out publicly agitating for a change. Look at the member for Waite. He runs a leadership challenge just before the election and look where he is sitting—number three! So, to all those members opposite who think, 'I'll be loyal; I'll be quiet; I'll do the right thing', that is not the right formula.

I would like to finish with this. Rob Lucas—if you did not have him you would have to invent him. When asked how they will pay for all their promises he comes out with something like, 'I don't know; we'll sack 4 000 public servants.' You campaign on a land tax package and come out with a costing but no policy, 'It is going to cost \$25 million a year but we cannot tell you who is going to get what back.' That would really have helped the Hon. Joe Scalzi in his seat; he could write back to everyone and say, 'I cannot tell you how much you are going to save but trust me, it's \$25 million a year. You might get nothing; you might get something.'

If I was Rob Lucas I would take a leaf out of my Japanese ancestry, drink the sake in the morning, get the paper out, get the sword out, get on my knees, think of the gods and commit political hari kiri. But of course he will not, and do you know why? He likes his white car too much; he likes the pay—since 1989. And members opposite just sit back and watch him take it. Well, long may he reign, because he is the Labor Party's secret weapon, and as long as he is out there coming out with costings instead of policies the better it is for us. I mean, fancy campaigning on land tax for two years and coming out with, 'Look, it is very difficult to come out with a policy; we will just give you a costing.' Fantastic! Poor old Joe Scalzi was running around the Italian community telling them, 'Don't worry, we'll fix it; I'll tell you exactly how

much you are going to save.' And when the policy came out, who was happy? We were. Who was upset? Only one person—Joe Scalzi, because he knew immediately what it meant. He knew exactly what it meant.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: And he was the only one who knew what it meant.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly. He could not write to a single constituent and tell them how much they would save on their house. Why? Because Rob Lucas is lazy. And long may he be lazy, long may he be costing your policies, and long may he be in that big fat white car in the upper house keeping all you young guns out of leadership positions. I will tell you what we do not want. We do not want David Ridgway, or Michelle Lensink or Terry Stephens. We want Rob Lucas to stay right where he is, and I will tell you why: it is because, while he is there, we keep winning.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I start by congratulating you on your elevation to the office of Deputy Speaker. I also put on the record my congratulations to the Speaker, a Heysen lad who has made good, and I am sure he will preside over us—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: His parents lived down the road. He will preside over us, I am sure, with great grace and care in the job that he will do.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How did Aldgate vote?

Mrs REDMOND: You tell me, Mr Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Labor, actually. And Bridgewater, and Macclesfield.

Mrs REDMOND: Can I say first of all, what a privilege and a pleasure it is to be here again, and I note that I am here with a reduced majority on my first attempt. I think the seat of Heysen is a wonderful seat to serve. It now runs roughly from Basket Range down onto the Fleurieu Peninsula to Mount Compass, and from Clarendon to the outskirts of Mount Barker. It encompasses close to 1 000 square kilometres. It is a beautiful electorate, and one of the nice things about representing that electorate is that there are many little separate communities and each community has its own character. It has been a great privilege and pleasure to become involved in all those communities as the member for Heysen over the last four years.

To give members a bit of the flavour of what I am talking about, I refer back to the time of the tsunami. Of course, many people right around the country became involved in all sorts of fundraising, and the Australian ability to give, in the circumstances that we saw confronting the people who were affected by the tsunami, was extraordinary. In my particular electorate each little community did different things. At Echunga they had a supper and someone come to talk about the tsunami and how it was being dealt with in Sri Lanka. It was a wonderful supper, as it always is at the Echunga Hall. You cannot get out for about three weeks because they make so many home-cooked things, and it is a great place to visit.

At Kangarilla they held a rock concert and all the oldies got out their old rock-and-roll gear and all sorts of people got out their stuff. There were jazz players and all sorts of people, and we had a wonderful concert there. At Flaxley they held an afternoon of table tennis and tennis at the hall with afternoon tea included. Aldgate, not surprisingly, had a cocktail party and an auction. Every little community throughout the electorate had its own way of contributing. It was interesting to see how the different communities

approached the thing quite differently because, as I said, they all have their own personalities. Largely, I deal with communities that have generations of people, so it is lovely to visit and get to know them because many of them have been there for a long time and can tell you a lot of the history of the place. They are attached to the area and are wonderful, community-minded folk and, as I say, it is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to serve those people.

I want to talk about a couple of things. First, I want to thank those who voted for me. I recognise that not everyone voted for me, but enough voted for me that I have been returned to the seat of Heysen, and I simply will work doubly hard in the next four years to see if I can make it less marginal. As I said earlier, though, I do not believe that any seat is safe. I think that these days all seats are marginal and should always be considered as such, and I think that any member who does not take that view risks a great deal.

As other people have said, no-one gets here by themselves. I am very conscious of the efforts of an enormous number of people. I do not intend to name them, except to express in particular my gratitude to my campaign manager, Tony Wiedemann, and to my two staff members, Gaynor—who has been with me since I was in legal practice and who came into the political arena with me, not knowing anything about it and having a huge learning curve, just as I did—and Nick, the other assistant in my office. They have been a huge support to me. Really, as is the case with all of us, I am sure, they run our life, and without them we would really struggle. There are numerous other people but, as I have said, I do not intend to name them—the campaign committee, the members of the State Electoral Committee, all of the people who got out and helped put up signs and handed out 'how to vote' pamphlets, and all the people who contributed financially to the campaign—to all of those people, I owe a deep debt of gratitude.

I for one will miss many of the people who served in the previous parliament. Of course, this is my first return to a parliament, so until now I have known only the people of that previous parliament. It is a bit like being in your first year at high school, and then moving up to second year and finding that a new lot have come in. I welcome all our new members on both sides of the house, but I also want to express the fact that I will miss those who have not returned. Some of them chose to go of their own volition and others have unfortunately lost their seat in spite of wanting to return. I take to heart the message that I think the member for West Torrens gave about contacting those people to let them know that they are not forgotten. I think that is a sound piece of advice.

One member I do want to mention in particular in this address tonight is Dorothy Kotz, who was, of course, the member for Newland for a number of years. Many people may not realise that the member for Newland, who so recently finished in this place, was the longest serving female member of the House of Assembly in this parliament. She holds that record on the basis that her period of service was 16 years, three months and 21 days. The next longest serving is Jennifer Cashmore, who held office for 16 years, two months and 23 days, which is only a matter of a few days less. However, the member for Newland did leave this place as the longest serving female member of the House of Assembly we have yet seen. I note that the member for Flinders is the next person likely to reach that milestone.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Should she get re-elected.

Mrs REDMOND: At the date of the counting of this record, she was already up to 12 years, three months and

seven days. So, presuming that we add four years on to that figure, that would get her very close indeed to reaching the member for Newland's record. It is indeed possible, as the Attorney suggests, that the member for Flinders could lose her 27 per cent margin, but I would expect that, if the member for Flinders wants to return to this place at the next election, she will have no difficulty in doing so.

Another thing I wanted to note about the contribution made by the member for Newland, though, is that she was also the second longest ever serving minister for Aboriginal affairs in this parliament. I understand that Greg Crafter served for seven years, but Dorothy Kotz, having served as minister for five years, is in fact the second longest serving male or female minister for Aboriginal affairs. It was an area with which she dealt with a great deal of passion and compassion in the manner with which she dealt with the issues which arose in that portfolio. She had a great love of the work and of the people she dealt with, and I am sure that she will be sorely missed.

Lastly, just before I move on from the contribution made by the member for Newland, I do not know whether anyone else managed to see Andrew Denton's program last night, but there was a very interesting interview with John Anderson. I cannot remember the fourth—and maybe the Attorney can help me—but John Anderson mentioned that there was a rule about the four 'D's by which one could leave office. I remember that they were disgrace, defeat and death, and I cannot think of the other one that John Anderson used. The word that I think applies to Dorothy is 'decision', because she is one of the lucky people who came into this place who managed to leave at the time of her own choosing. Some of us may or may not have that wonderful luxury. Many people come into this place and do not stay for as long as they wish to do so. As I said, Dorothy was the longest serving female who has been here, and she did a good job. I think she will be sorely missed.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What about the member for Unley? He deserves some accolades.

Mrs REDMOND: I will give accolades to the member for Unley on another occasion. I want to get on with a couple of matters that I hope to talk about in this Address in Reply. I note that the speech of Her Excellency referred to some environmental aims. There is one particular area of the environment that I want to address tonight, and that is the issue of water prescription. In my experience, what this government has done for the most part, in most of its pronouncements over the past four years, is to deal a lot with rhetoric, with headline grabbing and with using warm, fuzzy names for various pieces of legislation. Who could oppose something called 'sustainable development'? By its very nature, one wants to go along with that—and natural resources management, and so on.

The issue of water prescription is of keen interest in my electorate. For those members who may not be aware, what happened is that a couple of years ago the minister for environment gave notice of his intention to prescribe the eastern Mount Lofty Ranges and then, a year later, gave notice of his intention to prescribe the western Mount Lofty Ranges. There are a number of issues that I want to address in that regard.

Essentially, this policy that has been pursued is largely undermining our rural communities by stealth. There is no doubt that, in this state—the driest state in the driest inhabited continent—there is a perception—a correct perception, in my view—that water is a scarce and precious resource and it

must be managed. I have no difficulty with that basic idea. However, the nature of the prescription with respect to the Mount Lofty Ranges defies any reason or logic. It was done by the minister, but at the behest of the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation. It now gets to control the use of water in the Hills—and other places, of course. However, in the Hills, in particular, this can be a great problem.

The department has been unable to give any evidence whatsoever to justify this assertion that we need to prescribe and control water use in the Hills. By way of example, many people have gone to the public meetings that I have attended and, inevitably, the question is asked: what is the scientific basis for this happening in the first place? Where is the evidence that we need to do anything about prescribing water? The representatives of the department never give an answer. The department calls these meetings 'consultations', but it has a very different view about what consultation constitutes from my view of it. Consultation, to me, is a two-way process where the representatives of the department might listen to something that is being said by the people who are at the meeting. However, that is not the case. They come with their predetermined agenda and their predetermined arrangements for what will happen, and no amount of logic, no amount of requesting information, no amount of questioning, no amount of discussion and no amount of anything that any member of the public does will sway these people from this predetermined agenda that they will control the whole of the water use in the Mount Lofty Ranges.

So, that is the first problem with this prescription: the department is not even having consultations. Department representatives call it public consultation, but I attended a meeting at the Mount Barker Golf Club and, not only did they not listen to anything that was said but also they had predetermined what was to be written on the pieces of paper that were the so-called feedback sheets—the butcher's paper that was used by the numerous public servants who were there—to write down the responses. However, they wrote down responses that were different from the things that had been said by the various discussion groups. They simply wrote down what they wanted the findings to be. They have never been able to justify the position they want to take.

Not only do they have no way of justifying anything they want to do but they have done a fundamental shift in thinking, and it is this. I have no difficulty with the idea that I cannot stop the flow of water down a stream and stop my neighbour downstream from getting water. I have no difficulty with the idea that I cannot take water from under the ground and deplete the underground reserves. However, I think that there has been a quantum shift when you say that I have no right to receive the water that falls from the heavens above onto my property and do what I want with it when it lands. There is the fundamental quantum shift. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

STANDING COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of standing committees.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 3 May
at 2 p.m.