

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 April 2000

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Such:

That the Social Development Committee investigate and make recommendations to the parliament in relation to the rapidly expanding area of biotechnology in the context of its likely social impact on South Australians.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 206.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Members would be aware that the member for Fisher has been very interested in this issue, namely, asking that the Social Development Committee investigate and make recommendations to the parliament in relation to the rapidly expanding area of biotechnology and its likely impact on South Australians. This has been on the Notice Paper for some weeks now. I know that the member for Fisher is very keen that this matter be referred to the committee. I am the first to admit that I am not an expert in the area of biotechnology. From that point of view, therefore, I believe it is very important for this House to deal with this matter here and now, and I would hope that it would receive support from both sides of the House, so at least we as members can be brought more up to date as a result of a committee report in due course on the possible effects of biotechnology on South Australians. I urge all members to support this motion.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I would also like to speak briefly to this motion. The matter of biotechnology and genetically modified organisms has reared its head recently in the South-East with regard to genetically modified crops being grown and whether or not the standards of growing and disposal of material from those crops have been adhered to. Throughout my electorate, quite a few local government authorities have moved motions in an attempt to stop experimentation in respect of genetically modified crops and plant material within their local government area. I doubt whether they have the authority to do that.

This is a vexing question. I, personally, have collected a considerable amount of material setting out the pros and cons of moving into this technology. I have noted over the airwaves and in the popular press that there is a lot of ignorance and comment based on very little science. So, I think it is important that this committee thoroughly investigates this issue and pulls together some of the facts and publishes a report based on fact rather than emotion and hearsay. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): It was not my intention to speak at this stage, but I think it important that I follow up the comments of the member for MacKillop, particularly as I attended the public meeting in Mount Gambier on Monday night of this week. The meeting was not about emotion; it was actually about fact. The difficulty which came to the attention of that public meeting and which has come to the attention of the press since is that GMAC is not policing the requirements in terms of isolating the growing of genetically modified crops. The House will appreciate that a company

that is conducting trials in genetically modified crops is not required to reveal what genes they are dealing with. Therefore, as with animal health issues, one should think the worst.

If we have companies dealing particularly with glyphosate resistant genes, sometimes called in the marketplace Roundup Ready, there is the potential for those genes to escape into the wider gene pool because there are a number of species that are closely related to canola that are grown in the proximity of many of these trials. One of the conditions under which companies are allowed to grow these genetically modified crops is that there must be strict adherence to a 400 metre exclusion zone.

At last Monday night's public meeting in Mount Gambier there was clear evidence that this exclusion zone is not being managed. There was one landholder within 60 metres of one of these crops who did not know anything about it. He had not even been advised that the crop was being grown let alone whether the 400 metre exclusion zone which involved his property was being properly policed.

I asked a representative of GMAC last Monday night what the commonwealth was doing about the company's responsibilities in relation to policing these zones. His answer was, 'We're doing as much as we can with the resources we have'—a totally inappropriate answer. Either you do this properly or you do not do it at all. Gene jumping is a serious problem which we must face up to. Once it occurs, it can never be withdrawn. Once those genes escape into the wild weed population, we will have this problem for all time. If it ever happens that a glyphosate resistant gene escapes from canola into some related brassica weeds, we will have removed from our armoury one of the main tools used to control those weeds.

So, to some degree I think it is a pity that the member for MacKillop was not at last Monday night's public meeting because it was not about alarm but actually about fact. There is concern, and there is reason to be concerned. I support the action of the District Council of Grant which has now written to GMAC asking what policing it has done of the 20-odd GMO crops that have been grown in the South-East over the past three years and how many of them were visited and on how many occasions.

I am fearful that the answer will be: 'Very few of them, and not very often', which means that the agency responsible for protecting us in this matter is not doing its job. This is of serious concern. I will bring back to this House the answer that I receive from GMAC and, at that stage, I think we will express concern to the commonwealth government about the fact that it is not truly policing quarantine requirements under its regulations relating to the growing of genetically modified crops.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I rise to speak briefly in support of the motion. It is a credit to the member for Fisher that he has brought this motion before the House. Obviously, biotechnology is a rapidly expanding and developing area and one that will have a significant impact on society. To me, the most important principle at stake is the extent to which governments should be involved in regulating the practices that have already begun to take place, even in our own industries. Whether it be on farms or elsewhere in relation to plants, animals, or whatever, the government needs to keep a very tight check on what is being done; and, of course, that means first deciding what the limits should be.

It is entirely appropriate that the Social Development Committee take some evidence on the current state of

biotechnology and what the impacts might be because they are potentially as dangerous and significant as was the development of chemical weapons in warfare 80 or 90 years ago. We are dealing with a very serious issue. As I say, it is a credit to the member for Fisher that he has brought the matter before the parliament; and it is not a moment too soon.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I, too, commend the member for Fisher for moving this motion. It is quite evident from the comments of the members for Gordon and Mitchell that there is much support in the House for this motion. Like many things, technology has moved at a greater pace than the ability of legislation to come to terms with it. It is very appropriate that the Social Development Committee look at this issue. Constituents have expressed concerns to me at the rapid change in technology in this area.

The member for Gordon talked about gene jumping, which, as he sees it, can be a problem in the agricultural area. Broad cross-sections of the community have expressed to me concerns about the general use of gene technology in terms of health and how technology can affect disease, as well as being concerned about the legal ramifications of this type of technology.

I commend the member for Fisher for moving the motion. I am sure that it will be very beneficial in terms of increasing knowledge with respect to this important area with which we are faced. As a member of the Social Development Committee, I look forward to hearing the evidence on this issue. I am sure that the member for Gordon will have ample opportunity to put his submissions and concerns to the Social Development Committee, as will all other members. I will not speak at length on this issue. It is important that the House support the motion, and we should get on with it as there is not much time to look at these issues.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I, too, support the motion and welcome the matter going before the Social Development Committee. I point out that the committee will need to ensure that it gets a balance in terms of the arguments that are presented, because this is quite an emotional topic. Biotechnology is much broader than just genetically-modified crops. If biotechnology is handled properly and if it is not sent off the rails by some of the emotional debate occurring with GM foods, the benefits are enormous. One of the real problems we in Australia face with genetically modified foods is that the debate is going somewhat off the rails. Some of the claims that were made in the last week bring us back to the point that Europe was at about 12 or 18 months ago when the debate went off the rails there. It is important that the debate be totally balanced. We need a warts and all approach with education so that people actually understand what we are dealing with.

For instance, I heard an interview on ABC radio yesterday morning. I am not too sure how they decided to play it, but it concerned a so-called agricultural consultant from America who said that genetic food was like nuclear weapons having sex and reproducing, that it was all about putting pig genes into tomatoes, and that the reason politicians support it is that they receive a large amount of money from industry to do so. A large number of unsubstantiated claims were made. It was a bit worrying to hear that sort of thing without the opportunity for a balanced view to be put. I welcome the committee taking on this issue. I think it will be an enormous task. It will not require just a couple of meetings: it will really test the committee's patience in terms of the number of people who

might want to give evidence. It is important that we get it right.

Biotechnology is very broad. There are some enormous health and industry implications and opportunities. Some real environmental answers can come out of biotechnology. I welcome the reference to the committee and hope that we do have a very balanced debate, because unfortunately in Australia at the moment the federal government has been slow and we have not seen a balanced debate on these issues. I hope that the Social Development Committee can make a positive contribution to that debate.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I speak in favour of this motion and commend the member for Fisher for moving it. I believe that the best place for considering issues on which there is a great public debate is a parliamentary committee. I commend the honourable member for moving the motion and wonder why others did not think of it earlier. I believe that genetically modified foods (GMOs) are the way of the future, but I do have some reservations. We have been carrying out plant breeding programs for decades and, as a grain grower, I am very aware of the advantages that modern technology has created for the food growers of our country and, indeed, our world.

Many of the varieties of wheat, barley and canola that we see today were not around when I first started farming, but now we have varieties that give us stronger, better performing crops that are better suited to our relatively dry climate here in South Australia. I understand that biotechnology or gene technology just speeds up that breeding process. Instead of waiting years for a viable new strain to be developed, we are able to do it much more quickly with gene technology. Everything in life has its benefits and, as we all know, its risks. Gene technology is no exception, and much has been said, particularly in the UK and Europe, about the possible risk. But there is little actual evidence so far from scientific studies to support the risk argument.

It is sad to see what has happened in the UK and Europe, particularly with emotions being stirred up, mainly in relation to the mad cow disease, which has nothing to do with gene technology. Certainly, it has put the fear of God right through all these countries, and this argument has got way out of hand. Emotion has got in the way of commonsense and the facts. I shall give an example of the benefits of GMOs. Cotton is one of the many crops being genetically modified or made transgenic to make it insect resistant, so reducing the need to spread large amounts of insecticide. This has resulted in Australian cotton growers being able to reduce their use of pesticides by 50 per cent, with obvious possible environmental impacts, particularly to us in South Australia, because a lot of the pollutants in the Murray come from the cotton and rice growers upstream.

The worst of that is the pesticide, so we have to work on this. This is a natural insecticide that has been placed in a genetically engineered cotton plant and is not produced in the cotton seed, so it cannot enter the food chain or be washed out of the plant's leaves into the soil or waterways in any way. I hope that the same technology can be used in our legume crops in the future and also in our grain crops, to allow farmers to use less weed spray.

I have used these: we know that some of them are not very environmentally friendly and could be said to be dangerous, particularly the more difficult chemicals such as Reglone, which is made up of paraquat and diquat, which are pretty dangerous chemicals—not to speak of the insecticides we

use, particularly on peas to get rid of pea weevils. There is a time when you have to spray this, and you are not allowed to reap the crop until a certain time after spraying. We know that this is not always the case and that people do reap their crop a bit early, and the residues of this chemical may or may not be present.

Anything we can do to eliminate any of these risks far outweighs the risks that we may see from these GMOs. But it is an unknown area, and that is why this is such an excellent motion. Work is also being done on glyphosate resistance in many cereal crops, particularly barley and wheat. I welcome that, because glyphosate is one of the more friendly chemicals, if there is such a thing, and will take away the use of many of the herbicides that we use that build up in the soil.

We have several of those and, as we have been using farm chemicals for only a relatively short time in this country, we do not know what will be the effect over a 50 year period of using chemicals that leave residues in the soil. We do not know the long-term outcome of that, so there is more than one unknown in this: there are a lot of unknowns, so we have to explore all these things with an open mind.

There are many medical benefits in the field of gene technology. Scientists can now locate and study genes that cause genetic diseases and those making some individuals prone to cardiovascular diseases, degenerative brain disorders such as Alzheimer's Disease and motor neurone disease, certain forms of cancer and diabetes, and other immune disorders, such as rheumatoid arthritis. There has been a host of precise new tests for rapid diagnosis of infectious diseases in humans and livestock, and scientists are making promising progress towards understanding two of the world's biggest killers, the malaria parasite and the AIDS virus, and developing vaccines to prevent them.

We can see that the proper application of biotechnology and gene technology has an enormous role to play in our future. There are some capabilities of this technology that I am against; one is the capacity to take genes from, say, a fish and put them into a tomato or strawberry for certain benefits. There is also the issue of human and animal cloning. We have seen Dolly the cloned sheep and evidenced the resultant problems that animals have suffered.

I know that this is on the outer edges of technology, but we do have the capability to perform these transgenic functions from like and unlike species. This form of gene technology is immoral and very unethical, and we are actually trying to play God.

Another matter that I would like to raise on an allied issue, which is a favourite subject of mine from a long way back, is the irradiation of certain foods, which is killing particularly lethal bacteria such as salmonella and other dangerous bugs in foodstuff. Some sections of the community are against this and have kept this technology out in many areas, but perhaps we would not have had the Garibaldi tragedy if we did irradiate foodstuffs.

I would also like to state that if we irradiated the imported pilchards we are feeding to tuna, raw pilchards from overseas going straight over the side, perhaps we would not have had the death event that we had with all the pilchards that we saw the year before last.

In conclusion, I support the motion. We need more research into this issue and I believe that the federal government should coordinate the whole issue of GMOs so that we have uniformity across the states. This is a high priority, a matter for R&D across both agriculture and medicine, and I

know that the Deputy Premier (as he has just said) has been lobbying our federal colleagues to lead the way on this groundbreaking issue. I know there has been much hype about this subject, and I only hope that this motion will help quell the hype somewhat so that we can discuss it in the calm confines of the committee and achieve a proper reasoned assessment. I commend the member for Fisher for this motion and I certainly support and congratulate him.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I thank members for their positive contribution. This is a very important area for consideration and it does provide an opportunity for calm, rational consideration of all the aspects involved. It allows the community and experts to have a say and input. We need guidelines not only in relation to aspects covering human developments in biotechnology but also in relation to non-human aspects, agriculture being just one example. The biotechnology revolution will be a lot bigger and more far reaching than the agricultural revolution which saw the domestication of animals and the production and use of grains on a wide basis. It will be bigger and more far reaching than the industrial revolution and, indeed, I believe even bigger and more significant than the IT revolution.

One area which will not be picked up under this reference but which is also emerging as very significant—and South Australia is one of the leading areas—is nanotechnology, that is, micro-engineering with small particles. The community is generally unaware of the social and other implications of some of the technology that is emerging. The Social Development Committee, in terms of examining biotechnology and then, hopefully, in the future looking at the implications of nanotechnology, will make a positive contribution to the advancement of knowledge and the welfare of the people of this state. I thank members, once again, and I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

YOUTH AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Ms KEY (Hanson): I move:

That this House—

(a) calls on the Minister for Youth to immediately release the unedited version of the Review of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia completed in April 1999;

(b) condemns the minister's handling of the relationship between his ministry and the state's recognised youth affairs peak body; and

(c) calls on the government to end the uncertainty of YACSA's funding beyond 30 June 2000 and to deliver on the government's election promise to provide ongoing core funding to the council by approving a renewed triennial funding agreement without further delay.

I am very concerned to report that my advice as at yesterday was that the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, a peak body that is recognised throughout Australia as being an advocate and good lobby forum for youth, still does not know whether it has funding beyond 30 June this year. I am also concerned that the Liberal Party policy of providing triennial funding to this body has not been confirmed and that the organisation, as I understand it, along with a number of other community organisations in the building where the Youth Affairs Council is housed, is wondering whether it will be able to pay its rent and in fact keep up its tenancy in that building. Although Minister Brindal has released his review report to the House, he has not released the report publicly. This was a commitment that Minister Brindal had made to the

House, and I am concerned that he has not honoured that commitment.

When one reads the review report (which I had the opportunity to do when it was finally released in parliament), one will see that there is not a single reference to the over 80 written submissions received from the community to the review panel, and there is no listing of the submissions. After reading the submissions that I have been able to read, my understanding is that, of the 80 organisations mentioned, only two are even slightly negative about the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia. The sort of submissions that were received range from some 26 organisations in the youth sector, some 25 broader community services, a number of members of parliament, both commonwealth and state (including me) and local government. Four councils put forward their views on the Youth Affairs Council, seven individuals and government departments, including the commonwealth Department of Family Services, the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs in the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of Human Services. Here we are in April, almost a year after the review was brought down, and there is no action. Another of my concerns is that the review suggested triennial funding. In the review it was stated that it was necessary for a peak body, particularly in the youth sector, to have some sort of stability in the work that it does.

I was the chairperson of the Ministerial Advisory Committee for Youth in this state in the early 1990s (which is quite a while ago) and I had the opportunity to work with the Youth Affairs Council and its previous chair, Mr Paul Turley. Although Minister Brindal may say that he has come under pressure from this organisation, I can tell honourable members that the Hon. Mr Rann, who was the minister at the time, also came under pressure. I think that any minister (I think that this Liberal government has had some five youth ministers in a short period of time—some five years, I believe—as well as the Labor youth ministers) would have found that the Youth Affairs Council does not show fear or favour to any political party. If they believed that the Labor government was doing the wrong thing, they certainly made it clear: if they believe that the Liberal government is doing the wrong thing, they also make it clear. So, having had the opportunity of being the chair of a state peak body looking at youth matters, I can assure the House that it is certainly my experience that it did not take the gloves off because we had a Labor government—quite the contrary. My predecessors, as shadow ministers in the youth affairs area, would also support what I am saying: that this organisation is fearless in its advocacy for young people.

I commend the people who give up their time to form part of the peak body. There are a number of organisations that make up that peak body and look at the direction of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia. I think that, in this instance, they have been dealt with harshly and I think that it is most unfair that an organisation that does deliver for young people in this state still does not know whether it has any money or whether it can continue to rent its current premises, because the government has not bothered to confirm its funding one way or another. As I said earlier, this is despite the Liberal Party's platform that it would provide triennial funding to the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia.

In the time available, I will provide a response on behalf of the Youth Affairs Council to the review that has taken place so that the members of the peak body have an oppor-

tunity to comment on some of the issues raised. I emphasise the point that 99 per cent of the submissions spoke very favourably of the Youth Affairs Council. I will read into *Hansard* as much as I can of some of the comments provided to me, as follows:

YACSA (the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia) has cooperated fully with the review of the council's funding and accountability arrangements announced by youth minister, the Hon. Mark Brindal, on 30 December 1998.

Despite our serious and ongoing reservations about the propriety of the review process, the council has extended the three person review committee every courtesy and full access to all relevant documents necessary to examine YACSA's funding and accountability credentials as the peak body for youth affairs in South Australia.

The review was originally scheduled to report to the minister by 28 February 1999. In fact, the work was not completed until the final week of April 1999, some two months late.

Executive support to the review committee was to be provided by YouthSA, YACSA's funding body. In February, this was changed to an arrangement with Employment SA, no doubt causing some delay in getting the review under way.

The final report document was forwarded to YACSA at 4.30 p.m. on 29 April 1999. The report is disappointing in its level of understanding of the Youth Affairs Council and confused in its analysis of issues under review. For undisclosed reasons, substantial sections of the report have been censored by the Minister for Youth. There is no information in the report on the review committee, its membership, background or relevant review expertise. Neither are the two state government departments involved in providing executive support identified anywhere in the text.

The report fails to note the extent of YACSA's workload across the government and in the community, and the extremely modest staff resources (3.5 full-time equivalents) available to the council to meet the responsibility. Literally dozens of submissions to the review committee have congratulated YACSA on its energetic leadership of youth affairs in the non-government sector and called for an appropriate increase in funding to keep pace with those responsibilities. The review report has largely ignored this body of evidence. Ironically, the review has begun to identify major areas of concern in the administration of youth affairs within the youth portfolio itself.

YACSA welcomes the report's main finding that the triennial core funding should be restored by the state government to YACSA as the recognised peak body for youth affairs in South Australia.

- Review Report Analysis: page 1:1 Introduction.
- YACSA represents young people and the youth sector at state and national level.
 - Despite mention of the South Australian government's commitment to YACSA, there is no mention of the current government policy which reads: *Continue support for the community youth sector by providing core funding to the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia*. This is a serious omission of fact.
 - Statements about no previous review of YACSA are inaccurate. A major review of the organisation was conducted by the state government in 1987.
- Page 2: 1.2 Terms of Reference.
- The report makes no mention of the review committee's decision to call for public submissions on YACSA's Objects of Constitution and how these relate to the terms of reference through funding and accountability. This should be explained.
- Page 2: 1.3 Methodology.
- The methodology section is thin, and provides no insight into how some 80 written submissions and 20 face-to-face consultations were sifted, analysed and compared with regard to the review terms of reference.
 - No mention is made of the 80 written submissions sent to the review committee as critical evidence for the process of the review. They have not been listed as an appendix to acknowledge the contributions made from the community.
- Page 3:
- Useful comparisons were made with a range of peak bodies in South Australia and interstate regarding the funding models/funding arrangements which should be considered alongside the YACSA model. The committee is to be commended for its thoroughness on this issue.
 - YACSA's considerable input to the review is noted in a single line, *vis-a-vis*, *Several meetings were held with representatives of YACSA*.

This reference underplays YACSA's efforts to assist the review committee. Our representatives' names should have been noted along with the number of meetings—

I believe there were three—

and the preparation of an extensive information document, *About YACSA*, which provided full details of the council's funding and accountability arrangements.

This should have also been included in the list of readings, perhaps in appendix B.

With regard to page 5:2 of the executive summary, the opening paragraph asserts that restraint in government spending in the community sector is encouraging a more vocal advocacy role by YACSA. This statement misunderstands the complexity of youth affairs and oversimplifies YACSA's advocacy role. Advocacy is not just about cuts in government spending. The committee has obviously overlooked much of YACSA's proactive work such as the young parliamentarians proposal and the state budget submission, both currently in the public domain.

The statement about the level of funding to YACSA (which is relevant in the terms of reference) is quite bizarre. It says:

We recommend simply that YACSA's funding level be set to ensure the most equitable allocation of funds in the sector.

What does this mean? Do we now need a complete review of funding across all services in the sector in order to determine whether YACSA's \$135 000 per annum is enough? That is a nonsense proposition. In our view, the review committee has fudged this key question about the level of funding to YACSA and ignored an overwhelming number of submissions from the sector and the public which call for more funding. Is this a fair and balanced recommendation? We think not.

The review committee has obviously spent considerable time comparing over funding models and arrangements with YACSA. Essentially, they are saying that YACSA's current model works well and is industry best practice. This is a commonsense conclusion. Because of the lack of time, I will ask my colleagues whether they can assist me in making available to the parliament and the public YACSA's response to their review. I would like to close by saying that this matter needs to be finalised. The minister needs to get his act together, and he needs to assure this House that he is committed to supporting YACSA, as he says in private and in this House, by ensuring that its ongoing core funding is finalised and that he works on his relationship with the peak body for youth affairs in South Australia.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am happy to support this motion. Essentially, what has happened is that the youth minister wanted to have YACSA closed down, so he initiated this review. However, despite the original intentions, the recommendations of the review do not seem to justify the minister's wishes. The next obvious step is to restore triennial funding and reassure the future of YACSA. The best way I can contribute to the debate is to read for the record a continuation of the response of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia to the review itself, as follows:

- The discussion about strong sector support for YACSA as the youth peak body is welcome. Mention of the council's broad representative base of members and its investment in youth participation is important. Those conclusions must put to rest any question about YACSA's credentials as the peak body for youth affairs in South Australia.
- The discussion about YACSA's relationship with multicultural organisations is misleading and unbalanced. Throughout the

report, the review committee has drawn upon the submission from a single group of multicultural organisations. The only submission quoted from in the report is the critical comment made by this multicultural group. Their submission has been repudiated by some of their own members and rebutted by written evidence from several other multicultural and peak organisations.

- The charge that YACSA is 'deficient' in its representation of non-English speaking background youth (recommendation three, page eight) is unsubstantiated, and has been repeated in the report to the point of vexation. A more constructive approach to dealing with any perceived shortcoming on YACSA's part would have been for the multicultural organisation to discuss its own youth policy with YACSA, and to propose realistic strategies for addressing any outstanding problems in the representation of multicultural youth issues.
- The statement that YACSA is 'often in conflict with government' (whilst acknowledging that this is a legitimate function of a peak! [body]) is incorrect. YACSA is, in fact, quite seldom in conflict with government, despite some perceptions to the contrary. The statement overlooks the fact that YACSA most often works cooperatively with government ministers, departments and officers on a wide range of matters. Report recommendation three on a (further!) review of YACSA's working relationship with all state government departments is partly based on this misconception. It is also impractical and totally unnecessary.
- The statement that: 'annual performance agreements provide an opportunity for government to negotiate with YACSA to identify priority areas of (its) operation. . . ' is wrong headed and dangerous. Elsewhere in the report, the review committee notes the value YACSA places on its independence. It is, for that reason alone, totally inappropriate that government be permitted to 'identify priority areas of operation' for the council. It is implied that this may even be a condition of funding. The moment government has this level of control over the management committee of the council is the same moment we lose our independence as a peak body. This does not mean, of course, that government cannot ask YACSA to take into consideration its priorities for youth affairs as part of our planning process. That is not unreasonable. Indeed it is desirable and implies a better communication with the ministry than currently exists.
- The section on overlap and inefficiency in arrangements between the two funding departments (Youth SA and Department of Human Services) is nowhere substantiated.
- If current arrangements for accountability are considered effective by both Youth SA and YACSA (no mention of DHS here) as stated, why is there a need for a review every triennium? What form should it take? There is no rationale offered here for the judgments made. Moreover, YACSA's performance was never critically examined during the review. There is no sense of what we actually do reflected in the report.
- The comments about the level of 'political stimulation' generated by the review perhaps reflect more about the review's questionable processes than they do about the youth sector's political motivations.
- The statement that 'criticisms (of YACSA) by government are of concern and need to be addressed as a matter of urgency' is presented without a single supporting statement of evidence or explanation. What criticism? Does this refer to the occasional annoyance with YACSA expressed by some bureaucrats and ministerial minders, or is the criticism something we should take notice of—in which case, what is the substance of the concerns? If we are not told what the problem is specifically, how can we be expected to fix it?
- Parts of this section are well put together and coherently framed [pages 9 to 15]. Mention of the role of peak bodies as part of a healthy democracy is appropriate. However:
 - The notation that: 'Youth SA made it clear that they did not wish to purchase specific services from YACSA' is important. So is the conclusion that: 'Core funding which allows YACSA to address issues across all of those portfolio areas is essential to its effective operation.' It is gratifying to see that YACSA's core funding model is recognised not just as industry best practice but also as the best value for money option for government spending (page 10).
 - The report asserts (page 12) that the performance agreement for the years 1995 to 1998 was used without alteration. This is accurate. However, the assertion on page 23 that the same performance report has been used for those same years is not

correct and conveys a misleading impression about YACSA's level of accountability.

- The section on accountability (page 12) is waffle. This is particularly disappointing, given the council's high standards of accountability to government and to its members. It is also a major weakness in a report that was supposed to be focused on the terms of reference.
- The section on the funding level (page 13) is irrelevant to the terms of reference. At issue is YACSA's level of funding—not funding to services across the sector, however welcome such a recommendation is. Our impression is that all the submissions calling for more funding for YACSA have been disingenuously diverted into a generic call for more funding for the whole sector. And so there should. However, the issue of the inadequacy of current funding to YACSA is glossed over and ignored here. . .
- This section [4.2] is somewhat misleading, given the demonstrable lack of understanding in the report about the complexity of YACSA's role and how YACSA goes about meeting its responsibilities with extremely limited resources.
- Again the issue of YACSA's much identified deficiency, representation of multicultural youth issues, is raised. The report notes the lack any NESB representation on YACSA's management committee. This is astounding, given the review committee met with YACSA's multicultural youth task force convenor who sits on the management committee. The passage which notes 'scarce mention of issues facing any NESB youth in YACSA's policy platform' also overlooks the fact that the person who complained about this omission was part of the YACSA management committee which signed off on the policy platform in 1995-96, and again in 1996-97.
- It is interesting to read a report which cites criticism from just two groups in the youth sector in detail, yet overlooks over 70 submissions which praise YACSA's work. Not one of these is quoted on any page of the report.

In conclusion, the YACSA response states:

YACSA welcomes the end of the review and now asks for restoration of triennial funding and a fair hearing to consider our claim for additional youth participation resources. We want to get on with our job of standing up for the interests of young people and the youth sector in South Australia. We are disappointed in what we believe to be a lack of integrity in the review process and the poor quality of the review report. However some of its content may lead to useful outcome for YACSA, and for young people, if the government is prepared to discuss the issues and negotiate outcomes with the peak body in an atmosphere of goodwill.

I conclude the reading of those passages from the YACSA response to the review of YACSA with my own remarks. I reiterate that it is now up to the government to restore triennial funding to YACSA and give YACSA its full support to continue the excellent work it does in speaking up for young people in South Australia.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SPENCER INSTITUTE OF TAFE

Ms BREUER (Giles): I move:

That this House congratulates the management and staff of Spencer Institute of TAFE on winning the Australian National Training Authority's Australian Training Provider of the Year on 11 November 1999 and recognises its outstanding success in best practice achievement in providing vocational education and training to regional South Australia.

I am particularly happy to move this, as I spent some nine years as a lecturer with TAFE at Spencer Institute prior to coming into parliament. I must say it was some of the most rewarding time of my life and probably the best job I have had, including this one. Women's education and preparatory education were the areas I worked in. My long standing belief is that these are essential parts of any TAFE or other education for people looking to get back into the work force. Many schemes are provided for people trying to get back into the

work force, but I always found that preparatory education was the area where people were able to get the confidence and skills to go on to further study, so I am very much in favour of that. In moving this recommendation today I want to put in a word for those areas, because I know there have been some massive funding cuts in the TAFE system, and very often it is in those areas which unfortunately are often seen as 'mickey mouse' areas, but they are an essential part of any TAFE or further education syllabus.

Spencer Institute is one of the most versatile systems in our state and training environments in Australia, and it encompasses over 85 per cent of our state. It has 17 campuses in the electorates of many members here. The members for Stuart, Flinders, Goyder and Frome all have campuses in their electorates, and I am sure they will join me in congratulating Spencer Institute. It also has 22 study centres and works as a client base for more than 60 ethnic groups in that part of the state. It has over 11 000 students studying. I am very aware of the special difficulties that Spencer staff have in running this system because of the travel distances involved for many of the lecturers, who spend much of their time on the road. Having the biggest electorate in the state, I am very aware of the wear and tear on your personal life that is involved in travelling these huge distances. But TAFE staff are committed. They do this, it is part of their job and on behalf of their students they are willing to put in this personal time travelling around.

The 1999 Australian training awards recognised and rewarded best practice and excellent and outstanding achievement in vocational education and training. It was particularly good that Spencer Institute won this, because of our country and regional focus, and I know that many people in our part of the state were able to say, 'That's great; we were able to show people in metropolitan South Australia and cities in other parts of the country that country campuses are able to achieve these results.'

Distance education cannot be done cheaply. I am also concerned about the cuts to the TAFE system, because very often it is the country campuses that miss out. It is expensive to run courses in country regions. For a start, it costs a lot more for travel and for bringing in lecturers if that is required, and telephone bills are huge in country campuses. So, distance education is not cheap. It is a great tribute to the Spencer Institute for winning this prestigious award.

At the weekend, I attended the Isolated Parents and Children's Association conference in Port Lincoln. One of the issues of major concern at that conference was the problems associated with putting children into tertiary education when you live in regional Australia. There are problems enough with secondary education and being able to afford to send your children away to school if necessary because they are not able to access education, particularly high school education, in local areas. However, when the topic of tertiary education was raised, it was found that for many parents it is almost impossible to send their children away. I will take up this issue further at another time, but I want to emphasise to our federal counterparts that there are no real allowances that enable these parents to put their children into tertiary education.

Young people who live in metropolitan cities with a local university are able to get on the bus in the morning and travel to the institution of their choice. All their parents have to pay are their HECS fees and their day-to-day living expenses. However, if country people want to send their children away they have to find accommodation for them and pay for travel

costs when they return home and all the other incidentals associated with children living away from home.

So, this is a difficult issue. People in regional Australia are finding it more and more difficult to put their children into tertiary education. At present, we have the lowest rate in the country of people accessing tertiary education. This is where the Spencer Institute is able to fulfil some of these needs, because it offers many courses which, whilst they are not university courses, people in those regions are able to access. Parents do not have to worry about sending their children to Adelaide. Often they can access a nearby campus, and it is usually cheaper to put their children into accommodation in a country town than in Adelaide. Even if they do leave home, it is much cheaper for them to access a country campus. So, the Spencer Institute fulfils a need for many of these parents, and this is essential to allow young people to get an education in the areas that they want. The Spencer Institute offers courses in many areas in which young people can study.

I am also pleased with the input that the Spencer Institute has into local employment, because there are many lecturers and staff associated with tertiary institutions such as this one. Most of the institute's lecturers are recruited locally: they know the region and its needs, and they are known by the people who attend the campus. That contributes greatly to the local economy. For example, in Whyalla I think well over 100 staff are employed at the Spencer Institute. That is a large number of people working in a community of this size.

The Spencer Institute has also been able to demonstrate that it is able to move with industry. Many certificate courses have been offered through the Spencer Institute that have benefited local communities. One of those, for example, is the mining certificate, which is now offered. This course is essential because of the mining activity taking place in the Spencer region. There have been many finds in the Gawler Craton, and many mining industries will be created in the future. The mining certificate is essential in this area and it has contributed greatly. Many people in Roxby Downs have benefited from this course and have been able to go on to undertake other studies in those areas. Mining is an industry of the future, there are many more mining developments in our region, and this certificate will contribute greatly to the people involved.

9 There are courses offered, for example, through Coober Pedy. One of the great stories I know is that when there was a course offered at Coober Pedy to work with explosives one of the miners there spoke to me about this and said, 'They said we have to do this course on explosives. I have been working with explosives for thirty years and, see, I've still got all my fingers. I do not need to do this course.' That was a local course that was required in that community.

I was very impressed recently when I visited Port Lincoln campus and saw the aquaculture studies that are being undertaken there, because aquaculture is an industry of our future in our part of the state. The Port Lincoln campus caters wonderfully for this particular industry and works at the Marine Centre there in conjunction with Flinders University. That is another industry where Spencer Institute has been able to come to the forefront, develop courses and produce what industry requires. They have been very flexible in this. I know from my time when I was at Spencer Institute and from what I have been told since leaving there that they are always looking for opportunities, they are always looking for what employers are requiring and are able to develop courses and provide a first-class education for the students that are going through there.

I once again want to warmly congratulate Spencer Institute for its achievements. I think it is great for our part of the state, and I can see the member for Stuart over there smiling, and I know that he has an affection for Spencer Institute also and would join with me on this. I want to particularly congratulate Sue Sachs, the director of Spencer Institute, but also the previous director who would have contributed toward this award, Brian Nussey. It changed hands about the same time as they received this award. So I also want to mention him. There are many, many other staff members that could be mentioned but I do not want to go through all those names. All staff that were involved, including management, the lecturers, the administration staff and the support staff involved in the whole institute have worked well together to achieve this award.

Of course we cannot talk about this award without mentioning the students, which of course an institution cannot run without. They also contributed because of their results and their hard work. I remember when I was at Spencer Institute we occasionally used to say how much better the place would run without students. We could do things very efficiently. But of course we would not have had jobs.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BREUER: That is right. The students can be congratulated on the award also. I am pleased to move this motion and I recommend it to the House.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the motion, and I am delighted that the member for Giles has it. It was a wonderful achievement for the Spencer Institute of TAFE to win the Australian National Training Authority's Training Provider of the Year award last year and, of course, the award covers the period through to the year 2000. What a time to win—at the turn of the century. It is something we will remember. I am sure that the institute will capitalise on its achievement and hopefully it will have one win after another.

Whether or not that occurs, Spencer Institute, as the member for Giles said, is a country institute. It covers the largest area in South Australia including Yorke Peninsula and most of my electorate. I congratulate everyone involved with the Spencer Institute of TAFE because that institute has to face enormous obstacles, including the key obstacle of distance. People may not appreciate the fact that people travel from Whyalla through to Port Pirie or Kadina—a distance of many hundreds of kilometres—simply to attend a campus meeting at night. Likewise, people within one campus, such as the Kadina campus, travel many kilometres for sub-meetings as well. The staff is put under enormous strain in having to cover wide areas and various campuses. Despite all these obstacles, this institute has won the award.

I take this opportunity to congratulate a part of the Spencer Institute of TAFE, namely, the Kadina campus, on the new building that was recently opened by the Premier. This new building serves the whole of Yorke Peninsula. The area has campuses at Point Pearce and Yorketown which also benefit, particularly through the many new high-tech methods of undertaking studies. Members might be interested to know that the Kadina campus evolved as a result of formal approaches in 1995, when a deputation was taken to the then minister responsible for TAFE, the Hon. Bob Such, and I was very pleased to be able to lead that deputation.

Certainly, we were not on the list then, but Dr Such indicated that another campus that was scheduled for some new buildings apparently was not ready to proceed. The minister said that if that was the case there was every chance

that Kadina might get on the list, and that is exactly what happened. However, getting on the list does not mean that something will be built. I recall that when the then Premier, the Hon. Dean Brown, visited Yorke Peninsula later in 1995 he asked me, 'What are some of the new developments in the area?' I told the Premier that he could highlight the fact that we would be getting a new campus for our TAFE facilities. At the time the then Premier publicly announced that fact, which helped lock in the development.

Subsequently, a new minister, the Hon. Dorothy Kotz, reinforced that message. Things then seemed to go into limbo for a while, but the current Premier (Hon. John Olsen) reinforced the fact that the college would proceed. I thank the Premier sincerely for all the work that he did to ensure that this campus came to fruition. Recently the Premier had the honour of opening the Kadina TAFE campus in his former home town, and it was a wonderful occasion. I give particular thanks to the former Kadina campus manager, John Woolven, who did a lot of work behind the scenes. That good work has been carried on by the current campus manager, Barry Savva. It has been great to have had some excellent campus managers at Kadina.

I also acknowledge the work done behind the scenes by former members of the campus committee, Leith Larwood and David Boundy. As some members may recall, David Boundy was a former member of the House of Assembly who represented the southern Yorke Peninsula. I was very appreciative of David's help and his emphasis that a new campus at Kadina would encompass the whole of Yorke Peninsula: that it would not just benefit the northern part of the peninsula. That will prove to be the case, and I again thank David very sincerely. I also acknowledge the work of the District Council of the Copper Coast, which has done an enormous amount of work.

In answer to a question I asked in this House earlier this week, the total cost of the development was put at \$5.1 million. I believe that, when one takes into account the contributions of council, the total cost is nearer to \$5.5 million. All those factors augur well for the future. This development forms only part of the total Spencer Institute of TAFE. It is an integral and vital part of the community. As we were touring the new facilities on opening day (and I had been through them several times when they were being constructed) I felt that they reminded me very much of a university site, and I believe that that is the situation: that TAFE is taking on more the role of a university in country areas.

In that respect, I highlight the fact that not only has the institute received this accreditation but also a recent survey revealed that 82 per cent of Spencer Institute graduates were employed after the completion of their course—82 per cent were able to obtain work. I think that speaks volumes for what TAFE, particularly the Spencer Institute, is offering our rural communities. Therefore, all the other TAFE institutes in South Australia will have to work very hard to try to win this award in future years because, with the new Kadina site and with Yorke Peninsula going ahead from strength to strength in TAFE services, we are determined to see this high standard maintained. To all who have been involved—and there are many names I have not mentioned—I say a very sincere 'Thank you' for working towards a better TAFE.

I remember when I first came to the Kadina campus in about 1983 or 1984 that the then chairman was a Mr Alf Russack. In fact, Mr Russack's brother, Mr Keith Russack, was the former member for Goyder. Alf worked tirelessly for

TAFE. In those days in the 1980s our TAFE facilities for Yorke Peninsula were, basically, one building in Kadina. It then managed to get a few temporary buildings, then moved to a new site with, again, temporary buildings and now has the most modern site certainly in South Australia and I believe Australia. I heartily endorse the motion moved by the member for Giles and I, too, offer my congratulations to the Spencer Institute of TAFE.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I warmly congratulate the Spencer Institute and its management of staff for their very fine work generally and particularly for winning this award in November last year. Particular praise goes to the then director, Brian Nussey, under whose stewardship this recognition has occurred. There are some very fine, outstanding people working in that institute, as there are in most institutes of TAFE, on the institute board and on the campus management bodies as well.

I do want to pay a tribute, because those people put in a lot of volunteer hours to make our education system in TAFE work. They do so under extremely and increasingly difficult circumstances, given the massive cuts that this Liberal government has instituted to those institutes; \$20 million has been removed from TAFE over three years. That is a huge amount of money to deprive TAFE institutes of, and they somehow have to continue functioning and offering students courses. I personally know what measures are taken by those institute managers, people on the board and committees to try to make sure that students are not disadvantaged by the severe starvation of funds imposed by this state Liberal government.

My colleague the member for Giles did mention some of the reasons why this is a particularly pleasing award to the Spencer Institute, given its regional nature and the service it gives to those regional and remote areas. The cost, particularly of travel, and the distances that have to be travelled make it very hard for the institute to provide the services and attention to students that it manages to provide. It costs that institute a lot more to provide a service when there is that travel impediment than it does for many other institutes. Rarely is this taken into full account by the bean counters who look at just starving institutes of funds. I pay tribute to those people involved in that institute for managing it the way that they do. Of course, with this government's new direction in TAFE it is becoming more and more difficult to encourage those institutes to compete internationally and with other states.

The disturbing trend is that the institutes are being required to compete with each other. It does not make a lot of sense and is not in the interests of the students or public of South Australia, but that is certainly the direction in which things are heading. Spencer is, perhaps, a little behind the eight ball at the start of that consideration because it does have that cost differential to meet in providing distance education. Having lecturers take so much time to travel makes it difficult to timetable and difficult to fit in the courses that they need to fit in, in order to operate in this government's eyes as an efficient institute.

I sincerely pay tribute to the wonderful effort that that institute makes and to the achievement that it gains for our students. I also was at the Isolated Children's Parents conference on the weekend at Port Lincoln and many of the issues raised at that conference were pertinent not only to further education but also to university education. Some issues arose, questions were asked and dialogue took place with TAFE as to the provision of courses that could benefit

particularly that group of parents, in home tutoring and tuition.

It is a credit both to that association and to TAFE generally that the needs of students are being looked at. Obviously, there is a way to go, but it is important that that dialogue be taking place and that consideration be given to the needs of regional and remote citizens. Again, warm congratulations to the institute, to all involved, and to all who made up the team that was responsible for this award—despite the impediment placed upon them by this minister by his cruel cost cutting.

The Minister for Emergency Services may not be aware that \$20 million was cut from TAFE institutes—not from education generally but from TAFE institutes directly, and we have only a handful of them. A cut of \$20 million over three years is an incredible cost cutting exercise that is hurting TAFE like you would not believe. For the minister not to be aware of that appalls me, because it is impacting on students in this state. Congratulations to Spencer, and recognition and tribute to all those involved not only in Spencer but generally in the provision of excellent TAFE services.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I add my congratulations to the Spencer Institute of TAFE on winning this award. At the time of the announcement I know that they were all extremely thrilled, and I was able to call at the Port Pirie campus for a few Friday afternoon refreshments. It was great to see that they really appreciated the award they had been given. It is an excellent institute: not just a terrific group of people but a great mix of backgrounds of people.

Many were educators, but you also have quite a mix of people who went out to do a trade and worked in other jobs, and they bring an enormous amount of experience and understanding of the workplace back into the institute. The balance of those backgrounds really helps them to understand the needs of employers and employees.

The people in question understand the needs of those industries in the Spencer region. They do a great job of not only getting young people job ready but also making sure that those already in the work force have the opportunity to enhance their skills—and I think they do a terrific job. I will not repeat what other members have said, except to say that the House commends and congratulates everyone—the staff, management and students at Spencer Institute—on doing a fantastic job.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL AND FRINGE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this House—

(a) congratulates the artistic directors, chairs and board members and management on the outstanding success of both the Telstra Adelaide Festival and the Adelaide Fringe; and

(b) thanks both Robyn Archer and Barbara Wolke for their creativity and commitment in presenting challenging and exciting performances and exhibitions.

The Telstra Adelaide Festival 2000 which took place between 3 and 19 March this year was a resounding success and the attendance figures are predicted to be the highest ever recorded. The box office income is also expected to be higher than in 1998. A feature of this festival was the 16 major new commissions and 24 first performances of new work, in addition to 10 international collaborations. Much of this new work was possible due to the state government funding for

new commissions, and I congratulate the Minister for the Arts (Minister Laidlaw) for her concerted effort to secure that funding. The festival also received funding from Australian Major Events in support of *Writing to Vermeer* and the regional program. There were 67 performing arts productions (with 37 exclusive to Adelaide) and 20 visual arts exhibitions and installations across Adelaide.

Shows which were sold out included *Keep up your Standards* (Robyn Archer's final concert); *Mizumachi*; *Ochre and Dust*; Queen's Theatre performances of *Ur/Faust* and 't Barre Land's *Along the Highway*; and the opera *Writing to Vermeer*, which was 98 per cent sold. Other highly popular shows included *Eat your Young* at the Arena Theatre and *Cool Heat, Urban Beat*. There is interest in potential overseas performances of some of the new productions, namely, *The Ecstatic Bible*, *Mizumachi*, and *The Theft of Sita*.

The regional program was the first significant coordinated program of activity in South Australia's country regions. The majority of the events were free and sites extended across the state including the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands, Beachport, Beltana, Burra, Coober Pedy, Keith, Murray Bridge, Penne-shaw, Port Pearce, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, the Riverland and Streaky Bay. The four Plenty events were locally driven celebrations complemented with festival acts and feasts provided by Gay Bilson. This was a fantastic innovation to this festival sponsored by this Liberal government.

The fringe festival was the biggest ever in terms of participating artists, over 5 000, and audience numbers as well, with attendance estimated to be in excess of 850 000. The most popular shows were the comedy program, the Spiegel Tent, with approximately 150 000 people attending in the three week season, and the Big Rig, which had 500 to 1 000 attendances per show. A record number of emerging artists performed in the highly successful *Fresh Bait* program, with an average of 150 attendances per session. The free City Loop bus service was extremely popular with artists and audience members, and just highlights the synergy as a result of the one minister having both transport and arts. The visual arts program was extremely successful, with a record amount of art work sold.

In addition to the enormous program of exhibitions and performances, other events and conferences included the Australian Performing Arts Market, which first came to Adelaide after a successful bid in 1998 and which was a great success. This year, the total number of delegates grew to 330, including more than 120 international delegates. The market has grown in size and reputation as a place in which to do business and as the best place to see the very best of tourable new Australian work.

A second conference was the National Playwrights' Conference, a leading event on the Australian cultural calendar, which came to South Australia for the first time this year. A third event, the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Playwrights' Conference, gave indigenous artists the opportunity to come together—not to mention Writers' Week, which hosted 69 writers, including 22 from overseas, Artists' Week, which involved 270 artists, the Opera Conference and New Moves, a choreographic laboratory, and the opening of the Australian Aboriginal Cultures Gallery.

This Liberal government can be quite proud of the Festival, as can all South Australians. A bold and innovative approach has been applied to festivals under this government. We are building on our strengths. Arts and tourism are developing new synergies. We are building on work by previous governments of both political persuasions to

continue to make an Adelaide Festival of which all Australians can be proud. This Liberal government is now setting the pace in respect of the arts, and I think that the Adelaide Festival Fringe and the Festival of Arts have proven the point. We are making it better each year it occurs, allowing it to grow, and we are demonstrating to the people of South Australia that we have much to be proud of. I implore members of this House to fully support the motion, as I am sure they will, and we look forward to the next Festival in 2002.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I commend the member for Waite for bringing this motion to the House. Certainly, he has outlined the number of performances and attendances at the Festival, and that was very important. I think it is a great time for people here in Adelaide and in South Australia: not only can they enjoy local productions but also very innovative productions from overseas. Many people would not have the opportunity to see some of these major international productions if it were not for the Adelaide Festival of Arts and the Fringe. We can be rightly proud of both Robyn Archer and Barbara Wolke for the excellence that they have brought to these events, and I would like to commend them in their future endeavours (both will be leaving Adelaide) in terms of other productions in which they will be involved.

There have been some criticisms of the Adelaide Festival. One criticism was that many of the productions were very expensive and out of the reach of a lot of people. I could not get to a couple of them, not necessarily because I could not afford to, but it was very difficult to obtain bookings. *Mizumachi* was one performance that I certainly wanted to see but I was not able to do so. However, Mr Conlon and the leader were able to attend, and they enjoyed it very much.

It was great that there were so many free events during both the Festival and the Fringe in which members of the South Australian community were able to participate. I particularly liked the performances at Elder Park, both the opera and the symphony orchestra, where thousands of South Australians of all ages were able to enjoy those performances. It has been wonderful to see the resurgence of the popularity of opera and symphony orchestra performances and their appreciation by the South Australian community. They are no longer thought to be highbrow activities by many people. Certainly before these free performances were available through the Festival, many people whom I knew had never been to see an opera now really do enjoy it.

In addition to both the Festival and the Fringe, another important highlight of this period was Writers' Week. Again that was an opportunity for many people in the South Australian community to listen to and meet international authors of renown, and it was a wonderful time for South Australia. It certainly was good for tourism, and it was a boon for the restaurants and hotels. It was good to see that there are opportunities for people to enjoy themselves in South Australia without having to be petrol heads.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: Not only in Norwood. I commend the member for Waite for his motion, and I am certainly delighted to support it.

Motion carried.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House—

(a) calls on federal and state leaders to make the Murray-Darling Basin a priority matter for the next meeting of the Council of Australian Governments;

(b) requests the federal government and the governments of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria to recognise the environmental and economic imperatives to Australia of cooperating in a national strategy to reverse environmental damage and manage the Murray-Darling Basin in a sustainable way; and

(c) calls on the state government to set an example by taking the toughest action to minimise pollution entering the Murray River in South Australia, by increasing the efficiency in water use, by giving priority to rehabilitation and by sustainable management.

No state relies on the Murray River as much as South Australia, and no state receives poorer quality water from the Murray than our state. Obviously the river is vital to our primary industries, to tourism and also to a secure domestic water supply for Adelaide. In spite of past efforts to reduce salinity and pollutants, the Murray is more degraded than ever, suffering from increased salinity, pollution, erosion, siltation, algal blooms, poor environmental flows, weeds, feral animals and feral fish.

Obviously South Australia is keen to act in a bipartisan way to enforce improved management of the Murray upstream, and the Murray-Darling Basin cap must be enforced, catchment areas must be protected and rejuvenated, salinity levels must be lowered, the use of the Murray as a drain for sewage, stormwater and other pollutants must be stopped or minimised, and irrigation infrastructure must be improved to reduce waste and produce water savings. Whilst we seek national action—and the government does have our bipartisan support in that—we have to make sure that we do everything right on our side of the border, otherwise we will not be taken seriously and we will have a credibility problem. On this score, obviously there is some need for improvement.

On 23 February the *Australian* reported that research carried out by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission showed that over the next 50 years South Australia will put 10 times as much salt into the Murray River than Queensland and twice as much as New South Wales. I hope that report in the *Australian* is not true, because that is what is being used against us interstate. If it is false information being put out by other states, it is imperative that the government and the Minister for Water Resources comes out publicly and says that that information published on 23 February in the *Australian*, the national newspaper, is wrong.

In the early 1990s, Labor acted to cease the discharge of sewage effluent into the Murray River at Murray Bridge and Mannum. All other point and diffuse sources of pollutants must be identified and eradicated. A biological resource assessment of the Murray Mouth estuary prepared in 1996 by the South Australian Research and Development Institute—I understand that the study was funded by the commonwealth government—made 36 recommendations to the South Australian Department of the Environment.

These recommendations dealt with the urgent need to monitor water quality in the Lower Murray and lakes; the need to assess all sources of pollution, including grazing and pasture activities; the need to reduce wetland grazing; and the requirement for new planning management processes. Of course, the other day, the Minister for Water Resources described our concerns about animal manure and fertilisers being returned to the Murray River in South Australia as wild allegations, even though he was contradicted by the Deputy Premier who has responsibility for agriculture.

Labor's claims are supported by facts provided by SA Water and the Lower Murray Irrigation Action Group

which represents the Departments for Primary Industries and Environment, the EPA, SA Water, industry groups and irrigators. It seems that the new rather agitated Minister for Water Resources does not know or does not want to recognise the truth of the matter. A 1996 report, prepared by primary industries for the action group, says that 80 gegalitres—and I will explain to the Minister for Water Resources that 80 gegalitres is 8 000 million litres—of drainage water from irrigation areas, storm water, ground water and water from highland irrigation is returned to the river and carries an annual load of 190 tonnes of nitrogen, 50 tonnes of phosphorus, 100 000 tonnes of salt and bacteria back to the river.

Rehabilitating the Murray River and regenerating native fish populations requires a suite of actions. Carp has become the rabbit of the Murray River and, where it is difficult to distinguish carp-based impacts from human induced impacts, there is no doubt that carp contribute to poor water quality, bank erosion and the loss of native plants and fish.

In this motion, I am actually calling for federal and state leaders to make the Murray Darling Basin a priority matter for the next meeting of the Council of Australian Governments. The Premier rushed in and said, 'That's already been done.' The fact is that we need to see it made the keynote issue—not do what every premier does every Premiers Conference or COAG meeting and rush around saying, 'I've put it on the agenda.' Any premier can put that on the agenda; in fact, Jo Bjelke-Petersen made an art form of it. We want to see a COAG meeting about the Murray River—not have it tagged on the end after they have all congratulated themselves for supporting the GST. We want to see a COAG meeting that is dedicated to the Murray River, and I would like to see that made a keynote at the next COAG meeting.

It is interesting to note that, while I was talking, it was quite clear that the government did not want bipartisanship. It did not want me to accompany the ministers to the Murray Darling Commission hearing—the meeting of ministers. It did not want to see bipartisanship. Of course, the Premier was not going, so we had this kind of spectacle of the three ministers somehow computer enhanced to appear in the guernsey of the state football team. Let me just say to this parliament that the fight over the Murray River is not a game. This is serious business. The river is on a long-term death row. It is vitally important not just environmentally or for our water, which will be not potable if we continue existing practices. We will exceed World Health Organisation guidelines. It is also important for Australia to do something about cleaning up the Murray River for economic reasons. The fact is that \$23 billion of exports rely each year on crops from the Murray Darling Basin.

Of course, about 90 per cent of Australia's irrigated crops come from the Murray Darling Basin. It is in the interests of all states to have the will to do so. We will see meetings trumped up to be historic, because words have been signed. I remember the meetings in 1995; that was supposed to be when the historic decision was made—when all states decided and agreed to sign up to the cap. It was not enforced. Not only has Queensland not even bothered to try, but also it does not even have any monitoring systems in place. Of course, on several rivers New South Wales has failed to agree to that 1995 cap, which was to peg water extraction at 1993-94 levels.

Unless we reach agreement on that as first base, then we are not taking this issue seriously. No amount of posing for pictures in the paper, water-skiing and being dressed up in football guernseys will make one blind bit of difference to

New South Wales, Queensland or Victoria, because people in those states do not read our newspaper. What we need to do is to get some will and we need to work in a cooperative way to explain to the other states that this is in their interest as well as ours, but they will not listen to us while we are getting reports in the *Australian* that we are contributing 10 times as much salt to the Murray River than Queensland and twice as much as New South Wales. It is imperative that, rather than stunts, games or speeches, we see an agreement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that we have members opposite who do not actually want to see anything done about the Murray River. Here we have the member for the emergency services tax—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Police!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—without his fireman's helmet on, who apparently describes himself as the 'commander-in-chief of local emergency services'. Let me say this: they might not regard the Murray River as serious business, but we do. Here we have the member for Mawson, who will go down in history for one thing, three letters, 'EST', stamped on his political coffin, and that will be it. What I would like to see today—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police will remain silent.

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—is an agreement by the government to work with the opposition on this—to work together. The fact that, when I was on radio talking about bipartisanship, a very nervous member for Unley telephoned in, sounding like an agitated high school student, to say that he did not want bipartisanship is a demonstration, in my view, that this government is not serious. If you act in a cooperative way and you are prepared to work in a bipartisan way, then we will get something done on the Murray River. In the meantime, we will look at photo opportunities and songs with the degree of cynicism that they deserve until we actually see a commitment to work together to clean up the Murray River.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I refer to a foreword by Australia's eminent author Colin Thiele—and of course a great South Australian—in which he said:

Water is the most precious commodity on earth. Without it most life on the planet would cease to exist in the proverbial blink of an eye. And it is now glaringly obvious that, precious as it has been in the past, it is going to be infinitely more precious in the future.

He goes on to say:

We must therefore care for the Murray as never before. The fact that most people refer to it as the 'river' says it all. In Australia there is not any other water way that is even remotely comparable, so we need to value it and understand it, even as we continue to use it and enjoy it, hopefully with insight and sensitive appreciation of its character and its vulnerability.

I would like to reply to the leader's call for bipartisanship. Trust needs to be earned. Herodotus, the great historian, said that Egypt is the gift of the Nile. The Murray River is certainly the gift of South Australia, if not Australia. The Leader of the Opposition I hope is not—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Elizabeth asks me how you can relate it to the River Nile. The civilisation of ancient Egypt would not have taken place if it were not for the River Nile. If the honourable member would look into the history

books she would see that the whole civilisation of ancient Egypt was centred around the River Nile. You might think it is drawing a long bow, but the Murray River is just as important to Australia, particularly South Australia, as the River Nile was to ancient Egypt.

Ms Thompson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I hope the member for Reynell is not talking down teachers.

Ms Thompson: I certainly am not!

Mr SCALZI: Good, because teaching is a noble profession, and I would not want it to be reported from this House that she did not appreciate the good work that teachers do in the community. It is heartening that the opposition leader is now taking such a keen interest in the future of the Murray-Darling Basin. It is a shame, however, that this interest was developed so recently, and it shows. You can tell, because at every opportunity he has to mix it up with the GST and other issues. He wants bipartisanship, but he does not stick to the issue.

The opposition leader obviously did not read or chose to ignore a media release from the Premier dated 13 March which clearly indicated that the Prime Minister had advised that he would support the Council of Australian Government discussion of the long term viability of the Murray-Darling river system. Had he read the media release, the opposition leader would have known that the Premier had asked that a COAG meeting be held at the earliest possible opportunity. In fact, that was agreed by the Prime Minister following representations made by the Premier on three occasions last year and in January this year.

The Premier received advice from the Prime Minister that it would be listed as a key item of debate between leaders of the states and commonwealth at the next COAG meeting, well before the opposition leader's motion was tabled in this chamber. Among the issues the Premier has put forward for discussion by COAG are: inefficient uses or water being phased out; a greater investment in catchment land management improvements; changes to water release patterns from regulated rivers and streams to improve river health; a tree planting program in catchment areas—up to 5 billion trees—to control land and water salinity; and increasing water flow down the river. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition had been awake and on the ball, he would have put forward motions other than the redundant point about getting COAG to look at the Murray-Darling issue. It is on the agenda for the next meeting and will be discussed.

The opposition leader's motion also calls for the state government to set an example by giving priority to the rehabilitation of the Murray. Well, again: wake up, Leader of the Opposition. It is already happening and has been happening for some time. Has the Leader of the Opposition not heard of the National Heritage Trust? Some \$163 million has been put in place in the past few years. A significant amount of that funding has flowed into South Australia for a range of rehabilitation programs for the river in our state. That \$163 million is a substantial and tangible way of moving forward for the rejuvenation of the Murray-Darling basin system, delivered by a Liberal federal government and a Liberal state government.

An example is the Loxton irrigation system. As a result of a 40 per cent contribution from the commonwealth, a 40 per cent contribution from South Australia and a 20 per cent contribution from growers we have put in place changes to the open channel irrigation system as well as the appropriate drip irrigation system. This has freed up water for further

plantings in the Riverland. As a result of irrigation practices that have been put in place, we are using the same amount of water but have expanded the range of plantings and that has resulted in further export products. It is hardly surprising therefore that we have seen in the Riverland around 30 per cent economic growth each year for the past three years. The South Australian government is practising what it preaches.

Other specific projects being undertaken to improve management of the river include the Qualco Sunlands ground water control scheme to reduce waterlogging and salinity impacts of the irrigation activities; that is \$7.2 million in capital and recurrent costs. The members for Elizabeth and Reynell will be very much aware of that from the Public Works Committee.

Three new salt interception schemes are in the planning stages for Chowilla, Waikerie and Bookpurnong. These schemes, which will lower water tables and reduce salinisation, will cost in the order of \$2.2 million. There is the Murray-Mallee revegetation program to reduce dryland salinity impacts on the River Murray at a cost of some \$400 000, and there are the Lower Murray swamp and the government highland irrigation area rehabilitation programs to improve irrigation practices and reduce salinity and other water quality impacts on the river at a cost of cost more than \$37 million.

South Australia is contributing \$13.39 million to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission budget in the year 2000-01. This will be used to help fund commission activities such as monitoring water quality, construction and operation of works, storage, weirs and barrages, the development of strategies for improved water management and investigations into relevant interstate issues.

As a result of the recent ministerial council meeting, the South Australian Government is also currently drafting a salinity management strategy which will determine how South Australia should tackle the problem of salinity in our river. That draft will be completed in approximately July this year. A total funding of \$8 million is proposed for 2000-01 through the Murray-Darling 2001 program in South Australia. Primarily, this will fund the activities of local action planning groups. In addition, agencies are involved in ongoing programs of education and implementation of improved irrigation practice.

These programs represent just a snapshot of the commitment to the River Murray by the South Australian government and the people of South Australia. South Australia is also the only state with a statutory based state water plan that provides a contemporary assessment of the condition of the state's water resources and sets out the government's strategic policy directions for the development and management of those resources.

My colleague the member for Heysen, who is a key architect of that legislation and its introduction into this parliament, can take some credit for putting in place a base that puts South Australia ahead of every other state in Australia in terms of the management of our water resource to ensure its sustainability and longevity.

I now turn to paragraph (b) of the Leader of the Opposition's motion which refers to other states recognising the need to cooperate in a national strategy to reverse environmental damage to the Murray-Darling Basin. When Jeff Kennett was Premier of Victoria, he gave an unconditional commitment to this government that he would not sign off on the Snowy's corporatisation scheme until, and unless, South Australia was satisfied and our interests were protected. What

happened with the change of government in Victoria and the election of the Bracks Labor Government and the selling out to the one Independent who wanted a 28 per cent—

Time expired.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): It gives me pleasure to join in this debate. I had intended to wait for a week or two, but after listening to the Leader of the Opposition's appalling contribution I have chosen to put a few points on the board now. The Leader of the Opposition referred to what the government has done over a period and, in particular, what it has done in recent months regarding this most crucial issue that is facing the South Australian community.

Directly or indirectly, the River Murray affects the whole of the South Australian community. It is our lifeblood, our main artery, and it supports not only the economic opportunities but the basic living standards of this state. What we have seen for a long time in this House—in fact, I have witnessed it for seven years—is an ongoing stunt. This stunt is about 'Me, too, Mike', the Leader of the Opposition. 'Me, too, Mike', the Leader of the Opposition, failed miserably when he was a cabinet minister for 11 years to get on with the job of addressing the issues that were very evident then regarding the degradation of the whole of the Murray-Darling Basin river system.

Of course what we see now is the leader, who only ever talks, only ever gets on radio, but never ever shows any real action, has no policy, no direction and no real hope for South Australia, saying that this is a stunt. That is absolutely appalling. I can recall doing some work up in the Riverland when I was a very young person. They were struggling with the salt degradation and the issue of effluent going into the Murray River and coming down through Loxton and the Riverland, and that was twenty five years ago.

Since we have been in office there has been an earnest effort to try and address the issues of the Murray River. This is an issue of national importance and the federal government should play a big part in this. The Leader of the Opposition could speak to the person that he now purports to copy, namely, Premier Bracks of Victoria. It was Tony Blair until recent months but because Premier Bracks is now the flavour of the month I note that all of a sudden the Leader of the Opposition is trying to model himself on Premier Bracks.

However, the issue is that we have a Minister for Water Resources totally committed to the challenge ahead of him. We have already done a lot when it comes to addressing the irrigation systems, the fact that these irrigation systems in the Riverland went back to World War II with the open channel systems, the flood irrigation that was doing nothing to address salinity, the fact that not enough was being done when it came to revegetating the catchment areas of the Murray River—all those things are happening. Part of that is as a result of the partial sell-off of Telstra, and I recall that the Leader of the Opposition spent hours in this chamber objecting to that and working against it. Now he has the audacity to come into this chamber and say that we are about stunts. Well, in a couple of years the community will be able to judge. If Mike Rann is still Leader of the Opposition he will be taken for what he is today, and that is 'Me, too, Mike, one big stunt'.

Mr HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMUNITY FINANCIAL COUNSELLING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I move:

That this House expresses its grave concern at the short-sighted approach of this government to community financial counselling services and calls on the Minister for Human Services to reconsider his priorities to take into account the need for training and support for community based financial counsellors.

I am moving this motion as a result of an approach I received from the Southern Anti-Poverty Forum at the end of last year. They were concerned about the closure of the Southern Community Financial Counselling Service and the general lack of availability of financial counselling services in the south. They were also concerned that there is no longer any training readily available for financial counsellors whether they be volunteers or employed financial counsellors. This is because the training course previously conducted by the Adelaide Central Mission with a grant from the Department of Human Services has now ceased. It is also complicated by the fact that the Financial Counsellors Association of Australia is looking for new levels of training. It is very difficult for volunteers to accommodate that need: asking a volunteer to undertake one or two years' tertiary education is something that I think is beyond most of us. We know many volunteers undertake various forms of training in their own time, but that amount of study by distance education, as it would turn out, to undertake very difficult work for no pay is asking a lot.

In conjunction with the Secretary of the Antipoverty Forum, I convened a meeting of people in the south, particularly from agencies that have involvement in poverty issues and financial counselling, to try to get a comprehensive picture of what the problems are and how they can be resolved. The meeting was addressed by the President of the South Australian Financial Counsellors Association, Mae Schotten.

The importance of this issue was demonstrated by the huge attendance at the meeting. We had to put out more chairs: having expected 15 people, in fact 34 attended. People came from church organisations, community groups and various government departments, all of whom were reporting a really critical situation in relation to financial counselling. Budget counselling is that which helps someone get over an immediate crisis; financial counselling assists people to balance their lives, their income and commitments more effectively. There are shortages in both financial and budget counselling.

We discovered that in the broadly defined south, being from Aberfoyle Park to Victor Harbor, only 74 appointments are available in a week—and this is to cover a population of approximately 100 000 and, on a conservative estimate, 10 000 of that number would be living in poverty. We consider that the very basic preventive and early intervention measure of financial counselling for an eligible population of some 11 000 people in need is limited to approximately 74 appointments a week.

A number of issues were identified as indicating that financial counselling is even more important now than it ever has been in the past. I am informed that 11.2 per cent of all Australians live below the poverty line. Some pockets in the south experience extremely high concentrations of poverty. In recent years there has been a significant increase in household debt. In June 1990, total Australian household debt was \$120 billion. In June 1998 that figure had risen to \$290 billion. In 1985 Australians saved approximately

12.5 per cent of their income. In 1999 that figure was 0.06 per cent of their income. In 1998 credit card debt in Australia grew by 14 per cent.

Some local issues were identified as contributing to the drastic need for financial counselling services. Issues that were mentioned included the low literacy levels in some parts of the community, making it very difficult for people to deal effectively with the contracts to which they are exposed as part of their financial dealings. Everyone agreed that ETSA and Boral Energy are far less willing now to negotiate time payment. ETSA, Boral and SA Water will issue a card for part payment in advance. However, all payments must be cleared before a card will be allowed. The minimum payment for ETSA and Boral is \$20 and \$25 for SA Water.

People attending the meeting asserted that for those in drastic financial situations finding \$25 to make a time payment is an incredible barrier to being able to budget. In addition, all agreed that the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs seems to have distanced itself from community education. The types of programs that were previously available to assist consumers to act in their long-term best interests no longer seem to be available. Some help is provided by neighbourhood centres in terms of providing programs such as literacy and cooking on a budget, which makes a small positive impact, and we are glad that even that little amount of impact is available.

All agreed that the impact of gambling is increasing and that the need for financial counsellors is increased as a result of the impact of gambling. There is a record number of bankruptcies. Community organisations are finding that various institutions recommend that their customers and clients go to financial counsellors but are not aware of the lack of financial counselling services available. For instance, people at the meeting were able to say that the Housing Trust, the courts, corrections, and various financial institutions as well as the Rental Tenancies Tribunal, Centrelink, churches, housing cooperatives and debt collectors all refer people to financial counsellors. These people are so frustrated when they ring up and discover how difficult it is to get an appointment.

Concern was also expressed about the ready availability of credit, especially for young people who feel it is necessary to have a credit rating. As I mentioned earlier, there is a problem with training. In the past, the Adelaide Central Mission has conducted a program which involves people attending for generally two hours at a time for 10 weeks in a row and then undertaking supervised practice for about six months. The training was generally regarded as excellent. Many of the people at the meeting had undertaken it and found it really useful and practical training. However, the requirement now for a tertiary course puts training out of the way for many people. The local FAYS managers have developed their own in-house training programs, but they are not suitable for volunteers and will not lead to any form of professional accreditation.

The Adelaide Central Mission has indicated that, if it had the funds available to develop the program again, it would look at how it could be linked in with the tertiary program so that people could start here, get enough training to practise in the field under supervised circumstances and then move onto fully professional qualifications. There is a need for the Minister for Human Services to examine what support he is able to give to training for financial counsellors and to re-institute the program that did exist. There has been some indication that the minister is looking at diverting resources

from community education to allow more to be devoted to individual counselling services. The meeting was overwhelmingly unanimous that that will not work. Both types of services are required—the community education activities undertaken by various SACOSS-based organisations and community organisations as well as the individual financial counselling.

It was also recognised that very few people have their needs met by one session of financial counselling. Lives are so disrupted and debt so great it is likely that quite basic financial habits will have to be addressed in order to get back on track people's financial situation and their lives which were affected by that. The Southern Community Financial Counselling Services has been closed, and this is much regretted. This was a voluntary service. The service closed because it recognised that the volunteers who were keeping it going could no longer make the contribution that had allowed the service to exist. These were people who had undertaken this extensive training through the Central Mission, who had undergone supervised practice and who were working many hours, sometimes 10 or 20 hours a week, in a voluntary capacity at a very skilled trade.

All these people were in situations in which they actually needed the income themselves to keep them out of poverty: there is just so much managing you can do on a very limited budget. People should not be required to live in poverty themselves in order to provide this valuable service to people in need. Early intervention was seen as very important in terms of preventing bankruptcies and other major catastrophes in families. The effect of financial difficulties and poverty in families is widespread and affects every aspect of people's lives.

Adults will stop participating in sport; they will put off going to the doctor; and they will not insure their cars, and that affects them and others in the community. They do not undertake car maintenance, which again affects the value of their very limited assets, and affects their safety and that of others in the community. People stop maintaining their gardens, which often means that there is hassle from their neighbours, who do not like to see an untidy garden devaluing the street. This sounds like a small matter, but it is important to those involved.

People do not take out medical insurance; they do not have savings; they have one set of school clothing that gets washed and dried overnight; they restrict their medications; and they cut off visits to friends and family because they cannot afford it. All these sorts of activities, which are protective mechanisms when there simply is not enough money to go round, have long-run adverse consequences. Unfortunately, people often engage in risky behaviour. They take to gambling; they get involved in a get rich scheme or in pyramid investments; they sell the family home and go into private rental.

They take on extra employment, often undeclared, or they undertake practices that can get them into real trouble. Financial counselling services, readily available on an outreach basis after hours so that people who are working also have access to them (since many people are working with absolutely minimal income), are required urgently.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARCOO OUTLET

Ms KEY (Hanson): I move:

That this House notes Labor's opposition to the government's announcement of a \$16.8 million construction project to build the Barcoo Outlet under West Beach aimed at diverting the Patawalonga stormwater and waste straight out into Gulf St Vincent, and calls on the government to use these funds to implement the Patawalonga Water Catchment Board management plan, the construction of wetlands in the catchment, the upgrading of the Heathfield Sewage Treatment Works or measures that will deliver positive environmental outcomes.

I believe that this proposal on the part of the government is environmental vandalism, and it is aimed at protecting and enhancing the Glenelg Holdfast Shores area at the cost of the coastline, the marine environment, the tourists, the residents of West Beach and the users of that beach and of Henley and Grange beaches. On examining this matter, I have referred to a number of documents which have been made available with regard to Holdfast Shores, in particular, the first document I managed to acquire being the issues paper for Holdfast Shores Stage 2 proposal, wherein the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning made a declaration under section 46(1) of the Development Act that certain activities in a prescribed area adjacent to Colley Reserve at Glenelg be a major development.

The Holdfast Shores Quay proposal includes a number of areas to be approved by the Governor and subsequently constructed, including a Glenelg breakwater, sand management measures, boating channel, ferry berthing wharf, marina basin, sand trapping reef, marina pier, building platform and Barcoo Outlet stormwater diversion which, at the time this document which was received by our library in September 1999, was still subject to a further environmental impact assessment and a decision by the Governor. A number of other constructions are identified in the document, including apartment buildings, 23 residential allotments, a relocated dive shop and other shops.

My main problem with the Barcoo Outlet began quite some time ago when residents, who have kept quite an eye on the Adelaide shores development and the boat harbor, received information and initially, I would have thought, notice of the issues paper and the need for consultation of the major project under section 46 (1) of the Development Act. I am informed that formal consultation did not take place, so the various interested people, particularly residents, went on a paper chase—as have I—to find out what information is available and what sort of impact statements have been achieved.

I was pleased to be invited to a public meeting on 7 March conducted by the Henley and Grange Residents Association, dealing specifically with the 'Barcoo Outlet public forum agenda, West Beach Surf Lifesaving Club'. A number of people were invited to this meeting and a number of speakers were highlighted on the sheet distributed within the community. As a member of the Henley and Grange Residents Association, I received an invitation as a member and also as a member of parliament for the electorate of Hanson which represents part of West Beach.

Ms Kate Barrett, the Vice President of Henley and Grange Residents Association was one of the speakers who was listed and who did speak. Dr Michael Armitage, the Minister for Government Enterprises, was listed but he did not turn up; he sent his apologies. Mr Rob Thomas, Director of the Environment Protection Agency did not turn up but sent his apologies also, as also did Mr Alan Ockenden, Manager of the Patawalonga catchment board. Ms Michele Grady from the Conservation Council of South Australia turned up and spoke. Mr Ian Fitzgerald of the Marine Recreation Fishers Commit-

tee was there; I am not sure if he spoke but he certainly turned up. Ms Pat Harbison, a marine scientist and also a member of the Henley and Grange Residents Association turned up and spoke. Mr Peter Dale, Manager of Services Policy, City of Charles Sturt, also turned up and spoke. Ms Rosemary Hass, a representative from West Torrens Council, was not listed on the agenda but she made a report before she went off to her council meeting. It concerns me that not only did a number of people who could advise the public not bother to turn up but also some of the local members in the area, in particular the member for Morphett and the member for Colton, were not at the meeting. I understand that the member for Colton was representing the Premier at a function, and that was made obvious at the start of the meeting, but I am not sure what happened to the member for Morphett.

The people who attended were Mr Peter Lewis, as the chair of the Public Works Committee, and Gay Thompson, the member for Reynell, also from the Public Works Committee. An apology was received from Lea Stevens, the member for Elizabeth, because she had a commitment in her electorate on that night. Tom Koutsantonis, the member for Peake, was there—in fact, I sat next to him. Steve Georganas, the Labor candidate for Hindmarsh, was there, and he has attended all the meetings. Mike Elliott, the leader of the Democrats, was at the meeting, as was myself. Ms Gallus and Senator Nick Bolkus sent their apologies, because federal parliament was sitting.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms KEY: I understand that the member for Schubert had an engagement that night and arrived at the end of the meeting. I had a discussion with him about the issue the next day, and I am pleased to report to parliament that the member for Schubert and the other members of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee have decided that the committee will investigate some of the issues that were raised by this public meeting and also by some of the residents and people concerned about the Barcoo outlet.

As I said, I have managed to access a number of documents with respect to this issue. One document which was discussed at the public meeting and which I think is also of significance to this debate is entitled 'Fourth amendment to the assessment report for the environmental impact statement (as amended) for the Glenelg foreshore and environs—Barcoo outlet proposal (West Beach)' and is dated January 2000. There are a number of issues which I would like to read out which summarise some of the concerns that have been raised about the Barcoo outlet. The following is a summary of the main issues raised:

- not best practice urban stormwater management and not ecologically sustainable;
- amount of nutrients entering the Patawalonga lake debatable;
- loss of seagrasses in Gulf of St Vincent.

There are some other 16 points that I will raise but, because my time for today's contribution is running out, I would like to report on a document I received this morning from the Environment and Health Committee of the West Beach council. This document contains the results of the West Beach marine water quality testing. The council has decided to have an analysis carried out, at a cost of \$777. The brief was to report to council findings of a once-off water quality testing undertaken at West Beach boat launching area. The document states:

At a council meeting held on 1 February 2000 council received a report put forward on the marine water quality at West Beach and the potential risk to marine and human health from various sources of contamination. Council also resolved that a once-off analysis be conducted as outlined in the report, to assess any immediate risk to public and marine health. Water samples were taken on 24 February 2000 by the Australian Water Quality Centre and analyses was conducted.

Results of analyses and a map of sampling points are attached to this report. The most significant finding was that zinc levels are at approximately 100 times the levels recommended by the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council's Australian Water Quality Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water.

High zinc levels affect both marine animals and plants. Zinc enters the marine environment mainly through run-off from roads, and these high levels are indicative of high amounts of polluted stormwater entering the sea following a storm event. This is supported by records from the Bureau of Meteorology, which show that from 20 February to 23 February 2000 Adelaide received 43.8 millimetres of rain. The lower than normal conductivity of the marine water also indicates a large influx of fresh water in the sea.

Aluminium levels were also found to be slightly higher than recommended. Aluminium may be present in water from industry sources and sewage effluent.

Debate adjourned.

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

PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 131 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House strengthen the law in relation to prostitution and ban prostitution related advertising, were presented by the Hon. D.C. Kotz and Messrs Hamilton-Smith and Williams.

Petitions received.

COURTS PRECINCT

A petition signed by 638 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to clarify the status of the Law Courts, Police Headquarters development and the future of the Court Cafe, was presented by Mr Hamilton-Smith.

Petition received.

SUBMARINE CORPORATION

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Today as we head into one of the most action-packed weekends we have seen in this state, there are about 800 or so South Australians who have an extra reason to celebrate. The dedicated and skilled work force of the Australian Submarine Corporation yesterday received some welcoming news. South Australia also received welcoming news.

The federal government has decided to exercise its pre-emptive rights in respect of the 49 per cent shareholding of the Australian Submarine Corporation. The object: to on-sell to the best possible buyer, a buyer committed to expanding the company and developing its full potential for the long-term benefit of Australia and the defence shipbuilding industry. It is a bold decision and one fully supported by the South Australian Government on the basis that the federal government will take the next and appropriate steps. In fact, the South Australian Government has lobbied loudly and strongly for this outcome because it is the right outcome for the long term.

I have been in contact with and met several federal ministers as well as the Prime Minister in recent months. Only last Friday, after concerns that the proposal might be in danger of losing the support of federal cabinet, I sought an urgent meeting with the Prime Minister in Sydney. There I reiterated the importance of the ASC and its work force to the South Australian economy. As I have told the House on previous occasions, together they contribute \$100 million a year to gross state product.

The fight to ensure the long-term viability of the ASC has been lengthy and at times an unfair one. There are, of course, a number of potential owners, all of whom bring different long-term outcomes for the ASC and this state. Media reports, from the eastern seaboard I hasten to add, of dud subs and the questioning of the expertise of the South Australian work force has, not surprisingly at times, impacted heavily on morale at the ASC. As I have been at pains to point out, the reality could not be further removed. Yes, there have been problems with the submarines, but problems totally out of the control of the workers and management. Faulty imported equipment and design have been largely to blame.

Last year I sat in a room with unions representing the work force at Osborne. I gave a personal commitment that this government was in the fight for the long haul, and that whatever influence we could bring to bear would be brought to bear. I made a point of meeting with the late Dr Malcolm Macintosh together with John Prescott, the men last year charged with reviewing the future operations of the ASC and construction of the Collins class submarines. In fact, I was the only political leader in Australia to do so. Through our persistence and the pure tenacity of the work force, we have had our wins along the way. Last year in the wake of the Macintosh report, we won concessions from the commonwealth. The through life maintenance of the Collins class submarines would continue to be done out of Osborne. This was despite very real threats that the work could go to Western Australia. Yesterday's decision has paved the way for a shake-up of Australian ship building.

The nations three big navy ship projects—the Collins Class submarines, the Anzac frigates and the Newcastle mine hunters—are due for completion within the next four years. It is the general consensus of defence industry analysts that Australia can only support one naval ship builder. The commonwealth's decision has put South Australia in the box seat to be the nation's key naval shipbuilder. At the end of the day, our fight is about ensuring that the sizeable expertise skills base that we built up in South Australia is not lost and is in fact built upon. Our aim as a state government has been to see that the Osborne facility is given the opportunity to become the designated primary Australian shipbuilding yard for submarines and surface vessels in Australia; that there is the opportunity for the ASC to attract other heavy engineering work unrelated to submarines or surface ships; and to provide for a diverse work base to smooth out the peaks and the troughs. This outcome is a just reward for the 800 workers and management. They have given their all in sometimes very difficult circumstances and periods of uncertainty. The first step towards a positive future has now been taken. The challenge is now to ensure that ASC attracts the best possible buyer upon further determination by the commonwealth. As a state government, we will continue to do all we can to ensure that that challenge is met.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—

Amendment No 71
Amendment No 72
Amendment No 73.

QUESTION TIME**RADIOACTIVE WASTE**

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's statement to this House on 19 November last year when he said, 'I wish to make it very clear that I am opposed to medium and high level radioactive waste being dumped in South Australia,' does the Premier oppose medium to high level waste from Lucas Heights being dumped in South Australia and, if so, what action will he take to stop it? The opposition understands that construction of a new reactor to replace Lucas Heights is now contingent on a decision on where to dump spent fuel rods from Lucas Heights, and that South Australia is the federal government's preferred site. Under contracts signed by the federal government, these spent fuel rods will be returned to Australia 25 years after being sent to France for reprocessing. They will be vitrified (or cased in glass) and require a total storage space about as big as a typical office in this building.

On 20 November 1999, the federal resources minister, Senator Minchin, was reported as saying that, although the Premier had written to him acknowledging the federal government's intention to establish a dump, Senator Minchin said that the Premier did not say that South Australia was opposed outright to an intermediate level repository.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): My position and that of the government is clear; it is specific; it has not altered. I put a position down last year that indicated that low level waste—exit signs and waste from our hospital systems, which currently is being held in metropolitan areas—ought to be located somewhere safe and away from population base. My position in relation to medium and high level waste is clear: we are opposed to medium high level waste from Lucas Heights coming into South Australia. The federal minister knows my views quite clearly on this matter. I can assure members that he knows and understands my views on the matter.

In relation to reprocessing fuel rods from Lucas Heights, the advice that I received some time ago—and I have not received any advice to the contrary—is that it would be a number of years before a high level repository will be required—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: To my knowledge nobody has advised me or my office of any change to that. Let me hasten to add that our position is clear and unequivocal; it has not changed from the position I put down last year. Members would also appreciate the reality of this situation, recognising the capacity of the federal laws to override state laws. Be that as it may, the position I have put down on behalf of the government is without change.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will come to order. The member for Hartley.

FRESH PRODUCE EXPORTS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Premier outline to the House discussions he had recently with Singapore's leading retailers about increasing exports of South Australian fresh produce?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): As a by-product of the V8 race over this weekend, we issued invitations to a number of international and interstate business people to come to South Australia to use it as a marketing exercise for the state, and we have had an unprecedented response. I think 35 or 36 business people from overseas are in Adelaide over these few days leading up to the V8 race and about 60 are coming in from interstate. Through the respective departments, programs have been put together for these visiting business people covering a range of opportunities, whether they be in the manufacturing, automotive or other sectors.

This morning I met with the Chairman of NTUC Fair Price Cooperative, a leading food retailer in Singapore, with 76 supermarkets throughout the island. It has been part of an international buyers program operated through the government's Food for the Future Council. Representatives of the organisation have been visiting a number of food and beverage wholesalers and producers in the past few days, and we have been able to put in place programs to assist them. That international buyers program is a crucial peg in the government's Food for the Future plan, whereby we aim to triple our food production to \$15 billion by the year 2010. Our foods, from fresh fruit and vegetables to pastry, meat and seafood, are increasingly being sought by prestige hotels, restaurants and supermarkets through the Asia region. In fact, over the past two years we have had a compounding growth of 10 per cent. If we can keep that up, on that basis we will beat our target of 2010 by about two to three years.

The Singapore cooperative has made two visits to South Australia in the past two years, and today we have the chief executive officer visiting as part of the lead-up to the V8 race. The Deputy Premier will be continuing the push when he visits with the company in Singapore later this month in connection with the Hotel Food Asia Expo, at which a number of South Australian companies will be exhibiting. While they have shown a great interest in our fresh product, such as our rock lobster, abalone and Coffin Bay oysters, they are particularly interested in sourcing our fresh fruit and vegetables.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I was waiting for it, here it comes; that is something which I am sure even the opposition is keen to pursue, given the recent interest in pineapples in this House. That upsurge of the opposition's interest in fresh fruit is perhaps worth exploring a little further. Now that we have Pineapple Pat, and there is Tangerine Tom down the back and Mango Mike up the front, all in all you would only need a couple of other ingredients and you would have a fruit cake, but I would not want to put a bad name on a fruit cake. I ought to have said fruit loops; perhaps 'fruit loops' is a more appropriate tag. I understand that the pineapple is the symbol for hospitality and warmth. I am sure that is not what the member for Ross Smith had in mind when he delivered a pineapple or two to one or two of his colleagues—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of his reply.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am delighted that the opposition has shown this late interest in our horticulture industry and the capacity for our fresh fruit and vegetables to go to the international marketplace to be served at tables and restaurants around the world. Importantly, in doing that, right throughout country and regional areas of the state, we are creating greater job opportunities, greater investment and a better economy, as reflected in the great employment trend lines affirmed today: 21 consecutive months of employment growth in South Australia.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder will remain silent, as will the member for Bragg.

Mr HILL (Kaurua): Given the Premier's answer to the first question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, and given the federal government's plans to make a decision, we understand, later this year on the site for the establishment of an intermediate nuclear waste dump as a prerequisite for the construction of a new reactor to replace Lucas Heights, will the Premier introduce or support legislation to ban the storage of medium to high level nuclear waste in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): There is a bit of confusion in the honourable member's mind as to what we have always said. The government has been totally consistent in that what we have been exploring with the federal government has purely been about the storage of low level and short-lived intermediate level radioactive waste. That is what we have been talking about, and we have not given approval for even that. The Premier has been absolutely clear in that respect, both in this House and to the federal government. The honourable member then talks about whatever the federal government has done in relation to conditions with the new reactor at Lucas Heights, but this has nothing to do with the South Australian government.

If the federal government wants to make a condition about storage, then it is up to the federal government to find a suitable storage site that is acceptable to the people. The federal government has not found that site here. I had the pleasure of speaking at a radioactive waste repository meeting at the university and, on the odd occasion when I got a word in, I tried to make clear our agreement because some quite colourful statements were made about agreements that the state government had signed up on and commitments that had been made, etc., all of which had absolutely no basis. I have certainly seen nothing to verify some of the statements that had been made.

This government has been totally consistent. We have given no approval for low level and short-lived medium level radioactive waste. It might be worth reminding all opposition members that we have not agreed to anything with respect to low level and short-lived medium level radioactive waste. What we have done is totally consistent with the previous stance of the Labor Party from about 1989 to 1993, when several decisions went through cabinet in terms of agreeing with the federal government. It is also worth reminding all

members that much of the low level and short-lived medium level radioactive waste is already stored at Woomera, and we need to find a home for it.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: What about the legislation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will get a chance presently to ask a question.

POLICE STAFFING

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Police inform the House of the opposition's support for the government's current position on police numbers?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I thank the honourable member—

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

An honourable member: Are you on radio again Michael?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, often. Is the Minister for Police responsible to the House for the opposition's position on police numbers?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Fifty thousand, actually.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister may not be responsible specifically for the Labor Party policy, but he can develop an answer I would have thought on police numbers generally.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am very pleased that I am not responsible for the opposition's policies, because it does not have any! I have great pride in being part of a government and a party that has many policies, new policies in fact, that come into this House day in and day out. Now and again one has to give credit to the other side—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder will remain silent.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am always pleased, as the Leader of the Opposition says, to be bipartisan from time to time. I say that not in the form of a stunt as the Leader of the Opposition might do but in a genuine way. Members would recall that in May 1999 I announced there would be a significant effort into police recruitment. In fact, over a 12 month period from May 1999 until now, approximately 140 police officers have started at the academy. Of course, we have been encouraging men and women throughout the state to consider this as an excellent career. I thank 'Pineapple Pat', the shadow spokesman for his support, because—

Mr Hanna: Schoolboy stuff.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Well, we will look at the member for Mitchell later and at some of the material he is distributing, but we will do that another day.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Of course he wants to hear it, because on Friday 18 February the shadow police spokesperson said on radio:

... we're at least a further 200 down on the numbers that we used to have in 1993. Those numbers, we believe, are the appropriate level for policing in South Australia.

I know that 'Pineapple Pat' has not really been doing a very good job when it comes to counting numbers, because one only has to hear from the member for Ross Smith to know the trouble the honourable member has in working out the numbers. But the fact remains that when you look at this year, 2000-01, the number of operational police by June this year

will be exactly what the shadow spokesman has said is an appropriate level for police.

Of course the opposition spokesperson would not like to hear this but, if for a change he actually went into his office and telephoned me, I would be very happy to spend 10 minutes of my time to say what we are doing with police recruitment. I know that is difficult when one is busy doing other things with knives and whatever, but the fact remains that the opposition has clearly said that those numbers are the appropriate level for policing. Of course, we will not stop there. At the moment, members would realise that we have the Premier's task force report. I have already reported to the House that the Premier, myself and cabinet are looking at that and at a number of initiatives in relation to how we can better resource our police to do the job in South Australia.

Another issue about which I wish to refer with respect to police is women in the police force. Clearly, today it is very important—

Mr HANNA: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. This is clearly straying from relevance if the question was in order in the first place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The question related, as I recall it, to police numbers. As long as the minister sticks to police numbers he is in order, but I ask him to start to consider winding up his reply or, if not, to consider using ministerial statements.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: This is very relevant. Even if the member for Mitchell does not see it as important that we look at recruiting women into the police force and even if he does not support women in the police force, I ask him to consider that we on this side do. Having women in the police force is very important in a modern society. I am pleased to say that the government, in conjunction with SAPOL, has developed a strategy to recruit more women into the South Australian police force. In particular, I was pleased to see that on 8 March, during graduation, for the first time in some years there was an equal number of male and female graduates. The message is simply this: I as police minister thank the opposition for saying that that is an appropriate number of police to have in South Australia. Members opposite are on the public record as saying that, and I ask to see more bipartisan support from the opposition on an issue such as this. They have stirred up the community enough. They have injected plenty of fear into the community. They have misrepresented the facts when it comes to policing and law and order, and it is time they stopped grandstanding.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police will remain silent as well.

CONTAINER DEPOSITS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): What action, if any, has the Minister for Environment and Heritage taken to ensure that South Australia's exclusive container deposit scheme is not jeopardised by the imposition of the GST which, if not soon granted GST-free status by the Howard government, stands to threaten the future of a significant part of our recycling industry?

The opposition has been informed by Recyclers of South Australia's accountants that the GST will burden the industry with such huge compliance costs that it will cost 12¢ to collect containers that return to it the 5¢ allowable under the container deposit legislation. The accountants say that, to comply with the GST legislation, Recyclers will need, among

other things, to increase the number of sorting cages for containers from three, which separate glass, plastic and cans, to nine, which will separate further those containers that come in from registered sellers, from unregistered sellers and those containers already deemed GST free. None of those new arrangements will result in the Australian Taxation Office collecting one new cent from the tax.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): My office was on the telephone to Senator Hill's office not two hours ago. We wrote to both Senator Hill and the federal Treasurer (Mr Costello) earlier this week on this matter. There is power for the federal government to exempt the container deposit under the division 81 list in connection with fees related to the protection of the environment. We have already taken it up with the federal government, and Senator Hill, to his credit, has agreed to take it up with the federal Treasurer—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: He has done a great job on this matter. He has agreed to take it up with the federal Treasurer because he realises that it is one of the best environmental programs in the southern hemisphere. It involves a very high recycling rate of something like seven million units a year. So, the government is aware of the issue that the Leader of the Opposition has raised and is waiting for a response from the federal government.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SONG

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services inform the House of the role to be played tonight at the Premier's state dinner by primary school children from across the state?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Those members of the House who believe in and strongly back the future of this state, knowing that it is a place of excellence, a place of creativity and a place of great potential, will be pleased to know that there is another attribute to the state: a new song celebrating South Australia has been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair wants to hear the reply, even if members are not interested.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: A new song has been developed about the state and will be performed tonight, most fittingly, by those who represent the future of our state. I bring to the notice of the House that South Australian 11 and 12 year olds will tomorrow showcase what is best about public education. Tonight at the Clipsal 500 state dinner to be hosted by the Premier, 100 primary school children from throughout South Australia will come together from the Public Primary Schools Festival of Music choir to perform *South Australia: It's my home*, which celebrates life in this state. This performance will enable our young South Australians to be ambassadors both for South Australia and also for their respective schools. In addition, they will be performing the same song at the opening of the Davis Cup tomorrow—again, a great feather in their cap.

The department and the South Australian Public Schools Music Society have for some three months been working in partnership to coordinate this substantial choral performance, and a lot of work has gone into these performances not only by the 100 children involved but also by the teachers with whom they have been practising and by the conductors who have been undertaking this. Some 300 students have been

involved. This young choir comprises in total 300 young children from 12 primary schools in South Australia, including Macclesfield, Paracombe, Hackham East, Salisbury Downs, Highgate, Hawthorndene, The Heights, Reynella, Redwood Park, Glenelg, Nailsworth and Darlington.

A young soloist from this group is 12 year old Heather Muggridge from Hawthorndene primary. She has been chosen as the South Australian representative in the Gondwana Choir, which comprises some 60 talented members who represent all states of Australia—and it is certainly a feather in her cap. The special song which this 300 strong young choir will showcase at the Davis Cup conveys to listeners that our state thrives on creative spirit, fosters innovation and breeds excellence. Indeed, what better opportunity for our future leaders than to display their talents at the Clipsal 500 state reception and also the Davis Cup?

I understand that two former students from Brighton and Marryatville high schools, Lisa Edwards and Lachlan McLeod, who are both now accomplished international performers, will also perform, ably assisted by the members of the choir. The opening ceremony at the Davis Cup also will be backed by the Australian Symphony Orchestra, and I believe that this parliament should be very proud to promote the talents of our young primary schoolchildren who have been asked to accept, and indeed have accepted, the challenge of performing at both these notable events.

MISSING DOCUMENTS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Has the Minister for Tourism instructed her adviser Simon Birmingham to make full and frank admissions about the alleged theft of cabinet documents when he gives evidence to the Ombudsman this afternoon? The state Ombudsman has taken an unprecedented step by requiring the minister's adviser to personally appear before him and to answer questions on oath about her office's response in relation to the allegedly stolen cabinet documents concerning Hindmarsh Stadium. The Ombudsman has not used his inquisitorial powers in this manner since the state's FOI laws were passed in 1991. The minister's adviser Mr Simon Birmingham is also the minister's FOI officer. He signed off on a letter saying that there was no list of missing cabinet documents, contrary to statements made by the Attorney-General indicating that a list was being prepared in December last year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): Here we go again. I have said on a number of occasions that the opposition, and in particular the member for Mitchell, seem to have either selective deafness or terminal memory loss.

An honourable member: Or both.

The Hon. J. HALL: Or perhaps a combination of both. The allegations, the mud and the grubby activities in which the member for Mitchell and some of his colleagues have been involved in this particular instance are quite offensive. I am sure there are many members of this House and many members of the public who know how distressing it is when there is a breaking and entering of their house or their car—and I am no different from that. It has been a very traumatic experience.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. J. HALL: Before the member for Mitchell blows his top or explodes his fuse, as he does so often, could I explain one more time? First, I wonder whether the member

for Mitchell has ever heard of a data base. If he has not, maybe the Minister for Information Economy just might be able to help. I am sure that even the member knows what a computer does. As my colleague the Minister for Information Economy has explained to this House on a number of occasions, the Labor Party—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mitchell to be silent.

The Hon. J. HALL: We know that the Labor Party does not actually have a policy on IT, and if they follow their Victorian colleagues they will not even have a minister for it. I will be happy to take the member for Mitchell through this one more time. Here we go again.

The bags were stolen from my car on 8 November. That particular theft was reported to the police at about midnight on that night. When my staff were notified about the return of four of the six bags, they accessed the data base in a ministerial office. I am sure the member is familiar with that. Therefore, all the official files that had been checked out to me were accessed by the computer activities the next morning and they were all checked off. I would actually ask the member for Mitchell to understand, if there are no official government documents missing, how the hell can you make a list of missing documents! It is very, very confusing.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: If you are a fabricator like the leader, that's how you do it—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. HALL: Mr Speaker, the member keeps referring to stolen documents that related to Hindmarsh stadium, and I have consistently said that any material that I had in my car related to the staging of what will clearly be a successful tournament here between 13 and 23 September.

We know what a very grubby and tacky little exercise is involved in this, because they do not like the fact that the remaining items missing are extremely personal—some are extremely expensive, and I understand that some are not insured, which is making me even crankier! I have consistently said, from the middle of November, that no documents that were removed from my car that day will in any way affect the Auditor-General's investigation. I do not, under any circumstances, consider it appropriate to instruct my ministerial adviser what to say and what not to say. I find what is going on here extraordinary.

I would like to remind the member that over the last four or five months I have consistently said that the material that was taken was returned in four of the six bags that were retrieved from two locations in Stirling the next day. I really find this is absolutely offensive, and I deeply resent the imputations and the grub and mud that the member is throwing.

STATE ECONOMY

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier inform the House about the level of exposure and economic activity expected to result this weekend from the major events, the Clipsal 500 and the Davis Cup clash, in Adelaide?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): We have a number of sporting spectacles this weekend, and a couple of clashes that will be great spectator sport in South Australia. First, we have the Clipsal 500 to kick off tomorrow. Some 10 000 tourists are expected this year compared with 6 700 last year. Tourists from New Zealand are up 300 per cent, partly due to the New Zealand drivers competing. In terms of economic

benefits, last year the event was worth some \$13 million to the state. The media exposure from that event was of the order of \$24 million. It provided some 240 full-time jobs over the period and generated something like \$1 million in state revenue. We expect the outcome to be just as good in the year 2000.

We also have the Davis Cup clash this weekend, with a capacity crowd of 8 500 expected on each of the three days. About 3 000 of those people will be from interstate or overseas, with most visitors staying for about a week and each spending in the order of up to \$800 a day on food, retail and accommodation. The expected economic benefit from that is some \$16 million. The two events have a minimum impact on the community of some \$30 million. In addition, we have two TV crews from Germany broadcasting the tennis clash, and that will be further good exposure internationally for South Australia. It is an exciting and action packed weekend all round. You have the V8—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Indeed, we will. However, I reckon the partying in Adelaide will only be in a few places on Saturday. We have the V8 race at Victoria Park, the Davis Cup clash at Memorial Drive and something akin to a blood sport on South Terrace on Saturday. The word is that there is a single's clash on South Terrace, that is, Ralph versus the ALP, with an odds-on bet that the ALP will slice him up. It will be what has been described as a crushing victory for the ALP—

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to come back to the question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We are looking forward to the sporting spectaculars contributing to the economy. There is just one event that will miss out contributing anything to the economy of the state, and it is the one on South Terrace, although it could be a precursor, a scene setter, for the debate on the legislation that the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has introduced in this House dealing with boxing and martial arts.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I cannot but admire the member for Ross Smith: here he is marching towards this event on Saturday with great spirit and great determination. He has spirit and determination and he will not be diverted, and clearly he will not flinch. We look forward to the three clashes over the weekend. I am sure that the one on Saturday on South Terrace has been selected deliberately for that day. Could members imagine a better time to have a state council meeting of the ALP than in the middle of a V8 race and the Davis Cup clash—

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I guess the Labor Party in this instance does not want to compete for column inches—that is what it is on about. We will miss members opposite at the V8 race, but do not worry, we will be thinking about them.

BOTANIC GARDENS WINE AND ROSE DEVELOPMENT

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Will the Minister for Tourism assure the House that the Botanic Gardens wine and rose development will be completed on time (by June this year) to take full advantage of the Olympic tourism boom, and that it will be completed on budget with no extra contribution

from the taxpayer; if not, why not, and just how much will it cost?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am delighted—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, this new found enthusiasm for the National Wine Centre from the honourable member is really welcome. If the honourable member had driven down North Terrace recently he would have seen that the earthworks have started to take place.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order. Sir, can you explain why when a member asks a question of the Minister for Tourism the Premier jumps up to protect her? It just seems a bit strange—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been here a long time now and knows that the Premier as head of government is in a position to answer any question asked in the House.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: They have done it again and shown their ignorance. The member for Hart professes to be capable (God forbid!) of being a minister one day. If only he understood that acts are committed to different ministers. If he looks up the schedule (and it is available for him to look at), he will see that the wine centre is committed to me as minister. So, the member for Hart has demonstrated yet again his fundamental ignorance, and the member for Elizabeth also demonstrated that she was fundamentally wrong in her assertions yesterday. In two weeks of parliamentary sitting, they have not got one right yet. They have been wrong, wrong and wrong on their facts.

I can assure the honourable member that construction is about to start on this wine centre, and it will do exactly as he proposed in his question: it will add to the tourism potential and opportunity in South Australia.

FINE DEFAULT

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): What is the response of the Minister for Police to, and the police department's policy on, people who, having shown goodwill, cannot because of illness meet their agreed fortnightly instalments on a speeding fine? A pensioner couple in my electorate was fined \$123 for speeding on 25 February 1999. They signed a statutory declaration to pay \$5 per fortnight until the fine was paid in full. They met those repayments and by last Thursday approximately \$8 remained to be paid. They missed their last payment due to illness—both have severe disabilities. The department has informed them that as a result of their missing their last payment the fine has now been increased to \$101. They have told me that they cannot afford this extra burden, which I believe is incredibly unjust.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I never capitalise on situations as do some members on the other side. I would simply say that this is a specific case. As minister I am happy to look at it. If the honourable member will send it to me through the normal channels, I will look at it and transfer it, if required, to the appropriate minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The shadow spokesperson for police ought to remember that this government has gone out of its way to be more flexible in recent times in the way in which people have the capacity to pay their fines—far more flexible than you were when you were a pretty shabby

government. Send me the material and I will look at it quickly.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Heritage, representing the Attorney-General. My question relates to legislation administered by the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs. Will the minister advise of the numbers of so-called 'minor breaches' of this legislation which have been dealt with administratively and whether there has been any evaluation of the move towards dealing with minor breaches administratively rather than initiating a prosecution or disciplinary action in the first instance?

Last week I received from the minister an answer to a question I asked about the administration of consumer protection. This showed that, between 1992 and 1999, prosecutions initiated by the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs had decreased from 92 to four, disciplinary actions from 86 to 21, and assurances from 104 to nine. The reply states that 'the commission attempts to keep minor matters out of courts and free the resources previously allocated to that area to increase the surveillance of consumer protection in the marketplace.'

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I will seek a response from the Attorney-General and bring back a reply.

TREE DAMAGE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Heritage. In the light of the minister's strong statement on Tuesday in support of our national parks, will he please advise what controls and safeguards are in place to ensure proper and appropriate use of chemicals in national and recreation parks; and will he please explain how a corporation that admits that it is possibly responsible for substantial damage to mature trees in a recreation park as a result of its use of herbicide can be described by a senior government official as a 'good corporate citizen', yet the removal of dead twigs for testing results in public insinuation of prosecution?

In November last year I advised this House about dying mature mallee gums immediately adjacent to Vodaphone's telephone tower in the Cobbler Creek recreation park. Vodaphone has recently admitted that herbicides it has used in the park may have been the cause of this damage and announced a guilt payment of \$10 000, just in case. In a media report, the National Parks Director confirmed Vodaphone's use of chemicals in this recreation park and went on to describe Vodaphone as a 'good corporate citizen'—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: It's an explanation—yet when I removed some dead and dying samples for testing it was publicly insinuated by the former minister that prosecution was a possibility. Will the minister advise whether it was the money that made the difference?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I will ignore the cheap throw-away line at the end. The honourable member is well aware that there is a set of standard procedures in relation to herbicides, etc., that are used in parks. I will send the honourable member a copy of the guidelines so that she is aware whether and how herbicides are used in parks.

OAK VALLEY SCHOOL

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Education. What progress has been made in providing a new school at Oak Valley in the Maralinga-Tjarutja lands? Last year I asked a question regarding the progress of this school, having visited the area and the five campuses of this school, all of which are within a radius of approximately five kilometres and which comprised a caravan, a substandard shed with no toilets and a tiny office from which staff worked. They were appalling substandard conditions and they were occupational health and safety risks to both staff and students. Promises were made that the school would progress very quickly.

I believe that His Excellency the Governor is visiting the area shortly, and I would be interested to know whether any progress has been made in respect of this new building, or whether the plans are still on someone's desk in the bureaucracy somewhere.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I will seek a report from the department in respect of the Oak Valley school and report to the honourable member in due course.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. What action is the minister's department taking to supplement the resources of the Noarlunga hospital accident and emergency section, and what success can he report in renegotiating funding arrangements with the commonwealth in the light of persistent cost transfers from the commonwealth to the state? Over the past two years, general practices in the south have been ceasing or cutting back on after hours consultancy services; and they are also experiencing difficulty in recruiting staff. Cessation of after-hours service by a major southern practice has left the community with little choice but to present at the Noarlunga hospital for treatment, thus causing extra expense to the state, frequently causing patients to wait for many hours and, on a number of occasions, to leave the waiting area without being treated.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): First, I must say that I have acknowledged the increasing pressure occurring at the accident and emergency department of the Noarlunga hospital as a result of the GPs dropping out of providing after-hours services. In fact, I gave evidence to the Senate inquiry on this matter because, effectively, this is a cost transfer from the state government to the federal government. The federal government raised the issue of cost transfer, and I highlighted the fact that this was a classic example of massive cost transfer, whereby the federal government was trying to put the cost on to the state government.

We acknowledge the pressures at the Noarlunga hospital, particularly in relation to accident and emergency cases. When I was at Noarlunga about six weeks ago for the community cabinet meeting, I was there for the start of work on the new accident and emergency facility to be built at the Noarlunga hospital. It will be a massive improvement of facilities at that hospital, involving an expenditure of about \$7 million. It is part of a broader program that this government has of investing in the capital infrastructure of hospitals. I am proud of the fact that as a government we have done that and made those commitments.

I had a meeting this morning with the AMA in which we again talked about this issue of provider numbers for doctors to provide after-hours locum services as GPs in the southern area. Initially, the federal minister indicated that he would provide provider numbers for these RMOs who had come out of the hospital and provided after-hours services, with the federal government being billed for the expense involved under the MBS scheme. Having made that announcement, the federal government made a further announcement, saying that it was withdrawing the proposal right around the whole of Australia. It was not just a unique situation here: it was also to occur in the other states. Then I heard just a couple of weeks ago that the federal minister was going to reinstate it, and we are trying to find out exactly where the federal government stands on this issue at present.

Certainly, there has been some chopping and changing on this issue in Canberra over the last few months. We are very keen indeed to make sure that after-hours locum services are provided in the south, because the people in that area deserve to be able to get medical attention when they need it without having to go to a hospital. It is inappropriate for the public hospital system to have to effectively pick up GP services after hours throughout the whole of the state. In fact, it should not occur anywhere and certainly not in the metropolitan area. Therefore, this is an issue that I am continuing to take up with the federal government. We will continue to put pressure on that government, and I am delighted to say that the AMA in South Australia is fully behind us.

ROAD CLOSURES

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Will the Minister for Tourism advise why some of the road closures for the Clipsal 500 event are to apply for a period of 10 days when some road closures for the Grand Prix were only for four days? The current road closures in the eastern suburbs are causing enormous disruption to the community in terms of travel time. In addition, local businesses have suffered because people cannot access them as readily as they normally have.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): What the member for Norwood has said is inaccurate. The Dequetteville Terrace two-lane closure was 25 days beforehand for the Grand Prix compared with 18 days for the Clipsal 500. At the time of the Grand Prix, Rundle Street was reduced to one lane each way four weeks prior to the event and was closed during the week, whereas now it is open at all times. Fullarton Road was closed on the Saturday and Sunday of the Grand Prix: for the Clipsal 500 it is open at all times, one lane each way.

I acknowledge that there have been substantial delays. However, the community of South Australia is clearly much more supportive than the member for Norwood in terms of what is happening with the Clipsal 500. What has caused some of the extended delays is that Bartels Road has been closed, and that has made a significant difference. The event and all the activities over this weekend will be quite sensational, and I think it is incredibly irresponsible to whip up anger about it.

KANGAROO ISLAND DESALINATION PLANT

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Minister for Government Enterprises to report on the progress of the desalination plant at Kangaroo Island and, in particular, indicate whether there have been any start-up problems and whether it is now running at full efficiency.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I am not sure of the import of the question, because I actually opened the Penneshaw desalination plant about six months ago, and the residents of Penneshaw are thrilled. More importantly, the South African company that brought its technology to South Australia to build the desalination plant was so pleased that it is basing its business and large amounts of its research here, so this is a major bonus for South Australia.

There was a lot of rumour and innuendo about nine months ago that there was some problem: perhaps that is what the Deputy Leader is picking up on. So that there can be no suggestion that this cutting edge technological industry, which is fabulous for South Australia and which has huge potential on the export market, can in any way be sullied by the attempts of the Deputy Leader to question it, I will explain that the rumours were that it was not working quickly enough so that there was not enough water. That was incorrect.

There was always going to be a need to fill the tanks above Penneshaw and, because it was actually opened in the summer, there was always a chance that that supply would go down, so we were tanking in water from Middle River so that the supply would be fine. As winter comes on, that will no longer be the case. I cannot see a problem.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Fisher.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come back to order: you have made your point.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I think the pineapple juice has fermented! Will the Minister for Human Services clarify the role of the war veterans hospital at Daw Park? I was contacted this morning by a constituent who had heard via the media that there were plans to bypass that hospital by forcing veterans to use other hospitals, including private hospitals.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): At about the beginning of last year there was an attempt to open the use of hospitals for veterans very widely and for the federal department to contract-in private hospitals. When I found out about this, I rang the federal minister and objected very strongly indeed. As a result, I was able to secure a new funding agreement for the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park and, through that, we received a guaranteed level of funding for that hospital for a number of years.

That hospital is now the preferred hospital for providing hospital services to returned service men or women who have been overseas representing Australia and fighting for this country. In the past 12 months that hospital has actually increased the number of its activities for veterans, so it has been a very successful campaign. If there have been reports in the media that there are some attempts by private hospitals to become the preferred hospital, I can assure them that that is not the case. The preferred hospital is the Repatriation General Hospital.

An agreement has been signed off with the government, and the level of activity there for veterans has actually increased. We have guaranteed funding from the federal government and, although later this year the federal government still wants to open up the possibility of contracts with private hospital providers, that will not alter the preferred

position of the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park. In fact, we have the very strong support of the RSL behind this as well. I want the honourable member to go back to the person who raised the issue with him this morning and reassure that person that Daws Road Repatriation Hospital is the hospital that we support very strongly indeed.

MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCING

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to the minister representing the Attorney-General. What is the government's policy on mandatory minimum sentencing?

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): It is the same as it was at the election: I refer you to the election policy.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee. The House will come to order. The member for Schubert did not rise on the call. I have now called the member for Lee.

RACING VENUE RATIONALISATION

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Can the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the House and the racing industry when the government will announce its preferred position on the venue rationalisation report? The government's 1996 venue rationalisation report still awaits the government's preferred recommendation and, during the Auditor-General's Report debate in October last year, the minister advised me in the House that he would announce the government's position before Christmas.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As the honourable member knows, we have been negotiating with the racing industry about the corporatisation of the industry and handing management of the industry back to the industry rather than government authorities in relation to harness and greyhounds and the industry authority in relation to thoroughbreds. As part of that process it is obvious that, if it does corporatise, ultimately those corporations will have responsibility for the venues. On the basis that the industry signs off on corporatisation, then the decisions relating to the venues will then be the industry's.

The SPEAKER: Order! So that there is no confusion on the part of members of the Chamber, when I called the member for Schubert he indicated to the chair by signal of hand that there was not a question. As a result of that, I then moved to the member for Lee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yesterday in question time the member for Elizabeth asked me two questions about cardiac services at the Flinders Medical Centre. The claim in

both questions was that the government had just closed cardiac services at Flinders Medical Centre. The member for Elizabeth was wrong in the claims she made. Cardiac services at Flinders Medical Centre remain unchanged. What has occurred is that a specialist private cardiac clinic changed its location and name. This clinic treats private patients under MBS funding. The Flinders Cardiovascular Clinic—a private clinic—has moved to the new private Flinders Hospital and is now called Flinders Heart Clinic, but it is still a private clinic.

I can assure the House that there has been no change in the level of services provided to public patients at Flinders Medical Centre. The member for Elizabeth has confused this private clinic with public cardiac services which continue to provide the same level of services free of charge to public patients. As I outlined to the House last week, public patients at Flinders Medical Centre now have access to the latest cardiac diagnostic equipment through an arrangement with Flinders Private Hospital. This enhanced service is for public patients and is provided free of charge. Quite simply, the member for Elizabeth has got it wrong—in fact, very wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to come to order. We are trying to conduct the business of the House.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I bring up the following reports of the committee: the 122nd report on the Pelican Point power station, transmission connection corridor (status report); the 123rd report on the Botanic Wine and Rose Development (status report); and the 124th report on the Royal Adelaide Hospital Development (stage 2 and stage 3A—final report), and move:

That the reports be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the reports be published.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the chair is that the House note grievances.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): It is important today to acknowledge that we are meeting here on Kaurna land and that we have with us Aboriginal elders and people for whom recent national developments in the process of reconciliation have seen us take giant steps backwards and inflict further hurt instead of addressing the grief of Aboriginal people so that we can all embark on the journey of healing. Here in South Australia, our parliament has apologised for the policy of forcible removal of Aboriginal children. We must go further now and again lead the way by more than just words, and acknowledge that this government policy has wreaked havoc on many generations of Aboriginal people.

The federal government's insistence on dealing with definitional issues is bizarre and demeaning. It belittles the experience of those who were forcibly removed from their families and of those families who were affected by the loss of their children. It speaks volumes about the federal government's absolute failure to participate in the reconciliation process with genuine goodwill.

The state Minister for Aboriginal Affairs told this House yesterday that there is no question that Aboriginal children were forcibly removed from their families. To forcibly remove or take someone or something from their rightful place is stealing, and stealing is a crime. We need to reinforce our stated belief that Aboriginal people have been hurt by the break-up of their families, by the actions of governments and by government policies. Honesty is now the best policy.

Aboriginal people have unique and special beliefs and spirituality that we are yet to fully understand and appreciate. The removal of any child from its parent is akin to taking away the parent's heart. To say that the heart is only 10 per cent of a person's body, and therefore not a whole body, is a nonsense and foolish, because we all know that without a heart a body cannot function. So, too, we can surely see that the statements defining the word 'generation' do not really address the damage and hurt inflicted by what is now exposed as a damaging, hurtful and destructive policy. The stolen generation is not an urban myth.

There are precedents for apologies, and those precedents show that apologies are a catalyst for healing. Other countries involved in colonisation have managed to recognise their first nations. Canada, the United States and New Zealand have all negotiated treaties. That Australia can lead the world in so many ways and yet remain tardy in one so fundamental to national harmony is damning. Now is the time for action, and there is action in Canberra today. About 70 members of the stolen generation will be taken to parliament by bus today to protest against the federal government's refusal to acknowledge their existence. The delegation, which has been drawn from various parts of New South Wales, will seek meetings with parliamentarians and observe debate in both houses of parliament.

The action Aboriginal people seek is adoption of the recommendations of the national inquiry 'Bringing Them Home'. That report reflected the personal stories of 535 people, a further 1 000 written submissions, along with evidence from 235 witnesses. Those witnesses included professional experts in the legal and mental health fields, church representatives, indigenous and other community organisations, and university researchers. The report makes detailed recommendations on national standard legislation designed to end the avenues of continued forced removal of such children through contemporary welfare and juvenile justice systems. It is time these recommendations received the attention of all governments under the leadership of the national government. Adoption of the recommendations would, of course, put an end to mandatory punishment for juveniles.

It is also revealed that only a fraction of the \$63 million set aside by the federal government to address key recommendations of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission inquiry into the stolen generation has been spent. How much has been spent in South Australia, and what will be done by future programs to show the way? South Australians can lead the way and begin the work on the implementation of the recommendations, and I urge all members in this House to encourage the government to be bold and courageous by working towards those implementations and their adoption.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

There being a further disturbance in the gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will speak on whatever subject I wish. I will not be told by the honourable member. At least people know where I stand on issues, not wobbling around like the honourable member. I wanted to raise another issue here. There appears to have been a falling out among the ranks of what is known as the ALP women's mafia. I do not know how widely it has been circulated, but I have just had given to me—it was put in my letter box, and I check my mail on a regular basis—a particularly interesting document, headed 'Bolkus left women sell out to right' and stating:

Carolyn Pickles, Stephanie Key, Gay Thompson, Jenny Rankine and Penny Wong have decided they would rather support Julie Woodman, a right-wing conservative woman candidate for preselection in Makin and a right-wing—

Mr HANNA: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a point of order.

Mr HANNA: I believe that in referring to certain members as 'selling out' there is an imputation against those members. I ask the member to withdraw and desist from such remarks.

The SPEAKER: I have considered that. I think it is more a colloquial term than an offensive term. I am also acutely aware that this is a general grievance debate and I do not believe that the member is out of order.

Ms KEY: On a point of order, sir. My understanding of the standing orders is that a member who refers to other members of parliament should actually address those members by the name of their electorate, or if it involves members in the upper house it is referred to as the other house.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order and ask the member to use the forms of the House.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am quoting from a document that has been widely circulated, and my understanding, from the reaction, is that it is attracting some particular interest around the community.

Ms RANKINE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the honourable member wishing to take a point of order, I remind members of the standing order that does allow me to stop the clock in this particular debate if continuous points of order prevent members from completing their remarks within five minutes. In that case I will stop the clock. I take the point of order.

Ms RANKINE: As to the statement made by the member for Stuart previously about support for a candidate who may be putting up their name for preselection, I feel it was impugning me, because I have not in any way indicated that support and what he is alleging is incorrect.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair's ruling is that the member has the right, if she is in the chamber, to stand up and make a personal explanation at any time.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will continue where I left off, as follows:

... preselection in Makin and a right wing male conservative in federal Adelaide than support a progressive young energetic woman, Jo Dwyer. These are the very same women who have long demanded more female candidates. But when the crunch comes, despite all their rhetoric, they follow the dictates of their male factional bosses—

like the member for Elder—

It is interesting to note that in recent factional deals the Bolkus left group has given the right the seats of Light, Hartley, Mawson and

Napier. . . The Bolkus left has enough votes in its own right to win a safe Senate spot and two Legislative Council seats.

Why is the Bolkus left giving so much away to the right? Perhaps they should change the name of their faction from the Bolkus left to the Bolkus right.

It is about time members of the Bolkus left acted like a true left rather than a weak appendage to the right. In particular it is about time Bolkus left women stood up for one of their own.

It is obvious that this document has attracted some attention, particularly from the member for Wright, who seems to be particularly agitated in relation to this matter.

I come to the member for Mitchell, who will also get a mention. The following page is entitled 'Lawyers take over the machine' and it says:

The following lawyers have been or are being supported for preselection: Pat Conlon, Kris Hanna, Jay Weatherill, John Rau, Tim Stanley—

Ms KEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: There being a point of order, stop the clock.

Ms KEY: Previously your ruling, sir, was that members of this House should be referred to by their seats in parliament and also members of the other house should be referred to correctly. I ask you to rule that the honourable member is out of order because he is not referring to those members correctly.

The SPEAKER: It is the chair's view that the member is reading from a document, which is one thing. It is another thing in the free flow of debate that you must use the forms of the House in referring to other members and another place. Start the clock. I call the member.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would not contravene the standing orders under any circumstances.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, that is right; I would not contravene them. However, this is too good not to read onto the record. The document further states:

No other social or occupational group has received such support. The Labor Party to be successful must have a broad range of candidates. Seven lawyers is making the ALP one dimensional and too narrow. It appears the machine faction has been taken over by a legal clique. It has to be hoped that the genuine rank and file members of the machine would start demanding a broader range of candidates.

It is interesting that this document was put in the letter box just this morning. Obviously, it has had an impact on the member for Mitchell, who has taken the bait hook, line and sinker. He has taken the bait and he has fallen in the mud because—

Ms KEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: There being a point of order, stop the clock again.

Ms KEY: That was my point of order: I thought the clock had got stuck because it seemed to be on two minutes for a very long time.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Restart the clock.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am enjoying this, as I know the member for Mitchell is, because he is one of the seven who, aided and abetted by the member for Elder, has ganged up on the member for Ross Smith. We are looking forward to the member delivering more pine-apples, and we are looking forward to Joan Kirner's intervention to save the member for Wright, who seems to take exception to this document. I do not know whether she has one of these documents in her letter box. I could arrange to

have them distributed around her electorate, if she would like it. She is so interested and seems to be so concerned about it that I will ensure that we distribute plenty around her electorate, and I will actually give the member a few.

Time expired.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Peake.

An honourable member: Are you a lawyer, Tom?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): No, I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that the Liberal Party is being held hostage by retired farmers who are treating parliament as a hobby—and I think it is disgraceful. It is very easy for one side of the House to talk about some manufactured pamphlet they have had put in their letter box, but I have a copy of the *Adelaide Review*, which is an excellent paper and which contains an excellent article called 'Death throes' by Chris Kenny, the friend of the Liberal Party. When your friends are talking about you in this way, I think you are in a bit of trouble.

The problems within the Liberal Party are so rotten that it has reached the core. Liberal members are openly talking about revenge rather than winning. I see the member for Coles with a nice little smirk on her face, because I understand that she is not exactly out of the woods, as it were, even though the emperor, the Premier, has intervened to save the member for Coles after she has lost the numbers in her branch, because she probably spends more time being mischievous in other peoples' branches rather than concentrating on her own.

According to Mr Kenny's article, one of the apparently bright young rising stars of the Liberal Party—I do not know about 'young'—is in quite a bit of trouble. The member in the biggest amount of trouble is the member for Unley. I understand that a young business man, Mr Pisoni, has won complete control, including that of the Kings Park branch of the Liberal Party. It seems that the Minister for Water Resources has lost the complete faith of the local members of his electorate and his branch.

Yesterday in this House the member for Schubert attacked a young preselection hopeful, Justin Jarvis. I wonder whether the member for Schubert has the courage to stand up outside this place and repeat those remarks. I bet, Mr Speaker, he does not, because he was factually wrong yesterday. He accused Mr Jarvis of all sorts of things in this House about which he is entirely wrong. Instead of treating parliament as a hobby or as a retired gentleman or retired farmer, the honourable member should go outside coward's castle and, on the front steps, repeat the remarks that he made in this House. I contend that members opposite are cowards. They are using this House for base political gain. We on this side of the House will not do that.

I again refer to Mr Kenny's article, which talks about senior prominent federal figures who are conspiring the downthrow of 'one of the most talented front bench ministers in this government'. It seems that the Hon. Senator Robert Hill is up to his neck conspiring to get rid of the member for Unley—as is Christopher Pyne, the member for Sturt. It seems to me that Mr Brindal does not have that many friends. The only mate he did have at the last round of preselections was the Minister for Human Services.

Ms Key interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That reminds me; I am glad the member for Hanson mentioned that. I understand that there has been an influx of members in the Unley sub-branch. I hear that the raffle prize has got a whole lot better since Stormy Summers joined.

I participate in this debate because I raised an issue with the Minister for Human Services earlier last year about dental health care. One of my constituents came to my office after having been to the Adelaide Dental Clinic in Frome Street. She visited a dental surgeon in that clinic who said that he did not have time to treat her tooth and that he would rather pull it out if he could. She came back to me quite distraught saying, 'I do not want to lose my tooth. I do not want to have it removed unnecessarily; what can you do?' I sent her to a dentist in the local area who spent 10 minutes with her and fixed her tooth—she saved her tooth.

If this is the way in which we are treating our elderly citizens in our public dental hospitals, it is an absolute disgrace, and the Minister for Human Services, instead of blaming Canberra, his former colleagues or the budget, should get off his backside and do something about it, because elderly South Australians deserve better than they are getting from this current Liberal Government.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): The headline on page 3 of the *Advertiser* of 16 March was 'We are the cannabis capital of Australia.' This disturbing title comes from a major report by the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence released on 15 March this year. The report states:

Syndicated cannabis cultivating groups continue to operate in South Australia. These groups are reported to be growing the legislated maximum amount of cannabis plants that does not attract criminal sanctions.

That is, three plants. The *Advertiser* article by police reporter Jeremy Pudney goes on to explain that in South Australia a person can grow up to three cannabis plants and be given only an on the spot fine rather than facing criminal charges. The maximum number of plants was reduced from nine to three last June to stop syndicates growing networks of small crops. However, the ABCI report predicts that the switch to the three plant rule will fail. It reveals that during 1998-99 New South Wales crime agencies arrested a number of people allegedly involved in a large scale cannabis cultivation syndicate based in South Australia. Also, police in New South Wales reported that cannabis is regularly found hidden in vehicles travelling from South Australia. Cannabis was exported from South Australia to other states by post, in freight and with air passengers. At the same time, South Australian heroin arrests have skyrocketed from 192 to 340 in just one year, 1998-99.

Our soft cannabis laws are a tragic legacy of the Bannon government of the 1980s. In those days it was the fashionable thing for the left wing intellectual types to smoke dope, and they liked to think it was harmless. We now know that marijuana is far from harmless. Not only does it cause lung cancer—it has more carcinogens than tobacco—but it also affects perception and short-term memory.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Elizabeth says it is wrong. At least 10 per cent of regular users become addicted. Marijuana can also trigger paranoia and serious schizophrenic attacks, with users far more likely to suffer schizophrenia than non-users. Last June at a drug forum in Sydney, Major Brian Watters, convenor of the National Council on Drugs, said:

Those of us who have worked in the field for many years know that marijuana is a gateway drug. We are not suggesting that everyone who uses marijuana goes on to use hard drugs—but almost everyone we meet who is heavily addicted to heroin crossed the boundary to illegal drugs via marijuana. I have just returned from a

conference of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Drug and Alcohol counsellors in Darwin. The stories they tell are horrendous.

He goes on to state:

I was horrified to learn that the Tiwi Islanders, with a potentially idyllic lifestyle, have the highest levels of youth suicide in the world—higher than anything else in Australia. The Tiwi speaker went on to say that the major cause of suicide in the Tiwi Islands is marijuana.

This story comes not just from Major Watters: the marijuana suicide link among the Tiwi people was confirmed by a Bathurst Island doctor on the ABC's *7.30 Report* on 12 August last year.

Because of the Bannon era laws, marijuana is ruining the lives of many young South Australian people. The recent change in the rules from nine plants to three was in the right direction, but police say it is not working. It is obviously not working. It is still an offence to cultivate three plants—if found—and a fine is issued, but is that three plants per person, or per property or per section or per house? If I had 23 sections on my farm, does that mean I could grow 23 times three plants? That is 69 plants. If I get caught, do I get a slap on the wrist? Either it is a crime or it is not. It is like being a little bit pregnant: either you are or you are not. So, growing marijuana is a crime or it is not. We need to repeal that law and reinstate it as a criminal offence with heavier penalties, including an educational program where the court sees that as relevant, say, for a first offence. This is my very strongly held personal view. I will in the weeks ahead explore the legislative opportunities to bring this about and have some commonsense action taken on this very serious and escalating problem.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Last Saturday I had the pleasure of launching a book written by Evelyn Robinson called *Adoption and Loss: the Hidden Grief*. The author, Evelyn Robinson, was born and raised in Renfrew, Scotland. She later emigrated to Bermuda and finally to Adelaide, where she currently lives. She is a former high school teacher and the mother of five children, of whom she has raised four. She is currently a social worker employed by the association representing mothers separated from their children by adoption. Aside from this book she has presented and published numerous papers on matters related to adoption. In this book Evelyn Robinson puts into a wider context her personal experience of adoption and that of her family and then goes on to link together other available research and points a way to the future.

She describes her life, feelings and personal journey with such clarity and honesty that the book is compelling reading. It is in three parts. The first concerns her own story: her childhood and adolescence, the adoption of her first child born out of wedlock in 1969, her subsequent marriage, the birth of her other children, the ups and downs, leading finally to the happy reunion with her family and Stephen, her first son. The second part examines the dimensions of grief and loss experienced by natural mothers who lost their children through adoption: grief and loss, compounded by feelings of shame, guilt, powerlessness and secrecy—grief that is not easily resolved. In part three, entitled 'What does it all mean?' Evelyn explores what adoption loss means for both the individual and the society in general and draws together research and understandings from many sources to point to her vision of a future without adoption, because in her view adoption is ethically wrong and morally indefensible.

I was impressed with her analysis in this last chapter and certainly impressed with the issues that she raised for all of us, and particularly legislators, to consider. She mentioned the government's need to take responsibility for the damage done by laws which were put in place with the best of intent but which caused a lot of damage to the people concerned; and responsibility of governments to provide ways for people to deal with the past and go forward. I believe that our own adoption act has gone a considerable way towards this, but we may need to do more. She makes the point that when adoptions occur they are and should be a service for needy children, not needy parents. She says that the view that adoption is a social option for infertile couples is wrong. I quote from her book:

No-one has a right to have a child. Some people have children, others do not. A person born without an arm does not expect other people to donate theirs. People without children should not expect other people to donate theirs either.

The things she said are quite challenging; they certainly challenged me to rethink my position and look at some of the alternatives that are now being brought forward, particularly in New Zealand, in relation to adoption policy and legislation. The book is far more than a sensitive account of one person's experiences: it challenges our thinking about the practices of adoption and presents policy options for the future. Evelyn Robinson has a powerful influence on her audience, and I saw it again last Saturday when she spoke. She is to be congratulated for her courage and commitment in producing a book that will help many people, whether or not they have been involved directly in adoption.

In closing I congratulate the newly formed publishing company Jacobyte Books. Jacobyte is a new South Australian electronic publishing company. I wish them well and recommend all members who are interested in this topic to get a copy, and they can seek more information at the web site inquiries at jacobytebooks.com.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): When I stood up last night to talk about the *Footy Show* and Sam Newman I did not imagine the reaction it would have in the community by this morning. Today I have been on five radio stations: 5AA, 5AN and the ABC in Adelaide, 3AW in Victoria and 6WA in Western Australia, and an article will also appear in the *Western Australian* paper tomorrow morning. My electorate office has received 80-odd calls, 95 per cent of which agree with us wholeheartedly. During my grievance speech last night I was not trying to deny Newman's ability as an entertainer: I was bringing the plight of unfortunate people to the attention of the parliament. I know that, as a young Australian boy of Greek parentage, I experienced racial vilification, which caused an enormous amount of anger within me. But the six people who were interviewed for the program last Thursday have been exploited on the basis of their socioeconomic standing. They were Australian battlers, down on their fortunes and with health problems, perhaps mental as well as physical.

As a nation I think that we are scraping the bottom of the barrel when, probably, one million people sit back in their lounge rooms on a Thursday evening and get their laughs by watching battling Australians being ridiculed by Newman. Last Thursday Newman interviewed a couple who had become engaged. The woman had been married on three occasions. Suddenly the camera moved from the faces to the feet of the couple to show that the gentlemen's trousers were

crumpled and three inches off the top of his shoes and that they were wearing \$20 sneakers from KMart.

When someone is getting social security of \$300 a fortnight it is a bit hard to wear \$300 shoes like those worn by Mr Newman, who is earning a multimillion dollar income every year. One of the most appalling things was that involving the Aboriginal woman sitting in Rundle Mall who was absolutely well groomed and immaculately dressed but some of her front teeth were missing. She told Newman that she had brought her six children down from the Northern Territory to give them half a chance at an opportunity of gaining employment in Adelaide and having a better life. Newman then put his arm around the woman and said, 'You are a very beautiful woman', and then looked at the camera and said, 'But I'll have to get a second opinion about that.'

It does not matter whether we are white, black or brindle, whether we are millionaires or paupers or sick or healthy: every person in the world has feelings and that is what Newman fails to recognise. If someone were interviewing his sister on television and degrading her in exactly the same way, it would be a different story completely. I believe that the show is going down the gurgler. Some figures obtained from the Western Australian radio station show that, over the past four years, there has been a continual decline in the number of people watching the show. People have been saying that they switched off the show a long time ago. I will be doing the same tonight and watching Brereton on Channel 7.

I will conclude by relating some comments that Mr Newman made on radio 5AA when he was told what I said. Mr Newman said, 'Well, Mr Condom—or whatever his name is—doesn't understand how the *Footy Show* works, but, look, I don't necessarily blame him for that.' I do know how the show works because I have been watching it since its inception. Mr Newman then goes on to say, 'How big a ratbag can you be when you're a member of the South Australian parliament, an ex-mayor who, single-handedly, helped lose the Grand Prix and probably plunged the state into some sort of financial crisis?' All I can say, Mr Newman, is that we will see you in court and see whether we can relieve your hip pocket.

Time expired.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

SPORTS DRUG TESTING BILL 2000

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the collection of samples from state competitors for testing for scheduled drugs and doping methods; to confer functions and powers on the Australian Sports and Drug Agency in relation to collecting and testing those samples; and for other related purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: 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.

Australia has a proud sporting tradition and our sporting achievements have long been considered a source of national pride. 'Fair play' has been a cornerstone of our nation's ethos. For over a century Australia has produced athletes of international quality. We are one of the few nations to have representatives at each of the modern Olympic Games.

Australia has had many outstanding sporting champions who act as role models and inspire the general population and specifically our young athletes. It is indeed fortunate that the youth of Australia can look at these champions and know that the vast majority of successes have been achieved without the use of performance enhancing drugs. In recent times fair competition has been maintained due to the diligence of such agencies as the Australian Sports Drug Agency (ASDA). ASDA is the key agency within Australia for developing drugs in sport education programs and sampling and testing programs among athletes. Australia's reputation internationally is as one of the 'world leaders' in the fight against drugs in sport.

A variety of chemical substances such as stimulants, anabolic steroids, diuretics, narcotic analgesics, peptide hormones and analogues, and doping methods such as blood doping, pharmacological, chemical and physical manipulations, are banned for health, ethical and legal reasons. Many drugs, especially if they are not used properly, can have serious effects on an athlete's health. Stimulants can cause elevated blood pressure and body temperature; steroids may result in acne, liver damage and behavioural changes; analgesics mask pain which may lead to an injury becoming worse, with other effects being poor coordination and nausea; peptide hormones can cause diabetes; blood doping side effects include blood clots, stroke and infections from sharing needles.

The majority of high performance athletes have a very clear but simple attitude when it comes to the use of banned performance enhancing substances and doping methods. It is cheating! Cheating in any form is 'un-Australian' and works to undermine the pursuit of excellence by athletes and devalues sport within general society. Doping is therefore not tolerated in sport and all attempts to eradicate its use are welcomed by all who value sport.

Under the Commonwealth legislation, ASDA, generally speaking, has the power only to test those competitors who are at the level of international competition. Unless a competitor in this State falls within the definition of 'competitor' in the Commonwealth Act, ASDA cannot test such a person, even though the person is at the top State level for competing in national sporting competitions. It is obviously desirable that all competitors who represent or have been chosen to represent South Australia at the most senior level, whether as individuals or members of a team, should be liable to testing, and this Bill seeks to confer power on ASDA to do so. It is important to note that testing may occur during a competition or 'out of competition'. It is widely accepted that testing 'out of competition', with no prior notification, is the most effective method from both a detection and a deterrent perspective.

The Office for Recreation and Sport has consulted widely with State sporting associations to determine the appropriate testing pool—those State athletes that ASDA will be able to test. As a result the following is proposed as the testing pool:

- Individuals, or members of a team, who represent (or have been selected to represent) South Australia, or a particular sport in senior open events (ie, national sporting competitions at the top level for the particular sport that are open to all ages).
- Members of State training squads from which persons will be chosen for senior open events.
- Persons who are on a scholarship with the South Australian Sports Institute, or who receive assistance (financial or use of facilities) from the Institute.

Australia has a reputation for being a sporting nation that strongly opposes the use of drugs to enhance performance. If Australia is to protect and enhance this reputation, the State, Territory and Commonwealth Governments will need to work in partnership with sport to strengthen anti-doping activities that influence current and future generations of high performance athletes. The involvement of sport and governments at the State, Territory and Commonwealth levels provides an opportunity for a truly national approach to achieve drug-free sport.

A working party made up of representatives from each State and Territory, the Australian Sports Commission and the Australian Sports Drug Agency was established to develop the National Drugs in Sport Framework. This working party chaired by the Australian Drug Agency, consulted widely with national, State and Territory sporting organisations about what a national approach should seek to achieve and how it should be implemented.

The following are a summary of key strategies, which will contribute to achieving the framework goals:

- Develop drugs in sport policies in the government and sports sectors.

- Initiate drugs in sport education programs which aim to increase the skills and knowledge of athletes, coaches, administrators, medical practitioners and others who may influence athletes.
- Enact complementary legislation to enable the implementation of effective event and out of competition drug testing programs at the National, State and Territory levels.

Before proposing this legislation, it was imperative that a State Government policy that represented the views of the South Australian sporting community was developed.

As a result of broad consultation, such a policy on drugs in sport has been developed.

Drugs in sport education assists in helping athletes avoid inadvertent doping, reducing the concerns of athletes, coaches and administrators regarding the drugs in sport issue, and deterring athletes from using banned substances.

Over the past three years, the Office for Recreation and Sport has provided support and assistance to enable Sports Medicine Australia (SA Branch) to operate the Drugs in Sport Project. The project works to ensure that drugs in sport education is accessible to the South Australian sporting community. This program also offers State sporting organisations support and assistance in understanding policy issues.

With the education and policy aspects in place, this Bill will effectively achieve the final key strategy of the Framework in relation to State based drug testing.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause requires the Act to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause provides some necessary definitions. The expression 'Commonwealth Act' means the Commonwealth Act and regulations and orders under the Act, as in force from time to time. The definition of 'drug testing scheme' makes it clear that such a scheme under the Commonwealth Act may be modified by regulations made under this Act. The definition of 'senior open sporting event' is relevant to the definition of 'State competitor' which is set out in clause 4.

Clause 4: State competitors

This clause defines a State competitor. A person is a State competitor if he or she represents, or is to represent, a particular sport, or this State, in senior open national competitions. A person is a State competitor if he or she is a member of a State squad from which individual competitors or team members are selected to compete in open national sporting events at the top level. A South Australian Sports Institute scholarship holder is also a State competitor, as is a person who has been suspended from competition as a result of having had his or her name entered on the Register in consequence of this Act.

Clause 5: Functions and powers of the Agency

This clause sets out the functions of ASDA under this Act. Those functions are generally to educate the sporting community about the liability of State competitors to be tested for drugs and the consequences of testing positive, and to collect and test samples from State competitors in accordance with any relevant drug testing scheme. ASDA may do anything that is necessary, convenient or incidental to performing its functions. (It should be noted that, under section 9A of the Commonwealth Act, ASDA cannot perform functions or exercise powers that have been conferred by a State Act unless the relevant Commonwealth Minister has given ASDA written approval to do so).

Clause 6: Agency may request samples

This clause gives ASDA the power to request a State competitor to provide a sample and to make other ancillary requests of the competitor or of relevant sporting organisations. The power set out in this clause must be exercised in accordance with the relevant drug testing scheme. Subclause (3) sets out the circumstances in which a competitor will be taken to have failed to comply with a request for a sample.

Clause 7: Obtaining samples from competitors under the age of 18 years

This clause requires parental consent before a sample can be obtained by the Agency from a State competitor who is under 18 years of age. Such consent may be given generally or in relation to a particular request for a sample.

Clause 8: Entry of information on Register

Clause 9: Notification of entry on Register

These clauses require ASDA to enter a State competitor's name on the relevant Register maintained by the Agency if the competitor fails to comply with a request for a sample, or a sample tests positive. If a name is entered on a Register, the competitor and each relevant sporting organisation must be notified in writing. The competitor must be informed of his or her right to have ASDA's decision reviewed.

Clause 10: Review by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal of Agency's decisions

This clause gives a State competitor a right of review if his or her name has been entered on a Register. The Commonwealth Administrative Appeals Tribunal is the review body.

Clause 11: Removal of entries from Register

This clause requires ASDA to remove a State competitor's name from a Register if the competitor is successful on a review. All relevant persons or bodies must be notified of the removal.

Clause 12: Additional requirements as to notification

This clause sets out various additional requirements for the giving of notice by the Agency when it adds or deletes a State competitor's name on or from the Register. The Minister must be notified if an S.A. Sports Institute scholarship holder's name is entered or removed. The Agency must also comply with a request from the Minister for information about the entry or removal of a State competitor's name on or from the Register. A sporting organisation that has been notified by the Agency of the entry of a State competitor's name on the Register must advise the Minister of the action it has taken, or proposes to take, as a result of that entry.

Clause 13: Giving of notices

This clause provides that notices given under this Act must be given in the manner set out in the Commonwealth Act

Clause 14: Drug testing schemes to be laid before Parliament

This clause requires the Minister who has the responsibility for this Act to cause drug testing schemes and amendments to such schemes to be laid before Parliament. Any such scheme that had been promulgated before this Act comes into operation must also be so tabled.

Clause 15: Regulations

This clause gives the Governor power to make regulations for the purposes of this Act.

Mr WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOXING AND MARTIAL ARTS BILL 2000

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to regulate professional or public boxing or martial art events; to promote safety in boxing and martial arts; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: 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.

Boxing and martial arts are competitive sports in which the primary aim is for opponents to strike blows against each other. This fact alone differentiates them from all other sporting activities and, when coupled with financial and other incentives for those involved in contests, presents governments around the world with challenges related to ensuring the safety of participants and the probity of events.

The Martial Arts Industry Association, the peak national body representing most martial arts associations in Australia, has advised that in Thailand, for example, there are currently about 39 Australian kickboxers training at various camps. Over the next two years these fighters will be returning to Australia after having trained in camps where the art of striking fatal blows is an accepted and often applauded talent. On average between 30 and 40 people a year are killed in Thai boxing bouts in Thailand. The MAIA also advises that similar fatality rates are experienced in Cambodia, Burma and Laos.

Members may also recall that in November 1998 the national media reported on two girls engaged in a boxing competition on Australia's Gold Coast. A photograph accompanying the text showed one of the girls in tears.

These events have sparked community debate surrounding boxing and martial arts sports, management of these activities and the role of government regulation.

In response to this debate, Ministers for Recreation and Sport throughout Australia agreed to investigate the issue of appropriate management of boxing and martial arts.

Ministers agreed that the major objective of any legislation should be to promote contestant safety and ensure probity within the industry.

To that end, a Government Officers Working Group on boxing and martial arts was established and met at the end of March 1999. As a result of that meeting a set of draft National Principles has been developed.

Further meetings determined that it was preferable for each State to consider legislation in relation to boxing and martial arts based upon the nature and size of the industry within their respective jurisdictions.

In line with those concepts, I am today introducing the *Boxing and Martial Arts Bill 2000*. This bill, the result of extensive consultation with stakeholders in the boxing and martial arts industry, will require promoters of boxing and martial arts events to be licensed. Licences will require promoters to operate under rules approved by the Minister and the use of appropriately skilled people, including officials accredited under the National Officiating Program. Where appropriate the use of protective equipment will also be required.

The bill also requires all contestants in boxing and martial arts events to be registered on a national register and to be examined by a qualified medical practitioner both prior to, and after, events so that injuries are tracked and, if contestants are injured, contestants fully recover before competing again.

The Government's view in relation to the management of boxing and martial arts is that, in as many situations as possible, the sport should develop the rules, regulations and codes of practices.

However, the legislation will give the Minister the right to approve the contest rules and, if the Minister is not satisfied that the rules are appropriate, the Minister may approve variations to those rules.

There is wide recognition in the community that there is a growth in the Martial Arts industry and some concern has been expressed that the legislation would, in fact, stop instructors from teaching martial arts. This, however, is not the case. This bill is designed to ensure the probity of contests and the safety of contestants around events rather than around instruction.

Instead instructors, as with others involved within the martial arts industry, will be invited to adopt a code of conduct designed to ensure that the highest standards possible are practiced within the industry which, when combined with this bill, will prevent unnecessary injury and instil confidence in the industry.

I commend this bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the measure. In particular—

- boxing is defined as fist fighting;
- martial art is defined as kickboxing or a sport or activity (other than boxing) organised so that contestants engage in a fight principally by inflicting blows on each other;
- professional or public boxing or martial art event is defined as a boxing or martial art event that is conducted for profit or in which the contestants participate for money or a prize or public attendance at which is actively promoted (whether or not a fee is to be charged for admission).

Clause 4: Advisory committee

This clause provides that the Minister may set up an advisory committee to obtain advice on matters relating to the administration of the measure.

Clause 5: Minister may delegate

This clause gives the Minister power to delegate any powers or functions under the measure.

Clause 6: Promoters must be licensed

This clause makes it an offence to act as a promoter of a professional or public boxing or martial art event without a licence. The maximum penalty for non-compliance is \$10 000 or 12 months imprisonment. The Minister must issue a licence to a person if satisfied that the person is an adult (where the applicant is a natural person) and that the person is a fit and proper person to hold a

licence. A licence remains in force for three years and may be renewed.

Clause 7: Conditions attached to licences

This clause provides that a promoter's licence may be subject to conditions determined by the Minister which may be varied or revoked at any time. Failure to comply with conditions is an offence and has a maximum penalty of \$10 000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

Clause 8: Duties of promoter

A licensed promoter must ensure in respect of any professional or public boxing or martial art event that he or she promotes—

- that the event is conducted in accordance with rules approved by the Minister under the measure; and
- that the contestants are registered as required under the measure; and
- that the contestants have been found to be fit to participate.

Breach of these duties is an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of \$10 000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

Clause 9: Suspension or cancellation of licence

This clause gives the Minister power to suspend or cancel a promoter's licence.

Clause 10: Minister to approve rules for conduct of events

This clause provides that the Minister will approve rules for the conduct of professional or public boxing and martial art events. Such rules may adopt, or operate by reference to, any specified code, standard or other document. The approval of rules and any amendment or revocation of rules is to be notified in the *Gazette*.

Clause 11: Person must not compete unless registered

This clause makes it an offence for a person to compete in a professional or public boxing or martial art event unless the person is registered. The maximum penalty is \$5 000. The offence does not apply to a person who is registered or otherwise authorised to compete in such events by a recognised authority in another State or Territory unless the person has been given notice by the Minister.

Clause 12: Application for registration

This clause sets out the procedure for applying for registration as a contestant and provides that such registration remains in force for three years and may be renewed.

Clause 13: Suspension or cancellation of registration

A contestant's registration must be suspended or cancelled if it appears to the Minister, from a medical practitioner's certificate or declaration, that the contestant is not fit to engage in professional or public boxing or martial art events of the kind in relation to which the contestant is registered. In such a case the Minister cannot remove the suspension or re-register the person unless provided with two medical certificates certifying that the contestant is fit to compete.

The Minister may, in addition, suspend or cancel a contestant's registration if the contestant has contravened the measure or a corresponding law or has been a contestant in a professional or public boxing or martial art event after being declared to be unfit to compete.

Clause 14: Compulsory medical examinations before and after events

A contestant in a professional or public boxing or martial art event must be examined by a medical practitioner within 24 hours before and after the event. These examinations must be conducted by a medical practitioner in accordance with the regulations and, if the contestant is found to be unfit, the medical practitioner must take the action specified in the clause.

Breach of any of the requirements of the clause results in a maximum penalty of \$5 000.

Clause 15: Review by Minister

This clause provides for review, by the Minister, of a decision under Part 2 or 4 of the measure.

Clause 16: Appeal to District Court

This clause provides a right of appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

Clause 17: Exemptions

This clause gives the Minister power to exempt a person, or a class of persons, from specified provisions of the measure.

Clause 18: False or misleading information

It is an offence to make a statement that is false or misleading in information provided, or a certificate or declaration given, under the measure.

Clause 19: Prosecutions

Prosecutions under the measure can only be commenced with the consent of the Minister.

Clause 20: Evidence

This clause provides for the acceptance, in evidence, of certain Ministerial certificates.

Clause 21: Service of notices

This clause provides for the service of notices under the measure.

Clause 22: Regulations

This clause provides a regulation making power.

SCHEDULE

The Schedule amends section 8 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953* to make it consistent with the measure.

Mr WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (BHP INDENTURES)
BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April. Page 787.)

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise in support of this bill. This is an issue on which we must act in a bipartisan manner in support of the interests of jobs and the people of Whyalla, and I have made it clear from day one that the opposition would do just that. Whyalla has, for too long, been saddled with an unemployment rate way above the state let alone the national average; and for too long the city has suffered the economic and social effects of net population loss. For too long the people of Whyalla have suffered the impact of the rug being pulled out from under them in terms of essential government services, such as health and education. For Whyalla the continuity of the long products steel and manufacturing operations is a make or break issue.

I said in the House on Tuesday that the opposition and I have been very pleased by the level of goodwill and cooperation from members of the company, BHP. It has been exemplary of what can be achieved by bodies such as the Whyalla council and the Whyalla Economic Development Executive. I want to pay particular tribute to the efforts of the Labor member for Giles and the Secretary of the Whyalla Woomera Branch of the Australian Workers Union, Geoff Buckland, and his very hard working staff. More in sorrow than in anger, I have to say that the federal Liberal member for Grey, Barry Wakelin, has been virtually invisible on this issue, much as he was about all the service and job cuts performed on the people of Whyalla by the Howard government. I think that Barry Wakelin is just another example of the fact that having nine out of 12 Liberal MHRs in South Australia is not in this state's best interests.

As I explained on Tuesday this week, the first issue that had to be addressed was the way in which BHP was to divest itself of long products. The opposition, together with the council, the unions and the community believed that some form of public float was the best way to assure continuity rather than the foreclosure, or the death by a thousand cuts, of the manufacturing operation. I first went to Whyalla in the company of Don Dunstan, I think it might have been in the same year that the shipyard closed; and at different stages, of course, we have seen Whyalla hit time and again by economic decisions that did not reward a city, a work force and a population that had the skills and the guts to not only make steel and make ships but do it well.

We have seen an incredibly loyal work force of BHP in Whyalla. Despite all the knocks, despite the closure of the shipyard, despite the lay-offs after lay-offs over the years, redundancy packages, and so on, we have seen a work force which has remained loyal to BHP and which saw BHP as part of its future and part of the ongoing future of the city of

Whyalla. Of course, Whyalla has not just sat back in terms of being the recipient of those decisions. The Whyalla work force has been there with the Whyalla Regional Development Board and the council trying to diversify, but also adjusting to the changes that needed to be made to make BHP's operations at Whyalla competitive and world competitive. That has been, I guess, the task over the last few years. On every visit that I have made to Whyalla, at the invitation of both the local member and of Geoff Buckland, the workers and the union representatives have said to me, 'We have to make this work; we want this to be an ongoing concern; we want to make this world's best practice; we are committed to improving productivity; we are committed to reducing the level of pollution; we are committed to seeing an ongoing future.' That is why it was important for us all to try to secure the Alice Springs to Darwin railway.

Whilst it would not contribute much in terms of jobs at BHP's Whyalla Long Products Division, it would be a massive fillip in terms of BHP's Whyalla operations supplying the railway sleepers for that huge project. Therefore, it is with a degree of sorrow that all of us heard the decision last year that BHP wanted to divest itself of its Long Products Division, which included its Whyalla operations.

There was a great deal of community disquiet about what this would mean. Would there be a trade sale? There had been speculation for some time that in fact BHP would get out of steel. There was speculation for some time that the BHP operations at Whyalla would be closed down. There was speculation that there would be a trade sale which would see the Long Products Division sold off to an overseas concern that may not only cut up the operations or close down some of them but even see the closure of the entire works at Whyalla.

We had seen what happened in the eastern states and feared that the same would happen to Whyalla. So, the unions, led by Geoff Buckland, worked with the management to try to ensure that it was an ongoing concern that was up for sale or an ongoing concern which was competitive and which could be publicly floated. I met with delegates, workers and the member for Giles shortly after the decision was made in November last year. There was disquiet and anger, but there was always determination to make the thing work. I know that at that stage there was speculation in the media that there would be industrial action, and so on. The point that we made collectively to the work force and to the union representatives was that we had to make sure that we put the operations in the best possible light for, hopefully, a public float. It was always our view that, if BHP was to get out of its Long Products Division, a public float was preferable to a trade sale, because a public float would by its very nature see an investment and reinvestment in the operations at Whyalla.

Of course, we lobbied for that, as I am sure the government did, in meetings with BHP in Adelaide, Whyalla and Melbourne. We came to a collective agreement. The opposition, together with the council, the unions and the community, believed that some form of public float was the best way to ensure continuity rather than the full closure of the manufacturing operations. In February, the member for Giles and I went to Melbourne and met with senior representatives of the company to express our strong preference for a public float of the Long Products Division. Shortly thereafter, the company announced plans very much along these lines for a partial float or sell down.

As I also explained last Tuesday, we later met with Dr Bob Every, head of the new company, to pursue other key

matters to the company's divestment, for instance, the donation of unused industrial land. Perhaps members do not realise that, when the indenture acts were established, a huge amount of land was made available for BHP's existing and, perhaps, future use. With the decision either to divest or float the company, a great deal of industrial land was locked up as indentured BHP land. We wanted BHP to return that land to the community so that it could be used for the diversification of local industry.

One thing we were pressing for was the donation by BHP of unused industrial land back to the community. We also wanted to see an improvement in environmental efforts. Of course, we recognise over recent times that, whilst the indenture basically gave BHP carte blanche to do what it liked, there were virtually no environmental impediments whatsoever. BHP could have been a great polluter. In fact, however, BHP acted as a good neighbour in recent years by spending tens of millions of dollars to build environmental improvements into its operations.

I shall provide one example: I think \$40 million was spent on filters for the system to prevent air emissions. In terms of marine emissions, there was the very famous—and I believe soon to be world famous—use of nature to try to cut down water-borne pollutants that would enter the gulf. Indeed, there is the story of the search around the world for suitable reeds that could be grown in reed beds which the polluted water would be passed across, testing which reeds were efficient in terms of minimising pollution and absorbing heavy metals, other acids and so on that would have normally gone into the gulf. I understand that if you go to Whyalla, as I have, and look at the reed beds, you will see that reed beds from everywhere failed the task, except those that came from the Little Para River in Salisbury. They seemed not only to thrive on the pollution that was put across them but also reduced the level of emissions by 50 per cent.

So, here was a smart staffer at BHP's Long Products Division who basically came up with an idea, saw how it applied in Wales, looked at how it applied in the United States and went out to seek a natural solution to an industrial problem. The end result is not only Salisbury reeds growing well under extreme conditions but also something which has application for a range of other industries. So, that was very important. It was no longer the case that the successor to BHP Whyalla would not have carte blanche to pollute the environment, because the successor to BHP's Whyalla operations may not be the same good neighbour. In fact, we wanted to see much stronger environmental protections because, if we are building an aquaculture industry around cleanliness in terms of the environment in this state, it makes absolute sense to make sure that we reach world's best practice not only in terms of productivity, product and value adding but also in terms of the environmental effects.

The other thing we wanted was the payment of increased rates to the Whyalla council. The fact is that, under the indenture provisions of the 1930s and 1950s, BHP Whyalla was not required to pay any rates whatsoever to the Whyalla City Council. BHP, of course, always argued that it made contributions in kind—that it actually made payments, although it was not required to do so. Grace and favour payments were made to the city council. I know that the member for Giles made a point of arguing that, with BHP out of the picture and with the changes that would need to be made to the indenture to facilitate the public float or sell down of its operations, obviously it would be good to see the

normalisation in this new century of a major industry which pays its rates and pays its way to the local council.

We are therefore delighted that the negotiations the government entered into paralleled those of the Whyalla City Council, the unions, the local member and the opposition, and that this decision has been reached for an agreement for ongoing payment. The Premier said that over the next 20 years the payment of city council rates would be about four times greater than the payments that had been made in kind over the previous 20 years.

So, the outcomes have been positive, with BHP's management, including the new managers of its operations at what will be a new company, agreeing to make a substantial donation of land for an industrial park of around 700 hectares. Very significant and important parts of the indentured land will be returned. They have also agreed to operate under the full terms, conditions and jurisdiction of the Environment Protection Authority, and to provide extensive additional land for the existing conservation park, which is adjacent to the indentured land.

So, one chunk of land is going for an industrial park of about 700 hectares and about 100 hectares that is contiguous to a conservation park is being added to that park. I understand that BHP has already taken active steps in environmental improvement. As I noted previously, the existing Indenture Acts of 1937 and 1958 allowed BHP an unfettered right to discharge waste into the sea and air, and it has now agreed to come under the full jurisdiction of the Environment Protection Authority of this state. Therefore, with the new operators in a new century, we have a level playing field with other businesses in terms of the environment.

I noted the rates. We understand that BHP's successor will make ongoing contributions to the council that will grow to \$550 000 per annum by 2007. I was also keen to see a good agreement reached on the issue of the access of other enterprises to the port, and I hope that when the Premier responds he can give us some guidance in that area. That would be in my view an important plus in terms of helping to attract new businesses to the industrial park.

No-one is saying, of course, that it should be just an open go: obviously, BHP's successor should have first rights in terms of the wharf and port facilities at Whyalla. We are simply saying that other industries should be able to use the same excellent port facilities, given that the new industrial park is so close to port access. This would give another string to the bow of the industrial park, and help the regional development board and the Whyalla council to make sure that that is a success.

I am also gratified that the new CEO of the Long Products Division—and I think they are toying with various names, such as Alliance Steel, although that is yet to be resolved—has made clear that Whyalla and the mineral deposits in the Middleback Ranges will be the core of the new steel company that will emerge over time. People will be aware that there has been speculation for many years now that the ore supplies were running out. That is no longer the case, thanks to a great deal of expenditure and effort by BHP on exploration.

It wanted to firm up the continuation of ore reserves for the future so that the Long Products Division could be sold as an ongoing concern, and I understand that 20 to 25 years of ore supplies have already been proven up. Of course, Iron Duchess and Iron Knight deposits have been proven up and are ready to run. As I said previously, we also need to work to gain further benefits from the company, which I know to

be mindful of and grateful for the support of the Whyalla community over so many decades.

Any such further contributions need to be directed at the diversification and expansion of industry and jobs in the Whyalla region. But the responsibility is not BHP's alone: Liberal governments have failed the people of Whyalla. Despite a falling population, Whyalla's unemployment rate is still well above that of our state, and there is an urgent need to develop and diversify jobs and industry in the region.

In 1993, when I was Business and Regional Development Minister, I introduced Australia's first enterprise zones status for Whyalla, which would have given a boost to new eligible investment and jobs. Interestingly, the commonwealth government has subsequently introduced enterprise zone arrangements for the city of Newcastle for manufacturing in bond arrangements.

The deal we offered the Whyalla Development Board back in 1993 was that at its Whyalla Resource Development Zone, an industrial estate in its own right, we were prepared to offer to any prospective investor relocating from interstate or overseas a 10-year exemption from payroll tax, a 10-year exemption from land tax, stamp duties and a range of other state government charges, plus an incentive package plus, following negotiations with the Whyalla council, a total exemption from council rates for 10 years; then, of course, normal processes would apply.

I got the idea from one of John Major's ministers who was visiting this parliament in October 1992 and who told me of the success of a rolling series of enterprise zones in Britain, particularly in the north of Britain, in Scotland, in the Newcastle area, Outer Manchester area and in Wales. I think similar enterprise zones may have applied in Sheffield and in Northern Ireland. The deal in Britain was to create each year a new enterprise zone and give a whole series of tax concession to regional development boards so that they could kickstart interest and activity in industrial estates.

In 1993 we were proposing to kick off with Whyalla with a range of tax concessions and the following year to extend enterprise zone status to Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Each, after 10 years, would be returned to normality. No-one pretended that enterprise zone status in its own right would win the business, but it was an extra tool for the local regional development board and council that, when explaining to people that there was access to a range of minerals, port facilities, highly skilled work force, cheap electricity or what have you, in addition to those positives they could also offer a 10-year exemption from state government taxes and charges and a 10-year exemption from council rates.

I would like to see not only working with local government but pressure being placed on the Howard government to give the same commonwealth tax enterprise status to Whyalla. That way we could offer Whyalla commonwealth enterprise zone status, as has been given to Newcastle; state enterprise zone status, as was offered back in 1993; and local government exemption from rates.

Unfortunately, this government has had no interest in regional development until recently with the report, and one of the first acts of the Brown Government when it took office was to take away the enterprise zone status from Whyalla and to revoke the intention of extending it to Port Pirie, Port Augusta and elsewhere. Of course, the government has now rediscovered the regions following the Victorian election and a series of polls showing that regional South Australia was in a state of revolt against this government and its members because local people felt they were being taken for granted.

They saw what happened to Jeff Kennett interstate and suddenly discovered the regions.

This is why I believe that the government should learn the lessons of this mistake and reintroduce enterprise zone status for Whyalla, and indeed the other Upper Spencer Gulf cities. That would give tax free status for approved new investment for up to 10 years and, unlike other government industry attraction deals, the enterprise zone would not reward promises that are not delivered but would be given strictly on the basis of actual performance and jobs created.

Companies that would qualify for assistance within the enterprise zone would add to the region a range and significant number of secure and well paid jobs; involve value adding activities; meet agreed targets for job creation or become liable for reduction in incentives; and be committed to continued operations in the region for the long term. The land donated by BHP for an industrial park in my view would be ideal for consideration as an enterprise zone.

I am asking the Premier and the parliament to consider granting enterprise zone status to the new industrial park that is being created on land that was formerly BHP indentured land to give the local Whyalla community a head start and a kick start to win new industries, to diversify and to create new jobs. Of course, enterprise zones are not just about attracting industry solely on the basis of favourable tax treatment. We also need to work with unions, industry, educational institutions and local government to create advantages in skills, infrastructure and technology that will help to sustain Whyalla into the future.

I also want to talk about an idea that, I think, came from a group of people which included the member for Giles, the local union secretary (Geoff Buckland) and Phil Tyler at the Regional Development Board and others. Given that BHP is getting out of Whyalla, and having regard to the massive contribution made by the people and city of Whyalla to BHP over many decades, given its commitment, as I understand, to a corporate code of ethics, BHP should consider what has been described as a parting gift to the city of Whyalla. There has been a great deal of debate about what that parting gift might be. I have certainly had discussions with BHP and the member for Giles about it.

I think there is a growing consensus that the Whyalla campus of the University of South Australia should be considered for targeted assistance. When we introduced the bill in 1990 to establish the new University of South Australia, when I was the minister initiating that process, we put into place a number of things in the legislation. For a start, there was the biggest commitment to equality of opportunity of any university's legislation in the history of Australia. That was designed to ensure that, rather than become some kind of Oxford on the Torrens, the University of South Australia would be very much the people's university which would be committed to access and equity principles, committed to equality of opportunity, and which would have a special focus on higher education involving our indigenous peoples. I am pleased it had the first faculty of Aboriginal studies in Australia's history; I am disappointed that is no longer being continued, but it still has a strong commitment to Aboriginal students, a strong commitment to women, a strong commitment to the migrant community and a strong commitment to ensuring that it was a university that would reach out to encourage and give opportunities to young people who came from places such as Salisbury and Whyalla, and so on, to make the most of their potential.

Education is the key to opportunity and the key to advancement, and every time I went to Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta parents said to me that they were lamenting the fact that their children had to leave the Spencer Gulf area in order to try to find employment or educational opportunities either in Adelaide or interstate. They said that the Whyalla campus needed to be not only maintained but also built upon to make it truly a regional centre and a key part of the university and not some kind of outlying province.

I was recently on a plane sitting next to the professor who is dean of the University of South Australia's Whyalla campus, and he talked to me about some of his ideas of making the Whyalla campus not only proactive in terms of attracting overseas students who would contribute to and spend money in the town but also that there had been a huge addition to the number of students doing PhDs out of the Whyalla campus. He also talked about the Israeli model. I think he went to the Bathsheba campus in the Negev Desert, and I visited the Negev Desert to look at some of the operations at the university shortly before Christmas during my visit to Israel.

That university in a country which is dynamic and creative and which has a great investment in sustainable development, in the environment and in regional development, has become a major focus in the Middle East for studies in regional development and what can be done. We would like to see the Whyalla campus grow in status and stature as well as in the number of courses it offers, and it would be a fantastic parting gift for the people of Whyalla if BHP's management, as a parting gift, could make a substantial donation of some millions of dollars to the University of South Australia, where the money would be designated for the university Whyalla operations to build a regional focus for sustainable regional development, for instance, renewable energy and solar energy, as well as a range of other areas. I think this is something on which we should concentrate and that we have an opportunity to keep going with our discussions with BHP so that its departure from the city of Whyalla is seen as one that leaves not only an ongoing industrial operation but also a shining symbol of its belief in the contribution of thousands of people in Whyalla who have worked for or been associated with BHP and its operations.

The opposition supports this bill. I had intended to move an amendment today in terms of trying to ensure that there is consideration and debate about enterprise zone status. I have given BHP, the unions, the local member and the government our assurance of swift passage of this bill. This bill was supposed to be debated next week but we have assisted to bring on debate on the bill early so that we can assist BHP in its preparations for a sale. We do not want to do anything that would in any way impede BHP's success in a successful sell down or public float. Therefore, I will leave consideration of enterprise zone status for the industrial estate for the government—and it is something we might return to at a later date or perhaps in the Legislative Council. I think we need to ensure that this handover of 700 hectares of land for an industrial estate is not just a gesture. The land by itself is a nice exchange, but we want to see industries located there, and we want to give the Regional Development Board the tools it needs to do the job.

I have tried to be brief today. In closing, I will make sure that the Labor Party continues to support the city of Whyalla. The Labor Party is inextricably linked to Whyalla. The Labor Party and the people of Whyalla have worked together over many years. I went there for the first time with Don Dunstan,

and then with people like Des Corcoran and Jack Wright. There is a great deal of affection for Don Dunstan in Whyalla. His last visit to Whyalla as Premier was an incredibly moving event, with many hundreds of people giving him standing ovations at various meetings around the town because Whyalla people are canny and savvy, and they know ultimately that it is only the Labor Party that is on their side. I have great pleasure in commending this bill to the House.

Ms BREUER (Giles): Today I rise with pleasure also to support this bill. The Whyalla community is very pleased with the deal that has been negotiated, including the gifts of land, ex gratia payments that council will receive and the port access that will now be available, and it is also pleased that the environmental issues have been sorted out. This is part of the agreement reached between BHP, the city council and also the state government.

I am very pleased to see Mr Peter Lockett here today, because there are some issues that arise from this act on which I would like some clarification, particularly before it goes to another place and is passed there. Peter Lockett has been very active in helping us negotiate these deals with BHP, the council and the state government.

I would like to know what consistency the council will have with the agreement with BHP, and also ultimately who will be responsible for the rehabilitation of the mine sites around that area, some of which have already been closed in the past and leave a considerable problem in those areas. As a community, we would also like to know who will be responsible at the end of the day for the clean-up of the site occupied by the BHP steelworks should it close in the future. That is a possibility. I hope it is very remote, but who would be responsible for clean-up of that particular area should it happen? I would also like some analysis at some stage of how the new company sits under the EPA, given the opportunity for exemption. Also, what liability for the mines and other site clean-ups would rest with BHP in respect of its actions over the past 100 years when it has operated in our area? Who is responsible for ongoing problems?

More importantly, I refer to the mess that is still there from the fugitive dust from the pellet plant (it has been left there despite the \$34 million which the BHP long products company spent on the new stack), and there is an ongoing problem there about which I am frequently contacted by my constituents. There appears a bit of a hole in this act about who will be responsible for this issue.

I was pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about the prospect of a gift or exit funding from BHP. We would like to know whether there have been any negotiations through the state government with BHP on this issue.

I would also like to know whether any financial assistance is forthcoming from the state in recognition of the past rates that have been forgone and also the massive structural adjustment that will need to occur as a result of the reduced public sector and also the private sector in our area. We have one of the highest unemployment rates in South Australia, and it is an ongoing problem for us. We would like some answers from the state government on these issues.

The issue of the exit funding is not a matter that can be dealt with by the state government. It is a decision that only BHP CEO Paul Anderson can make. Unfortunately, it has been suggested that BHP will put forward the view that, unlike Newcastle, it is not closing down a section of its plant and therefore the circumstances of the two communities are quite different. However, Newcastle did receive a substantial

amount from BHP when BHP left that area. While steel-making was a major employer in Newcastle, it was only one of a very large number of industrial employers in that region which, unlike Whyalla, has a diverse economy. We would like some clarification on this also before we go ahead.

The state government does take the position that it has assisted Whyalla by encouraging BHP to negotiate with the community in regard to relinquishing some of the indenture lands and negotiating a fairer ramped up rate equivalent. We would like the state government to consider the waiving of all state government fees in regard to the transfer of that land from BHP to the Whyalla council. The council is up for a considerable amount of money in this transfer of land. If in the event that the land is not transferred to the council by 31 December 2000 (and therefore would become the property of the state), will the state agree to transfer the land expeditiously to the council, again waiving all state fees?

Will the government assist in the development of a set of guidelines for the use of the land set aside for economic industrial development, so that any developer meets the criteria and they could expect a very rapid approval? It should be similar to that used by the city of Newcastle for its Steel River site. This would greatly assist Whyalla in having a competitive advantage in the attraction of industrial development and recognising that there are other factors that influence developers besides the time taken for the approval process.

We would also like some assistance from the government in fencing the area that is to be incorporated into the Whyalla Conservation Park, because it is a huge area and the Whyalla city council does not have the resources available to be able to fence that area.

It has been interesting to note in recent weeks that the largest council in the state, the Onkaparinga council, has for many years received a very large rate payment from the refinery which the state government wishes to wind back, in exchange for which the government has put forward a \$560 000 compensation offer. No compensation offer has ever been made to Whyalla, despite the very low payments made in ex gratia rates by BHP in Whyalla in recent years. Importantly, there are no forms of assistance currently on the table from the state government, although it has offered to consider the Steel River type development package.

The state government should make immediately available some of the money that it began collecting from Marand Whyalla for the purchase, on behalf of the city from SRAP funds, of WhyTech Equipment a few years ago. Interest accrued from the date of purchase could be returned to the city. Payments were to be made over five years. We would ask the state government to make up the balance of the BHP rate equivalent to \$550 000 per annum until the rates are ramped up to that amount by the new company. This funding could be seen as an industrial assistance package for the new company or could be drawn from royalties paid by the new company. It is imperative that the government does consider these issues and I certainly will pursue them at a later date with the Whyalla community, of course. So, the Premier can expect to hear from us in the near future.

It is important to give some history of the BHP's involvement with Whyalla, and I pay tribute to our local historian, Don Winton, for his words on this. Don is almost as old as BHP's involvement with Whyalla. Thanks to the geological acumen of the explorer Edward John Eyre, who recorded his discovery of an extensive body of iron ore in Middleback Ranges in 1840 while on his way to Western Australia, the

birth of the Australian steel industry probably occurred many years ahead of its time. Major iron ore deposits in Western Australia were not developed until the 1960s. There was little immediate development following Eyre's discovery, but it is interesting to note that iron ore was taken from Iron Knob and shipped to London for display at the colonial exhibition in 1878, and that in 1890 two tons of iron ore was bagged and sent by wagons, via Port Augusta, to the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie for use as a flux in the smelting of silver, lead and zinc.

It was in 1899 that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited acquired its first lease permit, issued by the South Australian government, to work the ore deposits which proved to be of unexpected high quality. As a consequence, the paddle steamer *Cadell*, with 20 men, 16 horses, several drays and other equipment, including tents and supplies, arrived from Port Pirie in January 1901 and created the first settlement at Hummock Hill (which had been discovered and named by Captain Matthew Flinders on 9 March 1802. He also named Mount Middleback among other points of interest around the area.)

The task of the newcomers was to construct a tramway—it could not be named a railway because of state laws—from Hummock Hill to Iron Knob. In order to facilitate the transfer of iron ore to Port Pirie, the first 400 feet of a loading jetty was constructed so that ore could be loaded by chute into barges for towing to Port Pirie. Such was the success of the tramway builders that the first iron ore trains began running to Hummock Hill within 10 months of work starting on the 30-mile tramway. Then on 16 April 1914, the town of Whyalla was proclaimed, thus replacing the original name of Hummock Hill. Meantime, the BHP had decided to commit itself to making steel and the debate was vigorous as to the merits of taking Whyalla ore to the Newcastle coal, or bringing coal from Newcastle to Whyalla's huge reserves of ore. In the end, BHP decided on Port Kembla and Newcastle, but that meant increased activity at Iron Knob to a point where up to 4 million tons of iron ore was being quarried annually.

As European war clouds were looming—and Whyalla's population was about 1 400 people—the BHP set about dredging a new harbor; work was begun on the construction of a blast furnace; and plans were laid for the design and building of a shipyard. As a result of all this activity, the population soared to more than 7 000 people as other wartime requirements were met, including the setting up of a shell annexe for the manufacture of munitions. Further development occurred within the township, with BHP continuing to play an important role not only as the major employer but also as a leader in assistance to the community. What really caused a sensation was the announcement in 1958 that the BHP contemplated building an integrated steelworks at Whyalla at a cost of many millions of dollars—pounds in those days.

Preliminary work began in 1958, but soon escalated at a remarkable rate as housing, roads, schools, commercial, business and industrial premises were undertaken, in addition to the massive construction work on the steelworks site—and I can remember that being built. Labour was in great demand and migrants flocked in from overseas so that the local population of some 9 000 people in 1958 grew rapidly to about 33 000 in 1964, the year when the steelworks were commissioned. A check at the time of the steelworks opening revealed that there were representatives of 72 different nations on the company's payroll, including one Eskimo.

However, despite many successes in shipbuilding and steel making, BHP has faced a number of crises in which, of course, Whyalla has necessarily shared. Not the least of the upheavals was the announcement in 1978 that the shipyard had never been a profit making venture, despite the building of some 64 vessels between 1940 and 1978.

At that time there were about 1 450 employees at the shipyard and some 5 500 working at the adjacent steel works. Whyalla reeled under the impact of the substantial job losses then and in subsequent years as BHP rationalised and modernised the steel plant to the point where today there are about 1 400 on the payroll, with about 800 others employed as contractors. I certainly feel some pain at the big Australian leaving Whyalla. My father came to Whyalla in 1939 and worked for BHP for 39 years until his death in 1978. My brother and my son did their apprenticeships there and all my other family in Whyalla has worked at BHP at some stage.

My great grandmother went to Whyalla (Hummocky Hill, as it was called) in about 1904 with her daughter, who was my grandmother. Her husband had been killed in Broken Hill and she came to Whyalla to join her brothers and to bring up her children. There are many other connections all over the state with families from Whyalla. There are connections in Broken Hill. There are connections particularly with the mining towns of Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta, and members will find that most people in these areas have relatives in Whyalla. I am actually a fourth generation Whyalla person and for me Whyalla has always been a BHP town.

My story is not unique. Many other families have lived in Whyalla for generations and were BHP educated, employed, clothed and fed. There are also many families who came to Whyalla in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly from the United Kingdom. They are still living there, their children have grown up there and now their children's children are growing up there. There are also many refugees and migrants who came from Europe after the Second World War.

There has been a feeling of abandonment in Whyalla since the announcement by BHP to divest the company, and feelings of panic, much confusion, bewilderment, anger and pain. Workers have expressed concerns about their future, about the conditions offered by the new company, what future entitlements they will have and what will happen to their superannuation. None of this is resolved by this legislation. BHP is to spin off its \$1.9 billion long products steel business, where it will be floated as a separate entity on the Stock Exchange in the second half of this year, pending shareholder approval. The spin-off will be achieved through a pro rata distribution of shares to BHP shareholders, who will then have the option to sell before its listing. BHP says it has a net book value of \$1.9 billion with an annual revenue of about \$2.8 billion and about 7 000 employees.

The key assets of BHP's Long Products Division include the Whyalla operations in South Australia, and also the Rooty Hill mini mill, the mothballed Newcastle operations in New South Wales, and the three steel products businesses of rods and bar products, reinforcing products and wire products. These assets were put up for sale when BHP decided last year to halve its \$6.6 billion steel division in order to chase better returns by focusing on core steel assets. BHP has argued that its long products business is a viable operation but that it is better suited outside the organisation. The investment community however speculated that the company would have difficulty finding a buyer for a business with mature assets but no strong market position, and BHP was unlikely to have allowed the sale of the bigger assets.

BHP has denied that the spin-off has proved that the company was unable to find a buyer, arguing that the move is the best option for shareholders. Paul Anderson, CEO of BHP, said that divesting the long products business through a spin-off will result in maximum total value to BHP shareholders. The decision means that the long products business, Australia's leading manufacturer of steel long products, such as pipe, tube and structural products, as well as the company's leading metal distributor, will remain an integrated, highly competitive operation.

We in Whyalla still have a difficult time ahead of us. Many issues still need to be addressed and pursued, but I do believe that the new company will succeed. I am impressed with the management that has been appointed to the new company, including the CEO, Dr Robert Every and also the new chief financial officer, Dr Bernard Carrasco, whom I met in Melbourne when I went there with the Leader of the Opposition. I am particularly pleased to see Mr David Goodwin, who as Vice President External Affairs has been appointed to the new company because he has been instrumental in some of the arrangements that have been made with this legislation and with the deal that has been offered. I am also very pleased that our local CEO will be Leo Sellick, who has steered the city and company through the turmoil of the past few months.

I pay particular tribute to the people of Whyalla who have been through these upsets. It is a very good community to live in, despite the bad name that we have in the rest of the state. It is a great community in which to raise our children. I also pay tribute to the workers who have put up with all these upheavals, who have had the worry and frustrations and who have not known where their future lies. They have remained loyal to the community and to BHP.

I am pleased to see that the land issues have been resolved and that so much land has been given to the city and the conservation park. I am pleased that we may now have access to the port and that the ship breaking business could be a possibility, provided the environmental and economic feasibility studies turn out all right. I am pleased the environmental issues will be resolved in the future in relation to the new company and its obligations under the EPA, and I am pleased that Whyalla City Council was able to get such a generous amount from BHP over the next seven years. I certainly wish the new company every success, for personal and public reasons. I am confident that it will be a success, and I offer it my support. I believe that Whyalla can now go ahead confidently and that it does have a future. I commend this bill, with which I am very pleased, to all members.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am also pleased to support the bill. I act as regional development spokesperson for the opposition, and this is obviously a very important bill for that region of the state. Regions, of course, are extremely important to South Australia. A lot of the drivers for our economic growth here in South Australia have come from the regions. They have come from the regions like Barossa, the Riverland, the South-East and Yorke Peninsula. This is driven by agricultural developments, forestry and the wine industry and has been an important exporter for South Australia. It has been very clear that a lot of South Australia's export maintenance and export growth have come from those various areas and, in particular, the wine industry.

However, it is also clear that not all the regions in South Australia have benefited from this strong development. In the South-East and to some extent the Riverland, the thriving

industry there has created some infrastructure difficulties, and there is a shortage of housing in the area, although that is not so in all our regions.

The Spencer Gulf region is one of those regions that has not been an improving economy but has indeed been losing population, industry and small business. It is very important that South Australia bring in all regions to ensure that we have prosperity into the future. The Spencer Gulf region has traditionally been involved with mining and manufacturing. On a bi-partisan basis, we all hope that mining will improve in South Australia and that we take greater advantage of the potential of our mining industry here into the future. But manufacturing is also an important industry, although certainly the trend has been one of decline in manufacturing industries, particularly heavy manufacturing industry. There has been a trend towards knowledge-based and service-based activities, and those regions such as Whyalla that have concentrated heavily on manufacturing have suffered in the downturn. They have also suffered, to some extent, from the introduction of microeconomic reform and competition policy. This change to the arrangements with the BHP venture and the associated float gives the South Australian government, and possibly the federal government, the opportunity to look at what is happening in some of these regions. There is an opportunity to expand into other industries and to create industries in this region that will give new hope and opportunity to those people seeking work.

BHP was indeed a powerhouse development in the region and attracted many people to Whyalla, people of diverse cultures and nationalities, and Whyalla became an interesting, diverse and thriving large city. It is now declining and we need to look at other ways of ensuring that Whyalla and other cities in the Upper Spencer Gulf are maintained: not for the sake of it, not because we are trying to prop up something that is bound in the long term to fail, but because it is important to our state that all regions of South Australia are looked after equally. I think the federal Labor Party in its recent policy puts it very well indeed, as follows:

Manufacturing might not have the highest projected job growth, but this forecast is based on a continuation of current policies—it does not allow for a major industry policy focus on modernising established industries, something which will be a key commitment for Labor in government. The manufacturing sector remains central to the future of work, and Labor's commitment to manufacturing is as strong as ever.

Where workers at risk are concentrated in particular regions, we need to look at ways to foster regional growth and attract new industries, as well as developing existing industries. Amongst other things, Labor will identify workers at risk of skills deficits and job shedding and provide opportunities to gain new skills through retraining; target assistance to mature age Australians and persuade employers that 'experience pays'; and invest in regional development, particularly communications infrastructure development.

That is a far more positive message than we usually hear about regions that have previously had a manufacturing base. The policy continues in this vein, and states:

What makes Labor different from the coalition is that we believe there is a very important role for government in facilitating a framework conducive to local involvement, innovation and regional diversity, and managing the transitions that individuals and communities require to succeed in the new economy.

That is what it is about: it is not about propping up a community for the sake of it. It is, in fact, managing a transition so that that community can succeed in a new economy.

One problem with the heavy manufacturing industry is that, in recent times, there has been fairly rapid change in the

economy. One of those changes has been competition policy, which, together with microeconomic changes, has affected some regional areas to a far greater extent than perhaps the metropolitan areas. I recently attended the ABARE conference in Canberra at which some interesting insights were made into this issue. I first quote part of the speech made by Herb Plunkett, Assistant Commissioner, Productivity Commission, Canberra. He talks about drivers of change as follows:

As an integral part of the economy, country Australia is influenced by factors affecting regionally based industries, as well as factors affecting the growth and development of the economy generally. At a regional level, the dependence of agriculture and mining industries on exports emphasises the importance of developments in international markets and of Australia's participation in world trade in determining producer prices.

Mr Plunkett further states:

A ranking of regions by the estimated long run increase in output reveals that there is a much wider variability in gains across country regions than for metropolitan areas. Most metropolitan areas are estimated to gain proportional increases in output close to the average gain of 2.5 per cent . . . some country regions are estimated to be among the largest beneficiaries of the NCP reforms. Regions likely to benefit most tend to be in Queensland and Western Australia. On the other hand, regions benefiting least tend to be in Victoria, South Australia and the southern part of New South Wales.

In a sense I suppose that is telling us nothing new—it is nothing that the people in Whyalla would not already know; but it does quantify the uneven gains due to national competition policy. Certainly, the Labor Party, as I previously stated, believes that some of those gains should be returned to those regions to allow restructuring and orderly transition. Again, at the ABARE conference, Todd Richie, Director of Economics, National Farmers Federation, shed some further light on that aspect and said:

Regional communities will not remain viable without equitable and affordable access to infrastructure and social services. Unfortunately, regional Australia has witnessed a run down of rural infrastructure and services over a prolonged period of time. In many parts of Australia this run down has reached a point where the quality of life for those living in these areas has deteriorated markedly.

Again, that is something about which most of us are aware at this stage, but the debate is now whether governments have any role in that or whether governments leave it to the market, to a user pays principle, and to open competition, or whether governments intervene, to some extent, and provide funding, infrastructure and hope for the people working in areas where there are social economic effects of competition policy.

I believe it is extremely important that governments talk to the local people about the best ways to advance those communities that have suffered in recent years due to restructuring—not necessarily about how they maintain their existing industries but how they take advantage of new technologies. I think that Australians are in a good position to take advantage of new technologies: they have the flexibility, the educational institutions in place and the lateral thinking that enables them to be innovative in industrial development. That is, indeed, the key to industrial development in this new age—innovation which leads to exports. That is possibly the only way that we will overcome the disadvantages of regions such as the Spencer Gulf, the disadvantages of distance and a relatively small size. I believe that there is the potential in regions such as the Spencer Gulf to grasp hold of the manufacturing and mining related industries and look for new areas and new markets which will be part of the new age and which will enable that region of

South Australia, as well as the Barossa, the Riverland, the South-East and Yorke Peninsula, to contribute strongly once again to the South Australian economy, to provide good, reliable and long-term jobs in high-tech areas for their children and to lead the way for development around the whole region. Hopefully, that development will come in the form of mining.

Those linkages between mining, manufacturing and other inherent advantages to the regions is something that I think we must grasp hold of. We must talk to the people with expertise in the region and we must bring industries together to facilitate development and, in particular, marketing and the use of technology. I think that this restructuring of the former BHP area and, hopefully, the introduction of the enterprise zones, will mean that there is a cluster of industries in that area which we can use to lever greater development of those industries and to develop export markets both overseas and around Australia. Certainly, I think this is good news for Whyalla and the people of Whyalla, and I hope that the government sees it as an opportunity to provide a little assistance and to leverage up those operations so that Whyalla is once again a thriving and optimistic community.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I thank members for their support of what is a very important bill: it is extremely important for the people of Whyalla and for their future. Quite a bit was said about regional development. It is correct that, while regional development is very good in some areas of the state, it is not evenly balanced, and certainly one of the areas that has missed out is the upper Spencer Gulf area. There has been difficulty there, as has been the case in other areas of Australia which have had heavy industry as their base. The deputy leader referred to some figures, and certainly over time there has been a major shift from manufacturing to service industries. Service industries are where the people are, and that has really meant that the metropolitan area has done a lot better in that respect.

I believe that there are some real opportunities for Whyalla in the future. With respect to some of the mining exploration that is taking place, from talking to quite a few explorers and minerals people over the last couple of years, I know that many of them think that there is a lot more left in the Middleback Ranges than many other people think. Obviously, that would create some opportunities for Whyalla itself. Let us see what happens with the SACE project now under construction at Whyalla, because that could also be a major opportunity in the future.

The council will obviously be very pleased to see this solved. It will be a major beneficiary and it will help the council, along with the government, to attract other industry to Whyalla. I hope that we all have some success in doing that. Our major interest in all this is to create an atmosphere where Whyalla has the opportunity to go ahead and where we can achieve a successful sale of BHP, because it is that successful sale which has the potential to underpin the future of Whyalla. We now all look with anticipation to what happens from here. Certainly, the people of Whyalla have not perhaps shared in prosperity as much as we all would have liked. They are a very proud and loyal group. Most of them never want to leave Whyalla, so it would be good if we could turn around the fortunes there and get a lot more jobs.

I particularly thank everyone involved in the negotiations, including BHP, for its cooperation and the fact that it is doing something to help Whyalla, and the people who conducted the negotiations, who reached this outcome and who did a

terrific job. We all look forward to a successful sale and a successful future for the people of Whyalla.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am disappointed that the Premier is not here and that he has gone to a cocktail party. This bill is very important to the people of Whyalla. There are questions I would have liked to ask of the head of government about issues that I raised in a speech. The opposition, in trying to facilitate the swift passage of this bill, allowed it to be brought forward rather than be dealt with next week. I would have thought that the Premier would be sufficiently interested in it to put the future of BHP's Whyalla operations ahead of a cocktail party that could have waited until Parliament rose at 6 p.m.; however, we get used to the government's priorities. On the issue of the divestiture of land, I understand that it has been agreed that 700 hectares of land will be passed over—

The CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the leader is actually dealing with clause 20, not clause 7, in relation to section 7B of the principal act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 19 passed.

Clause 20.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There are a number of issues relating to section 7A, 'Environmental authorisations'. The bill provides:

... to the contrary, any exemption granted under section 37 of that Act to the company by the Environment Protection Authority in respect of pollution resulting from the company's undertaking at or near Whyalla on or after the prescribed day may be granted or renewed by the authority for such period as the authority thinks fit.

What is actually meant by that? We understand that under the agreement the BHP Long Products Division will comply fully with the environmental laws of the state, under EPA jurisdiction, by 2007. Will the Deputy Premier outline the schedule for phasing in different environmental considerations in terms of reductions in either air or water emissions but also explain exactly what that clause means? Is there the ability for further exemptions to be given by the EPA after 2007?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I point out that the Premier has gone to a function to be attended by many visitors to Adelaide. It was programmed in and it is very important that he be there. As far as the leader's question is concerned, the provision gives the EPA the legal right to allow specific discharges out of the plant. Agreement has been reached on the phasing-in, and we can supply the leader with the details of that schedule.

Ms BREUER: Under the legislation, the new company will be required under the Environment Protection Act to control whatever it lets into the environment, but the issue of pollution is there still, particularly from the pellet plant. BHP has invested a lot of money in trying to clean this up and has put money aside to do further work on it. On Monday I visited a constituent's house. He insisted I see the red dust that has coloured his cement and his house. After the visit I told him that he did not have to show me this because I live in the area and I am aware of the pollution which is there and which has been there for many years. Who will be responsible for any claims relating to the pollution that currently exists? Will BHP be responsible for that? Will anyone be responsible for that continuing pollution?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I take it that the honourable member is talking about the dust which already exists outside the plant and around the town. In the indenture that has been specifically exempted; BHP has no liability for that. Regarding what occurs in the future, this will give the EPA the ability to grant exemptions but, as the honourable member knows, over a long time BHP has been trying hard to clean up its act. I have no doubt that the EPA will keep the pressure on whoever is operating that plant to do so, as we see with the smelter in Port Pirie. But we must always realise that, in the interests of the people of Whyalla and Port Pirie, we have to use restrictions in a reasonable way to allow them to operate. The EPA must be satisfied that they are doing the best they can and that we get to the cleanest solution as soon as possible.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Regarding provisions relating to certain land, I ask the Deputy Premier, because I know he comes from Spencer Gulf, whether he believes that the government would support my proposal for the 700 hectares of previously indentured land which has been transferred for use by the city council as an industrial estate—whether the state government could give that land designated 'enterprise zone' tax exemptions in order to try to kick start some employment growth and diversification of industry in the area. All members would have seen—and I know that the Deputy Premier would have seen—industrial estates established around the state that are absolutely empty. This has a real chance because of its location, being close to wharf and port access and close to BHP's, or its successor's, operations, to be a goer, but it would need the sort of support that included incentive packages and tax exemptions. Do you agree with that and will the government give consideration to enterprise zone status?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The Leader of the Opposition has long put forward this idea. Certainly, on the surface the idea of an enterprise zone has some attraction and it is certainly something we have looked at. While the government agrees that assistance is often needed to get businesses set up in these areas, we are still very much of the opinion that it is better to look at it on a case by case basis. To actually designate an area in Whyalla and not in Port Augusta or Port Pirie may differentiate between them. I know another proposal would be to set them up in all areas but, basically, we have decided that the progression of that is to look at them on a case by case basis, wherever they are in the state. A suggestion has been made by several people about enterprise zone status with a boundary around it rather than looking at specifics, but basically there is some fear by existing businesses that it would give new businesses the opportunity to compete, perhaps unfairly, with them.

In some ways that could be handled by exemptions but, once again, it would come back to looking at them on a case by case basis. We have been involved with trying to get several businesses of the type we need such as the SACE and magnesium projects. We have gone through those proposals, talked to the people and decided, on a case by case basis, what type of assistance is best suited to get those people into those zones. We share the same end goal, but we do not totally agree on how best to achieve it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The enterprise zone status that would apply relates only to companies from overseas or those relocating to a designated industrial estate that do not compete with existing industries. However, we are saying that, if the government says it will look at industry by industry on a case by case only, that just simply means that

the Whyalla development board and the Whyalla city council are totally fettered in terms of getting any support for the industrial estate. We all want to see this to be a real industrial estate rather than a notional one. This could be a real chance for the government to follow its conservative counterparts in Britain who, during the Major and Thatcher years, gave substantial assistance to regional centres by giving special tax incentives that gave the regional development boards and councils a chance to go out there and lure some business.

It is a bit odd for the government to say that it would not support this when it hands out tens of millions of dollars to companies that want to establish call centres here, a practice that has resulted in complaints from existing industries. We are talking not about hand-outs but about exemptions from taxes in a designated zone with certain qualifications. I am asking the Deputy Premier and the Premier to meet with the Regional Development Board in Whyalla and with the council to discuss how this could operate. I also ask the government to inquire of its federal counterpart whether the same commonwealth enterprise zone conditions that apply to Newcastle for manufacturing in bond can be applied to Whyalla with virtually identical circumstances.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: One issue that needs to be covered is that part of this bill gives the council the right to raise rates over some of the area we are talking about. It is up to council whether or not it wishes to continue in that direction. A range of programs is available to the boards and to councils to try to attract business, one of which is the fact that the upper Spencer Gulf is a special zone. As the Deputy Leader said before, given the way that readjustment of the whole economic structure has gone about, those types of towns have missed out the most. As service industries have grown and the manufacturing industry has mechanised and contracted because of the competition from elsewhere, so the number of jobs has diminished. Over many years, governments have not been successful in having other business come along behind. We are all aware of the challenges. The best way of meeting those challenges is something on which we do not necessarily agree. Certainly, when the Rail Reform Transition Fund was put in place and the bulk of that money was designated for the upper Spencer Gulf area, much thought went into it at that stage. Members will find that the local people felt that it was better off being specifically looked at on a project by project basis. The member would be aware that the three development boards and councils up there have formed the Upper Spencer Gulf Special Purpose Group. We have been giving them assistance. I do not disagree with the sentiment of where the Leader of the Opposition is coming from. I agree with the sentiment; we just vary in how we best achieve it.

Clause passed.

Clause 21.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In terms of the vesting of a company's statutory rights and obligations in assignee, one of the key factors that determined whether we would need to change the Indenture Act was if there could be just a straight transfer because the indenture in the 1950s said that all the benefits, mineral access and so on, in land were to be designated to BHP or its successor or assignee. However, it was important to have changes to the indenture legislation so we could get a good result in terms of the environment, council rates and in terms of handing over a portion of the land.

If BHP's Long Products Division is eventually floated in full, after a phased sell-down, and if at some stage there is an

attempt to have that industry sold off or bought out by an overseas company, where does that leave the company in terms of the obligations under the act?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: As to a takeover of the business, if the new business is substantially still in the steel making business, the way it has been set up is that the minister would have to show reasonable cause why he would not. In that case, it is set up in such a way, if it stays as a steel business, the rights under the indenture basically stay unless the minister can make a judgment as to why it should not happen. Whereas, if it were a company that closed the steel business or went into another business, the minister has to be satisfied that it is in the best interests of Whyalla that the conditions under the indenture stay as they are.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (22 and 23), schedule and title passed.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:
That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): In seconding the third reading, I place on record that I think this is an example of where best endeavours have achieved a very good result for the people of Whyalla. The passage of this indenture bill through this parliament today is a historic day for the people of Whyalla and for a very loyal work force of BHP. I just hope that, given our passing this with some expedition in order to facilitate the process eventually of a successful partial public float of the Long Products Division, BHP will take it upon itself to make a substantial donation to the people of Whyalla by way of a grant to the University of South Australia. We are talking about many decades of migrants from dozens of countries around the world who came on ships to Whyalla to help not only build Australia and build a life for themselves but also to make BHP the great Australian company that it became.

It is a huge giant step for BHP to be getting out of the steel industry in this way. I believe that this parliament in a bipartisan way has acted with honour in trying to ensure the best possible result for the people of Whyalla and for BHP's loyal work force.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WRONGS (DAMAGE BY AIRCRAFT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 March. Page 712.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): In the motion picture *Siam Sunset*—filmed in South Australia and premiered at the Piccadilly Cinema last year—a young newly wed industrial paint chemist played by Linus Roache is cavorting on the front lawn of his English home with his beautiful wife—have you seen it?

Mr Williams: No.

Mr ATKINSON: The couple then rest alongside each other on the lawn staring at the blue yonder. The young husband notices a speck in the sky that gradually becomes larger. It is a refrigeration unit that has shaken loose from a freight aircraft and fallen out. It falls on his wife, killing her, and, as a widower, he treks to South Australia to do a bus tour of the far north to overcome his grief, and while he is here he discovers the colour for which he has been searching in his laboratory for years—Siam Sunset. It is items falling from the sky that is the subject of this bill.

Under the Rome Convention 1952 about international aircraft, the owners of such aircraft are strictly liable for damage caused by their aircraft falling to earth or dropping items to earth. However, although there is strict liability, rather than the need for the plaintiff to prove negligence, the liability is capped—for instance, at \$A36 million for a Boeing 747. Australia subscribed to the Rome convention and gave legislative force to that by the commonwealth parliament's enacting the Civil Aviation (Damage by Aircraft) Act 1958. The Minister says the Rome convention's limit on liability was designed to encourage the infant international civil aviation industry.

Most international carriers are not subject to the Rome convention and they are strictly liable without limit for aircraft falling to earth or dropping items to earth. There is according to the minister a third category of aircraft liability, and that is for operators of intrastate aircraft who are natural persons. Corporate operators would be caught by the commonwealth legislation under the commonwealth constitutions corporations power. The minister says she thinks there are about 400 aircraft in this category, and perhaps the Acting Speaker and I were on some of those aircraft quite recently travelling to Berri and Port Lincoln. These operators are liable for negligence; they are not strictly liable. In other words, the aircraft operator must be proved to have had a duty of care to the person who suffered damage, and it must be shown on the balance of probability that the damage was reasonably foreseeable.

In 1999 the commonwealth withdrew Australia from the Rome convention by passing the Damage by Aircraft Act, which introduces strict liability for 'injury, loss, damage and destruction caused by aircraft or by people, animals or things that have dropped or that fall from aircraft in flight and introduces a strict unlimited liability for aircraft.' The bill before us takes damage caused by intrastate aircraft in South Australia from the sphere of negligence law into the sphere of strict liability and removes the cap. The government has

qualified this by excluding from strict liability damage caused by crop dusting aircraft dropping seed or herbicide in the wrong place. The law of negligence would still cover this. Also, liability for trespass or nuisance caused by low flying aircraft is excluded if the aircraft is flying at a height that is reasonable, having regard to the prevailing weather conditions and other relevant circumstances. Such an aircraft must also comply with the Air Navigation Act and the Civil Aviation Act.

If aircraft operators are strictly liable and damages are unlimited, the risk to their insurer is greater and one would think that insurance premiums would have to rise. By contrast, if negligence is required to be proved, this reduces the risk to the insurer. The minister assures us that premiums will not rise much. He says that third party insurance for ground liabilities is the cheapest part of aviation insurance. The opposition has just one question about the bill, and that is whether it covers hot air balloons and gliders. Should the minister answer that question satisfactorily, the opposition shall be happy to support the second reading.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I thank the honourable member for his contribution to this debate, and I appreciate the thought he has obviously given to the subject. To answer his specific question, I can tell him that hot air balloons and gliders are covered. As the honourable member has said and as the second reading explanation states, this is a technical legal issue. I appreciate the support and we look forward to the bill going through all its stages as quickly as possible.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 April at 2 p.m.