

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 April 2000

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

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY (CONSENT TO BLOOD DONATION) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the bill.

LIBRARY FUNDING

Petitions signed by 1 360 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure government funding of public libraries is maintained, were presented by the Hons G.A. Ingerson and M.D. Rann.

Petitions received.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 1 991 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to fund intensive care facilities at Noarlunga Hospital, was presented by the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire.

Petition received.

PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 266 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House strengthen the law in relation to prostitution and ban prostitution related advertising, were presented by Messrs Atkinson and Hill.

Petitions received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. R.G. Kerin)—

Rules of Court—

District Court Act—District Court—Appeals and Applications

Magistrates Court Act—Magistrates Court—Forms

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1998-99

Motor Vehicles Act—Regulations—Schedule 6

By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. I. F. Evans)—

Dog and Cat Management Board of South Australia—Report, 1998-99

Environment Protection Authority—Report, 1998-99

Native Vegetation Council—Report 1998-99

By the Minister for Recreation Sport and Racing (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority—Report, 1998-99

Racing Industry Development Authority—Report, 1998-99

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Local Government Act 1934—S. 20(8).

HANSARD

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of members to the fact that the uncorrected daily *Hansard* report, the same version as appears in the printed daily, is now also available on the morning after a sitting day in electronic form on the parliamentary intranet. This new service supplements the continued availability on the internet at about 4 o'clock on the afternoon following a sitting day of the corrected daily *Hansard* report and the electronic version of the weekly *Hansard* report on the Tuesday following a sitting week.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 5 to 7, 9, 10, 46, 47, 56, 58, 63, 69, 75, 78 and 79.

WOOMERA

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I rise today to update the House on the work being undertaken to secure the future for the unique township of Woomera. All members would be aware of the imminent closure of the joint defence facility at Nurrungar. Local residents have concerns about the subsequent reduction to the population and impact that may have on essential community services. Their concerns are genuine and the government has been listening. That is why the state government formed the Woomera Defence-South Australian Government Working Party to identify and resolve issues raised by the closure. More than that, the working party is about exploring new initiatives and new prospects to ensure Woomera's survival.

The unique nature of the region offers a potential growth for defence and space-related initiatives, and this is an area that we have been pursuing with some vigour for some time. Our argument is simple: if Australia is to have a space industry, Woomera should be its headquarters. We are in a unique position of having two projects pushing to use Woomera as a base for the launching pad for their space programs: Kistler Aerospace and Spacelift Australia. Both have the support and encouragement of the state government.

I announce today that, following lobbying by the South Australian government, the commonwealth has agreed to grant Spacelift major project facilitation status. It is a decision welcomed by the state government, and it is a positive step in the right direction. It means that Spacelift will receive priority, timely and efficient approvals for its proposed development to launch satellites from Woomera. The interest from Kistler and Spacelift are key economic opportunities. If successful, they will bring other potential investors to the township.

Given the withdrawal of the joint defence facility, the government's key focus has been on ensuring that the town's essential services are maintained. I advise the House that the agreement between the state and commonwealth for the state government to operate the Woomera hospital will remain, despite the closure of the defence facility. The presence of the ambulance service is an integral part of the retention of health services in Woomera. Although the service is not used frequently, it will be retained.

There has been an amalgamation of education services—TAFE, secondary and primary schools—into the one site. Subject to student numbers, these services will be maintained. Certainly, the use of Woomera West as a processing centre for illegal immigrants provides a good basis for keeping infrastructure and services in the township. We supported the decision to open a processing centre in Woomera on that basis. There are currently 1 200 illegal immigrants at Woomera West. That site will soon have the capacity for 1 400. There is the capacity to expand that to 2 000 with the diminished use of the Curtin Base in Western Australia. So, the economic benefits to the township are real and substantial. But the reality is that immigration policies can change. There is the potential for the economic support to be withdrawn at short notice. That is why, as a government, we need to explore other potentials. Woomera, as the home of the Australian space industry, offers that alternative and potentially lucrative opportunity. It is an opportunity that we will continue to pursue.

LIBRARY FUNDING

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): On behalf of the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning in another place, I lay on the table a ministerial statement being made today on the funding of public libraries.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL FEES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Will schools send parents a second school fee account this year to cover the cost of the GST for the second half of the year on materials and service charges already paid by parents at the beginning of the school year? On 29 March 2000, the minister told the House that, depending on what was covered, the materials and services fees charged by schools could be taxable. The minister also told the House that he was sending information to parents 'so they know exactly what they will be up for in the GST and the materials and services fee'. The minister would be aware that fees in some public schools can total up to \$600 a year.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The goods and services tax reform package is a significant and worthwhile change to the economics in this country. It will deliver significant benefits to the Australian population. In terms of the goods and materials services fee we have advised schools that, when they send out accounts to parents, they should include on the bottom of the account that part of the account may be subject to goods and services tax.

We are still awaiting advice from the Australian Taxation Office on certain aspects of that tax. We know that it will not apply to tuition, to excursions that directly relate to subjects or to materials that are used in the delivery of subjects—for instance, wood in woodwork, chemicals in chemistry and different crayons, etc., in art. We also know that equipment used by the school in delivery of subjects will not be taxable, although, as I said the other week, where a student purchases, leases or hires equipment, pens or pencils, etc., it will be taxable.

INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Can the Premier explain how the state government's industry assistance scheme is helping South Australian businesses to establish and expand?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): We have a proud record, over the course of the past six or seven years, of industry assistance, a scheme which has not only meant the creation of many jobs in South Australia but also saved hundreds of jobs in existing industries. I was interested to read in the newspaper at the weekend the ALP's supposed new policy thrust on industry development. Senator Schacht drew a comparison between 30 minutes policy debate and 2½ hours number crunching, and that demonstrates the priority of the Labor Party in developing policy directions for South Australia's future. They are just not interested in it. What they have done is either recycled or copied or it is wrong. That is the choice coming from the opposition in its public announcements on so-called policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The poor member for Hart cannot cop it. We saw him being aggressive in the chamber last week. The member for Hart is losing it a bit because he does not like what has happened—

An honourable member: He's lost it.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Indeed, he has lost it. The member for Hart actually thought he was getting himself positioned as the heir apparent. The member for Hart had groomed himself to take over from the leader, but he has been left in a vacuum. It is now the member for Kaurna who is positioning himself. He will by-pass the member for Hart, and where does that leave the member for Hart? Right out in the cold!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will come back to his reply.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We have assisted 94 companies since July last year; in the past year 81 per cent of our support by way of industry assistance has gone to 75 existing South Australian companies in order for them to expand or to save jobs in those companies. We have added to that with companies such as Westpac and BHP with its shared services centre, involving in this state an investment chased by most other states of Australia but which South Australia won competitively. The BHP shared services centre will bring a nucleus in the professional firms to South Australia in subcontracting and business that previously was available only in Melbourne or Sydney, and there will be enormous spin-off benefits.

What the Leader of the Opposition has effectively flagged by this so-called policy is that they are not prepared to do the hard yard in attracting industry to South Australia: we are. They are proposing an economic development strategy that is simply plain nonsense. In order to strengthen local companies, local economy and local business, you need to develop scale. You must have quantum within your economy. You need a broad and diverse industry base and large scale investment. It is the key for adding quantum and, in so doing, providing opportunities for other businesses. Surely, actually increasing demand for local businesses within the South Australian economy, on its own, is strengthening local South Australian small and medium businesses, giving them a future and making them more viable—and that is what we have reversed from the 1980s. During the 1980s we saw an exodus of Stock Exchange of Adelaide registered companies,

a flight to the eastern seaboard, a withdrawal from South Australia and a reduction in the quantum of business opportunities within the South Australian economy to serve those businesses.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What we have seen is a reversal of that. As a result of these investment policies, the trend has been for employment growth for 21 months in a row—not a bad start! We should compare that to the track record of the Labor party when it was in opposition. It seems to me that opposition members have been listening to one professor of sociology too many.

We want to build a new and vibrant economy in South Australia. Econtech and Access Economics are clearly indicating that, over the next two years, the fundamentals will be in place to achieve that in South Australia. But what does the opposition want to do? It wants simply go back to the past. It has no new policy idea and no new initiative; it wants to dismantle. It is wrong yet again. By way of example, the Leader of the Opposition said that they would put in place tests to ensure that any incentives were tied to performance. I do not know where he has been for the past two to three years, but that is the basis of the contracts: that they be tied to performance. I point out that Clarks had to pay us back \$350 000, because they did not—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will come to order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:—meet their performance which was tied in under the contract. So, this is not a new idea of the leader that we ought to tie the incentives to performance agreements: we have been doing it for a number of years and have been effecting it in the performance. If the leader wants to present a new, alternative face, either he has to get new policies and not recycle the old ones or simply copy the policies that we have in place.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Education. Given that the GST can apply to cakes sold at school fetes, will the minister issue instructions on how schools should value the market rate for cakes baked by mums and dad, and what action will the minister take if schools are found to be cheating? A tax office booklet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE:—on the application of the GST to schools says that, if a cake with a market value of \$5 is sold for \$3 at a school fundraiser, the GST will apply, because the sale price is more than—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE:—50 per cent of the GST inclusive value. However, if that same cake is sold for \$2, the GST will not apply because the sale price is less than 50 per cent of the GST inclusive value.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will cease interjecting.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the leader for interjecting.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): We have been waiting for four months to come back to parliament, and this is the best that this

opposition can do—to cut up a cake in parliament. That is the best question that the opposition can come up with. What a joke! What an absolute joke! When we were coming into parliament, the Leader of the Opposition was saying, 'We've been waiting to get back into parliament so that we can question the government on these important issues.' Well, here it is! What an issue! In fact, it is not even a new issue. I remember this matter in the days when John Hewson was the leader of the federal party, and they have wheeled out the cake again. They cannot even come up with a new example. Great Scott! I am sure that the Australian Taxation Office will have a recommendation on this, and we will inform school communities of it when it comes out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will settle down.

Members interjecting:

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

CONSERVATION

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage advise the House of the success of the Green Corp Program in South Australia, and also other volunteer conservation programs that are now operating in this state?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): Last week the House will recall that the opposition questioned me about the impact of the GST on the recycling industry in relation to the container deposit legislation. It appears that the ALP is certainly partial to the odd bit of recycling. During the blood-letting at the Labor Party State Council over the weekend, the opposition leader made what was supposedly a big new policy announcement in relation to youth conservation corps. Indeed that is an interesting proposition when we consider, first—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I note the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. He might want to listen to exactly what is happening in relation to the youth conservation corps and the green corp in this state. Yet again, the leader has announced something that basically exists. We were just about to let everyone know—

An honourable member: Who set it up?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The federal government set up the green corp—and we will come to that in a minute. This new direction of the Labor Party is simply a recycled policy from something the leader was promoting in the early 1990s. It was interesting that Senator Schacht, after the state council meeting at the weekend, basically said that there was little interest in the leader's speech. No doubt there was little interest because all he was simply doing—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will remain silent.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS:—was recycling a speech he had made previously, a policy that already exists, and indeed programs that are essentially in place. Had he taken the opportunity to speak to the member for Kaurana (the opposition spokesman for the environment), he might have realised that these programs are already in place. I do not understand why those two are not speaking to each other. If he had taken the opportunity to speak to the member for Kaurana he would have already known that these programs have been in place for a number of years. In fact, since 1993, this government has supported a number of conservation volunteer type programs to work in partnership with the community and the

environment. That is evident through this government's commitment to the problems facing the lifeline of the state, the Murray River. I note that the opposition leader's basic principle is: he will save any Murray except Murray De Laine of course.

The green corp program has been operating successfully in South Australia for three years. The opposition leader gets up there Saturday in front of the party faithful, putting himself forward as the great leader, and announces something that has been in place in this state, ladies and gentlemen, not for one or two years but three years. Why none of the members opposite did not put up their hand and say: 'Hello, Mike, it is in place,' we are not quite sure. The fact is that the green corp program, which is run under the federal government, enables young Australians to contribute in a very meaningful way to the environment.

For the benefit of the opposition, I will pass to the Leader of the Opposition a leaflet on the green corp program. Lots of programs are available for those who are having a break in the next two weeks when parliament is not sitting. They are called 'Conservation breaks' for university, school—and I will put in—parliamentary breaks. There are all sorts of programs, including the Le Fevre Peninsula program, programs at Leigh Creek, Bushland Park in the Adelaide Hills and the South Para bio region. Others programs, including the Black Hill Conservation, are coming up. There are lots of opportunities for members of the Labor Party to be involved in the policy that already exists.

For those who are not available on the weekends, this program that already exists—and does not need to be re-announced for the third or fourth time by the Leader of the Opposition—has mid week programs. If you are busy on the weekend, members can be involved during the week in the environmental programs that already exist. Again you have areas such as the Adelaide Hills Parks, Torrens Island, the Pelican Lagoon, Elliston, South Para, Roxby Downs, Flinders Ranges and Kangaroo Island—take your pick. Do not stand up at your state convention and make the big announcement about having a particular policy when, in actual fact, it already exists. In South Australia, approximately 500 young South Australians have already gone through this program, this policy that already exists.

Some 120 more are set to participate in the coming months. On a national level, 5 000 young people have already completed this program, and a further 1 000 will go through the program over the coming months. In addition, we are all aware of about 5 000 or 6 000 friends of parks, with 110 friends of parks groups throughout South Australia, who are involved in myriad volunteer programs within our parks. The Leader of the Opposition must be a bit embarrassed about this, because a lot of this started in 1991, when the leader happened to be Minister for Youth. So, in 1991 when he was Minister for Youth, this program already existed, and he should have been aware of it right from the day it commenced. You do not need to reannounce it; it is already operating.

It is interesting to see the opposition's federal colleagues' response to the policy announcement. When this was announced in the federal parliament by the federal Liberal government, the federal Labor party at the time described it as a mickey mouse program. So, the leader has announced what his federal colleagues think is a mickey mouse program. This is just another example where the Labor Party simply does not have a policy; all it has done is photocopy something that already exists and reannounce it.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I direct my question to the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training.

Members interjecting:

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

Ms WHITE: How will schools manage the complex GST paperwork associated with running a raffle, and how does the minister propose that schools will make up for having to pay 10 per cent of fund raising revenue to the taxation department? A booklet released by the taxation office states that if a school raises \$1 210 by raffling a cash prize of \$550, then \$60 GST would apply to the profit of \$660. If the same raffle had a non-cash prize purchased for \$550, then \$110 GST would apply on the total revenue of \$1 210 and the school would have to reclaim the \$50 GST paid when buying the prize itself. However, the booklet states that, if the prize combined cash of \$275 and a non-cash prize purchased for \$275 resulting in a margin of \$935 over the value of the cash component, the amount of GST payable on the margin is \$85 or one-eleventh of \$935, and an input must be claimed for the \$25 paid on the purchase price of the non-cash prize.

Members interjecting:

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

Ms WHITE: The school must also pay \$60 GST on the cash component of the prize, leaving the school with \$600 profit.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Now I know what the honourable member has been doing for the past four months: she has been rapping away on that calculator, working it all out—plus and minus and this is what it all equals. I am advised that, where a body of the school—such as a group of parents—is raising money for the school and is independent of the school council and the amount raised is returned to the school council, there is no GST—no tax—on the fund raising they undertake.

WALLAROO WHARF

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I direct my question to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Will the minister advise the House on damage caused to the Wallaroo commercial wharf by the Maltese registered ship *Amarantos*? Yesterday I was informed by Captain Peter Shipp, the Regional Ports Manager for South Australia, of the incident at Wallaroo where a ship yesterday caused significant damage to the Wallaroo commercial wharf. Members would be aware that the Wallaroo port is a critical piece of infrastructure in South Australia and my electorate, with some 60 ships—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is a fact; you have been long enough—

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

Mr MEIER: As I was saying, Wallaroo port is a critical piece of the state's infrastructure, with some 60 ships calling in per year and gross tonnage of over 1 million tonnes passing through the port in 1998-99. In particular, it supports farmers in my electorate through the import of fertiliser and the export of a range of commodities including wheat, barley, peas and beans. The Wallaroo wharf is also an important location for recreational fishing for not only my constituents but also

many other South Australian fishermen. Indeed, in January this year the Minister for Government Enterprises announced recreational and commercial fishing access arrangements which secure the rights of fishermen on commercial wharves.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for Goyder for his question and concern about damage to the Wallaroo commercial wharf. At about 7.10 yesterday the ship *Amarantos* did come into contact with the Wallaroo commercial wharf whilst it was being berthed. Detailed reasons for this are yet to be determined, but I am pleased to say they are being investigated and are indeed the subject of an investigation by the Marine Incident Investigation Unit of the Australian Transport Safety Bureau. That investigation has already commenced, and I look forward with a great deal of interest to the results of that investigation. Most importantly in this sort of circumstance (and I know this would be of great issue to the member for Goyder), no injuries were caused by the incident and, thankfully, there was no risk in this incident, either.

However, it does show the potential risk for the people who use commercial wharves, and this is why the government, after extensive community consultation, has developed a way forward for ongoing recreational and commercial fishing access to what are workplaces when looking at a commercial wharf. The core principle in these arrangements is obviously that of safety of both the users of the wharves—be they commercial or recreational users—and the workers. Pleasingly in this incident no-one was at risk and therefore no-one was hurt, but it would have been terrible if that were the case. That is why we were pleased to announce in January at Wallaroo both our recreational access and commercial access arrangements for commercial wharves.

I well recall the time up in the electorate of the member for Goyder where the fishing trophy for the media versus my office was unfortunately won by the media. I am told that an extraordinarily wonderful recipe for pickled crabs is doing the rounds of many media parties at the moment.

We are looking at the pro forma access agreements that will form the basis of the arrangements between local councils and the fishing industry in relation to the recreational and commercial access.

In relation to the particular infrastructure that has been damaged, I am advised that the principal damage to the jetty structure itself thankfully is only a few broken timbers and possibly one damaged pile structure, and the Ports Corp estimate of repair costs to its infrastructure is in the order of \$100 000. However, the major damage incurred is to the SACBH grain loading plant, which is supported above the commercial wharf, and estimates of the cost of this damage and the time to make good the damage are as yet unknown. However, to ensure continued safe usage of the wharf Ports Corp intends to erect a security or safety fence around the grain loading plant, and that will allow work to be undertaken without disrupting any of the recreational access.

As the honourable member indicated in his question, a huge number of people go to Yorke Peninsula with the intention of fishing. I forget the percentage, but it is extraordinarily high—a huge percentage of people as tourists venture to the honourable member's electorate and tick 'fishing' as one of the reasons for going. All I can say is that they must have more luck than I did when I was over there.

In relation to infrastructure, the respective insurance companies, the representatives of those companies, the shipping lines and so on are assessing the damage, and I inform the House that Ports Corp will not provide any further

services to the *Amarantos* until appropriate funding assurances are available to ensure absolutely that the liability will be properly covered by the ship's owners. It is not possible to identify how long the facility will be out of action, but, pleasingly, it is not expected that the damage will cause a major disruption to grain exports from South Australia, and the facility is expected to be functional prior to the next grain export season. I am advised further that, subject to ensuring safe truck access routes during the reconstruction works, the port should be able to continue to handle fertiliser imports servicing Wallaroo.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Education, who seemed to criticise or ridicule the—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—efforts of parents, confirm that the GST will apply to second-hand uniform shops operated by many schools? If so, will this mean the closure of shops operated by many schools? And I point out that this question is relevant to many parents in this state. A booklet issued by the taxation office says that the goods and services charged, sold, hired or leased to students by a school will be subject to the GST. The opposition has a copy of a newsletter sent to parents at my daughter's school, Black Forest Primary School, which says that the second-hand clothing shop will be closed because of the GST. The newsletter states:

Unfortunately, the introduction of the GST will herald the demise of our second-hand sales in the uniform shop. For the minuscule amount of money the school makes on second-hand sales, we unfortunately cannot justify the time it takes in both the shop and the office.

The minister might find this funny—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—but parents in Gawler might just blow out the candles—

The SPEAKER: Order! I withdraw leave.

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—on his parliamentary career.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat. I withdraw leave.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The member's question shows that we are nitpicking today in dragging through a number of issues and trying to work them out. I am not aware of the details of this uniform shop. It has not been raised by any other uniform shop or school that such shops will stop selling uniforms to students. The GST package will benefit all Australians. There is no doubt about that. What we do know, and I refer the leader to my answer earlier on in Question Time, is that the items that are not taxable under the GST relate to the direct delivery of education in our schools. As I said before, where the fundraising body is independent of the school council and donates any proceeds to the school council from its barbecue, sausage sizzle or whatever, I am advised that is not taxable. Where a school is in competition, where it sells a product that is owned by students, such as uniforms and musical equipment, GST is applicable.

MAJOR EVENTS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Tourism explain the additional tourism benefits that events such as this weekend's successful Clipsal 500 Adelaide and Davis Cup tie bring to South Australia and our regional areas, in particular?

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I sincerely hope that the member for Waite and the very significant number of members who joined us at the Clipsal 500 over the weekend thoroughly enjoyed what was clearly an absolutely sensational weekend. As we know, there was a record crowd of more than 164 000 over the three days, in addition to over 24 000 people who participated over the three days at Memorial Drive. It truly was an absolutely sensational weekend for South Australian sports lovers and also for the very many people who visited the state for the three to five days of those events.

The economic impact of the event on South Australia has been quite phenomenal, and I will cite a couple of figures that I am sure we will exceed when we receive the results of our formal economic impact statement. Last year, the economic impact of the Clipsal 500 (or, as it was called last year, the Adelaide 500) was in excess of \$13 million. We expect it this year to be considerably more than that, because one of the magnificent things about South Australia's major events is the reputation we are gaining not only interstate but also overseas. More than 7 000 visitors from interstate came to South Australia over the past four or five days, most of whom attended the Clipsal 500, others attending Memorial Drive to watch the Davis Cup. We expect the figures to show that, in total, more than 10 000 interstate and international visitors were here in South Australia for at least four days. One of the exciting things was that more than 600 visitors from New Zealand visited our state. I think that the Clipsal 500 organisation ought to be congratulated for the incredible effort and results it has received out of New Zealand.

What is particularly good is that so many of those interstate and international visitors have taken advantage of their visit to this state to venture out into our regions, thereby spreading the benefits. It is worth noting that the South Australian Travel Centre has never been so busy in its entire existence, with visitors choosing to visit the magnificent Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley, the Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island; indeed, the benefits are beginning to speak for themselves. I am sure that many of us have heard about the great results experienced by restaurateurs and transport operators over the past few days. We are particularly pleased that regional South Australia has been such a great beneficiary over this sensational weekend. As many members know, there has been an enormous amount of corporate activity here over the past few days. Many of the corporates were not just enjoying the race and the tennis: they were enjoying all the great attractions and benefits that we have on offer here in South Australia. We hope to see in the future some wonderful trade spin-offs from the food and beverage supplies that we have in such abundance here.

Last year during the Adelaide (now Clipsal) 500 we received more than \$23 million worth of media coverage interstate and overseas. That is extraordinarily important when one looks at some of the budgets of a smaller state such as South Australia. This year, the media coverage has been quite phenomenal, and here I would like to thank Network Ten, the host broadcaster, which not only telecast the race but also topped and tailed many of its telecasting activities with

commercials and tourism material based on many of the attractions of South Australia, and predominantly those attractions were the regions of our state.

I therefore think that Network Ten is to be congratulated. Also, I pay a special tribute to the media generally, and the *Advertiser* in particular, for their incredible, enthusiastic and consistent support of major events. The *Advertiser's* headline on Saturday I think said it all: 'Perfect one day, better the next'. We know that that was the case. While we could have done without the rain, it certainly did not detract many people from enjoying the after race concert.

I have absolutely no doubt that the economic impact that I will be able enthusiastically to report to the House in five or six weeks will show that major events are certainly absolutely sensational, and I believe the whole of South Australia ought to be congratulated for what we have achieved.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services meet with local government and request that any conditional grants to schools by local councils be increased by 10 per cent to cover the cost of the GST to schools? A booklet issued by the Australian Taxation Office on how GST will apply to schools states that if a school registered for the GST receives an annual grant of, say, \$1 000 from a local council to run a choral festival, the school will now have to pay one-eleventh (\$90.91) to the taxation office as GST. The ATO says that if the council agrees to maintain the level of funding by increasing the grant by \$100, then claiming this back as an input credit, the effect on the school and the council will be neutral.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I will look at the details of the question and get back with an answer.

YOUTH WEEK

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Can the Minister for Youth describe to the House how young South Australians are celebrating Youth Week this year?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Youth): South Australia's Youth Week initiative has, as the honourable member might know, spread across the nation with the first National Youth Week finishing last Sunday. For the past four years, South Australia has devoted a week of its calendar year to celebrating young people's achievements and ambitions. However, a year ago the commonwealth, state and territory ministers agreed to the first National Youth Week to be held in Australia from 2 to 8 April (or in South Australia from 2 to 11 April).

Youth Week is focused on issues and concerns of young people from all regions and backgrounds and has highlighted the positive contribution that young people make to our society. The South Australian government continues to support Youth Week through local governments and their communities by providing \$100 000 in grants which in many cases has been matched dollar for dollar, and better, by local councils. Councils have been invited to apply for funds for local activities, whether they have been carried out by councils or community organisations and, increasingly, it is youth themselves who are organising the activities.

The activities are varied and, while I am tempted to read some of them to the House, they detail 24 pages, and I will

make all of them available to any member should they request them. A total of 45 councils statewide have participated in the inaugural Youth Week. Also in South Australia, 'vocal chords', a web site designed by young people for young people, has been launched as part of Youth Week in South Australia. It is being managed by Ngapartji Multi Media Centre, and this site wants people from around the state to postcard details about themselves, their highlights and their achievements.

I did have some disappointment on a personal level with Youth Week. I said at the beginning of Youth Week—and I was accurately reported by the *Advertiser*—something to the effect that I was proud to be Minister for Youth because I believe that the current generation of youth would be better than my generation or that of my parents. Some days later, a letter to the editor demanded an apology on behalf of his generation, which had battled the depression only to sacrifice their lives in defence of this nation.

My comments were meant not to denigrate my parents' and grandparents' generations. They indeed battled against hardship and fought the odds to give their children and grandchildren a better chance—a better Australia. They wanted for us, as each generation does, greater opportunity and a better life. Far from reflecting adversely upon their efforts, the next generation will be this nation's crowning achievement and an ornament to their memory. I, like the member for Coles, would like to thank the media for their efforts during Youth Week. This year, over 120 Youth Week stories were printed in both metropolitan and regional newspapers, and there were numerous radio stories throughout Youth Week.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

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

Does the Premier maintain his longstanding support for the goods and services tax as being easier and simpler for small business to administer and a boon for small business, as he has so often said, in light of sections of the GST Act relating to declarations? Section 165-55 of the act provides:

For the purposes of making a declaration under this subdivision, the Commissioner may:

- (a) treat a particular event that actually happened as not having happened; and
- (b) treat a particular event that did not actually happen as having happened and, if appropriate, treat the event as:
 - (i) having happened at a particular time; and
 - (ii) having involved particular action by a particular entity; and
- (c) treat a particular event that actually happened as:
 - (i) having happened at a time different from the time it actually happened; or
 - (ii) having involved particular action by a particular entity (whether or not the event actually involved any action by that entity).

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The Leader of the Opposition is referring to the ALP state convention on Saturday. Talk about events that did and did not happen on Saturday! The member for Elder has this smile on his face. Just have a look at the smile. It is almost as big as the incision in Ralph Clarke's back; it is a transition of the smile. What I would like to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will settle down.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can understand a high degree of sensitivity from members opposite. The rhetorical question to the Leader of the Opposition is: does he deny that the abolition of wholesale sales tax will help every automotive worker in South Australia, particularly the thousands of people employed in his electorate associated with the automotive industry? The Leader of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. He can have no policy and at the same time tip a bucket on any policy that the government has. He cannot ignore the benefits that will flow from South Australia. Consistently—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I answered the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the leader again for interrupting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I answered this question last week or the week before—they have been so repetitious. We have had four months to get ready for parliament, and look what we have had, and the Minister for Education has clearly pointed that out. The simple fact is that a new tax system will put our exporters into a position to access international global markets.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Mitchell is awake today; he is out from behind his pillar. The member for Mitchell has just asked, 'What is that supposed to mean?' I thought Mitsubishi was somewhere near your electorate. The member for Mitchell has clearly indicated that Mitsubishi and its employment does not count for him, because he is so ignorant of the fact that, in relation to Mitsubishi, the wholesale sales tax and costs of production are very important in securing the future of major plants and maintaining employment levels. It is why the Government has worked so hard with Mitsubishi and will now be working with Daimler Chrysler to try to ensure longevity in that manufacturing plant and minimum disruption in restructuring to get certainty for jobs. That is what we are about, and the member for Mitchell can come out from behind his pillar and put in an inane comment. But the fact is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, he doesn't understand. If we take our automotive industry in particular, a new tax system will create a competitive advantage and take off something like \$1 billion worth of international competitiveness; that is, it will create an international climate that will be \$1 billion better off than was previously the case, giving them a \$1 billion plus break to take their products into the international marketplace. That is what this new taxation system will mean.

The other thing that the Labor Party ignores in its questions is that in the first pay packet that everyone—including your automotive workers—takes home in their hip pocket on 1 July will be more cash for disposable income. Opposition members might want to ignore that fact, but they will be sunk on 1 July when people realise that their real disposable cash income—retained earnings—will be such that they will be better off.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SEA WEEK

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage advise the House of any government initiatives being taken this week to coincide with Sea Week?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): It is indeed—

Mr Foley: Not Ocean Week!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, it is not Ocean Week: it is Sea Week this week, as the member for Hart, representing a coastal electorate, should know; I am surprised that he does not. It is with pleasure that the government has taken the opportunity to announce a new marine emblem as the latest emblem for the state, namely, the leafy sea dragon, which will be the marine emblem for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will come to order. I think the leader has had a fair go this afternoon. I expect him to show some leadership to the House.

Mr Venning interjecting:

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

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Phycidurus eques (the leafy sea dragon) are found in the temperate waters of southern Australia, mainly in South Australia, although there have been some sightings in Victoria and Western Australia. They are protected in South Australia. Those who have seen them—and we will ensure that everyone receives copies of photographs so that they can identify them—will know that they are full of colour and character. The reason we are making them a marine emblem is so that we can run a community education program about the importance of our marine and coastal environment. There is no doubt that there is an increasing awareness and concern in the Australian community generally about the environment, and we would like to take the opportunity to use the leafy sea dragon to highlight some of the marine issues and strategies in place to improve the marine environment.

We are not the first state to do this: New South Wales has a state fish called the blue groper. We are actually the second state to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: —of which I am sure the member for Elder is fully aware. We are the second state to have a marine emblem. Throughout Australia, and indeed South Australia, we have a good community program, Dragon Watch, which is run by the threatened species network and the marine and coastal community network and which is all about monitoring the leafy sea dragon because it is an icon fish that will give a good reading of the health of the marine environment. Through the various volunteer community groups involved in the program, we have had increased community awareness of this fish. In fact, Threatened Species Day in 1999 was all about the leafy sea dragon and the connection between land and sea. It is important that people realise that what happens on the land will have an impact on the marine environment, hence the importance of the water catchments. It is with great pleasure that, as part of Sea Week, the government announces that the leafy sea dragon is our new marine state emblem.

GOVERNMENT WEB SITES

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I direct my question to the Minister for Information Economy. Will the minister tell the House how much it costs taxpayers to set up and maintain the government's web sites and, given his comments to this House last week—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Just wait—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, I am glad that the member for MacKillop led there. Can he guarantee that these sites, maintained at taxpayers' expense, provide accurate, up-to-date information? On 5 April the minister informed the House how he surfed the web, because he understood the information economy and the future. If the minister had checked the web site for the Premier's Department, he would have seen that it still records Wayne Matthew as the Minister for Year 2000 Compliance. The Premier's personal web site also lists the Office of Asian Business as one of the Premier's agencies, but if you try to enter that site a message comes up saying that the page cannot be found—little wonder, given that the Office of Asian Business was amalgamated, renamed and then moved to another department almost one year ago. Also, the minister's own web site lists SAGRIC International as a government enterprise, despite the fact that it is now owned by a private company.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Information Economy): The date of 11 April in the year 2000 is a significant day for the information economy in South Australia, because at last the ALP has asked a question of me as Minister for Information Economy. This is a good moment, because here we have the economy of the future, which will drive South Australia and its leading industries into the future on a global scale at the press of an 'enter' button, and two and a bit years after the election, the member for Hart, who has been the shadow minister for information economy since then, asks a question. In the first estimates committees he said something to me along the lines of, 'Look, I don't understand this; why don't we go and have a cup of coffee and discuss it outside?' I have been waiting for the request, as I have said I would be happy to do so. Since then, this is the first question he has asked. It is a great day for South Australia, and I think it is appalling that the ALP has taken so long to address an issue in relation to the information economy.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Adelaide is making the point that this may have been the first question from the opposition on this subject. Can we have an answer on this matter? Can we have the first answer on this matter?

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

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will look at the honourable member's question individually, but for argument's sake it is fascinating that he indicates that the Hon. Wayne Matthew is still the minister for Y2K compliance. There are carryover issues for that and the minister is still responsible for that; he has been assigned responsibility for that. The simple fact of the matter is that not only is the ALP continually putting its foot in it in relation to the information economy; I think they might also have done it with this question.

HOSPITALS, CAPITAL WORKS

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House on the latest capital works projects for our major metropolitan public hospitals?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): First, I think it is appropriate to note that we came to government with the former Labor government spending only about \$50 million a year in capital works on the hospital system. Since we have come to government we have spent over \$500 million in upgrading the capital facilities of our public hospitals here in South Australia.

We have examples like the new Mount Gambier hospital, the new Port Augusta hospital and the very substantially upgraded Port Lincoln hospital. Most of the country hospitals of South Australia now have some excellent aged care facilities as a result of the commitment by this government. A classic example is the Boolooroo Centre hospital where, in conjunction with the local community, very good facilities were installed. In the first three months of this year I announced, on behalf of the government, a substantial upgrade of three major hospitals and a fourth where the work has started. The first was the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where we announced \$37 million for the first stage to build 200 new beds to replace 200 old beds. The staff of the hospital were absolutely delighted that there was a commitment to go ahead, with the first of the demolition work due to start in about July this year.

The Lyell McEwin Hospital for many years has needed upgrading by bulldozing all the old transportable buildings put there in the 1950s and 1960s. This government committed \$87 million so that we could have two additional medical and surgical wards, a cardiac care unit, the women's health centre, a new emergency department, central sterilising services, new intensive care and high dependency units. I am also pleased to advise that later this week I will be opening the upgraded facilities at the accident emergency section of the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

The third major upgrade was the \$74 million announcement concerning stages 2 and 3A of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The first stage of the Royal Adelaide Hospital redevelopment has already been finished at a cost of about \$20 million. As a result, we have magnificent new rehabilitation facilities at Hampstead Gardens as well as a number of other facilities at the Royal Adelaide. Out of the redevelopment of stages 2 and 3A we will have in particular an upgrade of emergency facilities and the trauma unit. We will have additional high dependency beds at the hospital and a range of other initiatives as well.

Importantly this government has made a huge commitment to making sure that our hospitals are brought up to an international standard in terms of the quality of the facilities so we can continue to provide a high standard of health care in this state. This government has made the commitment and the people of South Australia appreciate it.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Is the Premier concerned that South Australians who live permanently in caravan parks will have to pay the GST on their weekly rents, while people who live in rental apartments, flats and houses will not have to pay that GST? Will the Premier lobby the Howard government to remove this extra impost on some of the most vulnerable people in our community, including many in my own

electorate? More than 3 000 caravans are used as permanent residences in South Australia. Under the GST legislation, supported by the Premier, unless caravan park owners agree to forgo tax credits on their own GST costs, the GST will apply at 10 per cent for the first 27 days of residency. From the 28th day the rate of the GST applied will be 5 per cent. These costs will be passed on in full to caravan park residents, despite the Prime Minister's promises that caravan park rents would be free from the GST.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The member in the last sentence of her question indicated commitment from the Prime Minister. The honourable member also ignores the tenor of my answer to the previous question.

Ms White interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Local Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Local Government has the call.

PORT BROUGHTON RURAL TRANSACTION CENTRE

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Local Government): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: On Friday 7 April I had the pleasure of participating in the launch of South Australia's first rural transaction centre at Port Broughton. I am sure the member for Goyder, who also attended the ceremony, would attest to the importance of this facility to his local constituency. Bank closures in rural areas have been of considerable concern to communities and governments around Australia. In August 1997, the Port Broughton branch of the ANZ Bank closed its doors for the last time. This was followed by the closure of the Bute branch of the ANZ Bank the following year, which left the District Council of Barunga West and its community without access to a single bank within its boundaries.

The Barunga West council, however, took up the challenge. It showed that it was willing to move in new directions to ensure its community is provided with the necessary services. The council, in conjunction with credit care, an agency comprised of the federal government and Australia's credit unions, and the further private sector involvement of the ANZ Bank, have worked to establish an alternative financial service. The council received a grant of \$120 000 to provide a centre in Port Broughton. A further \$15 000 was provided for the operating costs for the first 12 months.

The Port Broughton rural transaction centre provides an on-line ANZ Bank agency, a Centrelink agency and a Medicare service for the lodging of claims. The centre will now provide services to this rural community that were previously unavailable. The centre is designed to be self funded, with the proceeds from the services funding the operating costs of the centre, and profits retained in the future will be used for community activities. The establishment of the centre is a breakthrough in partnerships between different levels of government and the private sector. The success of the state government's boundary reform program and the new local government legislation has enabled councils to grasp

new opportunities for their communities with larger pools of resources and clearer legal mandates.

The transaction centre is an excellent example of functional reform partnerships, which is the third phase in the state government's local government reform program. I certainly congratulate the initiative of the Barunga West council, its Chairman, Mr Howard Daniel, and its District Manager, Mr Nigel Hand, for extending the parameters of community service. The South Australian government strongly encourages other rural councils to follow the lead shown by Barunga West in developing successful partnerships for the provision of improved services to rural communities throughout South Australia.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Ms BREUER (Giles): I welcome the statement today from the Premier regarding Woomera. I was pleased about what he had to say about the future of Woomera. It was particularly fitting today in view of the fact that two escapees have climbed the fence at the detention centre at Woomera and the police and Star Force are currently looking for them. Apparently last night a large group became quite violent and damaged fencing and property. I cannot find out anything else about what happened there but I have concerns for the safety of the residents of Woomera and also the people who escaped. I am known to have welcomed this camp because of the work it has provided for the community of Woomera, and I visited the camp and was quite satisfied with the arrangements there.

I have been criticised for speaking out about the fact that they should be providing air-conditioning in these camps and that they should have adequate facilities. At present people are catered for in little huts. There are up to 25 people staying in each hut. I spoke out about this and expressed my concerns. I also expressed my concerns about the need for them to process quickly their claims to stay in Australia. This is precisely why I have said all the way through this must be done. The fact is that two men are wandering around the Woomera district at present who escaped from custody. This has been my concern constantly in this whole process.

I do not think these men are likely to be dangerous or that anybody's life is in danger except the escapees themselves who have no idea of what they are letting themselves in for. It could be far more serious. Here we have over 1 000 young men caged in hot conditions with no prospect of an early release and with very little work to keep them occupied. What if they all tried to escape; who will control them? I must admit my concern when I visited the camp was the fact that it took 10 minutes for these people to realise that there were some dignitaries there and stage a demonstration. There was only a group of about 15 guards between us and about 500 or 600 young men at the time. These young men are from violent war time backgrounds, are caged with nothing to do, cooped up and expecting to be released in two or three weeks. They were told by the smugglers, who are the real villains in this whole business, that they would be out in two or three weeks. I am asking the Premier what precautions are being taken for the people of Woomera. These people do not know this country. They come straight off aeroplanes, they get taken to the camp, which is about two kilometres from the airport, they do not see the country around the camp and they do not realise how harsh and hostile it is.

I am also concerned about the Kosovar refugees and what has been happening in the last few days, and I am glad to hear

that the Premier shares those concerns. What are we saying to the rest of the world when they see that some time back we invited those people here with open arms and now we are caging them up in refugee camps with people who have entered this country illegally? I despair of this federal government and the message it is sending to the rest of the world about Australia. People who have been welcomed here are being put into what are virtually prison camps. There is no other way to describe the refugee camps.

I am pleased with the Premier's announcement today about Woomera, but I urge him to look at the security in the Woomera area and to look after the concerns of the Woomera people. I also ask the Premier to read the petition that will be lodged this week from the people of Coober Pedy about the crime rate in their town. A group of citizens got together, drew up a petition and collected hundreds of signatures because they are concerned about the crime issues in their community. There are major concerns but there are no resources to put into that community.

The young people are aimless and they have no facilities. We need funding to cover those issues. Recently officers from the Attorney-General's Department spent some time in Coober Pedy, they consulted with the community and they came up with a number of recommendations. However, the big issue is that there are no funds to match the recommendations. I hope that, when the petition is received in parliament, answers are given to the residents of Coober Pedy and money will be provided for crime prevention, youth services, counselling services, facilities for young people and to assist the police force in its job.

Time expired.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I will talk about a word that the member for Hart mentioned in passing, that is, compassion. I want to talk about the compassion shown by the Labor Party at the weekend. What a magnificent job it did in dumping two of its best state members and a federal member who used to be its state secretary and who took the party to nothing but victories. However, Mr Hunter, who took the party to its worst loss since 1934, explained how there was little action and that everything went well over the weekend. Compassion is what it is all about and the member for Hart put it right on the line: we need to be compassionate about our fellow man.

I remember Senator Schacht very well. He was a very compassionate man and a very strong ALP supporter. He stood up for all the principles of the Labor Party. He did most things aboveboard so that everyone could hear, which is totally different from what we see from the machine today. I was fascinated by some of the comments that Senator Schacht made over the weekend because it is very important, in this compassionate world that we live in, that we put all these things on the record. He was so compassionate about his colleagues. He said that, if the Labor Party in South Australia is to become effective, it has to create forums for policy discussion. For so long we have been hearing about Labor Listens and how Labor is getting all its policies right. Senator Schacht also said:

Usually the State Convention goes for two to 2½ days. They closed the conference down. They were not interested in having any discussion on policy and this again proves that the machine overall is not interested in creating forums in the Labor Party where ordinary rank and file members and delegates can openly and genuinely discuss policy, and that is another issue that has to be dealt with.

I am glad to see the member for Ross Smith in the chamber, because I feel for him today. He is a man who has devoted his whole life to the Labor Party. He was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and he did an absolutely magnificent job in that position. I remember working well with him. We spent many hours organising the changes to the industrial relations legislation—some he agreed with, most he did not, but we worked together very well. The Labor Party showed its compassion by dealing that honourable gentleman such a bad hand at the weekend, so I really feel for him in my heart.

The member for Price, Murray De Laine, one of the best cyclists the state has ever seen, was dumped off his bike. He was not given one more chance to ride his bike and to be part of the machine. What an absolutely unbelievable position! Two really worthy members of the ALP were dumped by the machine. No compassion, no soul, no nothing!

Where was the Leader of the Opposition while all this was going on? He was an invited guest watching the V8 race. One would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would defend his members. I would have expected the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I know he is not in any faction, but I should have thought that the leader of the party would get right down in amongst all the grovelling and make sure that two sitting members, people with absolutely outstanding service as far as the party is concerned, were protected. It is a tragedy to see such wonderful members of this House being knocked over by the machine. The left is the faction with which the member for Spence is involved so much, and, with his knife in his hand, the honourable member leaves the chamber, blood dripping everywhere, and the poor member for Ross Smith is left here to worry about his future.

Time expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I draw attention today to the emerging trend in industrial relations that many members on this side of the House are aware of and are increasingly disturbed by and which I believe is a practice so pernicious and so fundamentally contrary to the principles of natural justice that this parliament must take a stand against it. I refer to the practice of corporate outsourcing and restructuring through labour hire companies, a practice which, in one of its variations, has become known as the Patrick tactic. I say that it is one of its variations because the situation in the 1998 maritime dispute was about deunionisation. We have seen in recent years how this tactic has come to be used for a wide variety of purposes.

The Oakdale miners and National Textile workers have seen it used to deny them separation entitlements. Qantas counter staff were required to tender for their own jobs through a labour hire company and accept lower rates of pay. Much closer to home, in my own electorate, TransAdelaide workers have been treated in the same shoddy way. In that instance, the labour hire companies are the private tenderers which have successfully undercut the TransAdelaide contracts with the Passenger Transport Board. The government will no doubt deny that that is the case with TransAdelaide. It is one of the minister's fondest claims that she gave TransAdelaide every opportunity to tender and win contracts, unlike the Court government or the former Kennett government. However, drivers know better, and so does the public.

They know that TransAdelaide lost its bus business because the government is intent on reducing wages in the

public transport sector. They know that that is the main objective of most privatisation and outsourcing programs. They know, too, that TransAdelaide workers sacrificed entitlements and introduced flexible work practices and have done their best over a long period to serve the public, and, for no reason other than that the government was paying them more than it wanted to pay them, their jobs have been taken away.

The government has been at great pains to assure us that the vast majority of TransAdelaide drivers have new jobs with the private operators. The unvarnished truth is that, at some depots, less than 40 per cent of the work force has been retained by the incoming operators. Of course, management has survived, and it amazes me that so many TransAdelaide managers have been employed by the new operators, despite the fact that their bids, put into the PTB on behalf of TransAdelaide, failed to secure any contracts at all. Of course, the minister keeps claiming that there are plenty of jobs available for ex-TransAdelaide employees, although she neglects to mention that most of these are interstate. New South Wales is apparently eager to employ ex-TransAdelaide staff, and that says a lot about this government's undervaluation of its own work force.

It is a disgrace to think that, nowadays, employers can get away with these unscrupulous tactics. Thankfully, the courts have started to provide protection. A new principle is emerging which seeks to protect workers' entitlements in business restructuring. Although the transmission of business doctrine, as it has come to be called, does not address all the issues that incorporate restructuring, it goes a long way. A number of particularly underhand attempts at undermining workers through corporate restructuring have been prevented or reversed by the courts applying this new doctrine, and I will speak more about that at another time.

We have had our share of Patrick style restructures here in South Australia. In the past year, workers at three South Australian meatworks have seen their jobs terminated because of dubious corporate restructures and labour hire agreements. I understand that the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union is pursuing a transmission of business case against the new owners of the Murray Bridge Meatworks. Conroy's Meatworks in Port Pirie is currently continuing a lock-out of its slaughtering team as part of a protected action under the Workplace Relations Act, while simultaneously bringing in a labour hire company on AWAs. The *pièce de résistance*, however, is the long running Mount Schank dispute in Mount Gambier which, although not taken to court, threatens to flare yet again. The owners of the Mount Schank Meatworks have restructured their companies in a similar fashion to Patricks. They employed their workers through a contract with a subsidiary hire company. The labour hire contract was designed in such a way as to make it relatively easy for the parent company to sever the contract at any time.

When the Federal Court found that the meatworks had been underpaying its work force for some time, to avoid paying the significant back pay to which the workers were entitled, the company simply severed the labour hire arrangements and began to employ a new work force on AWAs. The parent company appointed administrators for the subsidiary labour hire company, which was then unable to pay its debts to its work force. An injunction was successfully sought by the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union, reinstating the sacked workers, and the dispute was eventually settled by negotiation. Despite this, the Mount Schank Meatworks still owes some \$32 000 in unpaid superannuation, in excess of

\$15 000 in unpaid WorkCover bills and various unpaid fees to the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service and, to cap it all off, is withholding about \$4 000 in union fees which the company collected through payroll deduction. This is only one example of the insidious and destructive effects of this new form of corporate piracy on our workers and their families.

Time expired.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I would like to bring to the attention of the House the plight of some small businesses in shopping centres. I have a little knowledge of small businesses, especially those involved in selling fruit and vegetables. Everyone would know how difficult it is for these small retailers to make a living. Not many people would be prepared to get up at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m., go to the Adelaide Produce Market and try to get the best prices so that they can compete in a shopping centre.

I acknowledge that about two years ago this government, pursuant to the Retail Shop Leases Act, gave the right of renewal after a five year lease for a retailer. It would appear, however, that there are still some shortcomings, if not in the act itself but in the way in which it is interpreted and implemented. Late last month a fruiterer who had been locked out of a shopping centre came to see me at my office. He had been asked by the landlord to leave. Even though he had been given notice that this was to be the case, the bottom line is that I do not believe that this fruiterer was given a fair chance. I do not believe that someone who had spent over \$100 000 in goodwill about 10 years ago should lose everything. But that is the case. I will not name the fruiterer or the shopping centre because, hopefully, the landlord of the shopping centre will show a little compassion for the plight of this retailer. As I said, the fruiterer has been at the centre for about 10 years and paid his rent regularly and on time. He was willing to pay the higher rent that was requested. However, it seems that he had been given some short-term leases, which prevented his lease from being renewed after a five year lease expired.

Although I acknowledge that, legally, most probably the landlord of the shopping centre had the right to take this action, I believe that the lack of compassion shown by some landlords with respect to small retailers can be compared to the situation that existed in the days of feudal landlords—especially in the case of the bigger shopping centres. Everyone would know what feudal landlords did: the poor peasant would work hard out in the fields and the feudal landlords would grab and take everything that the peasants produced. The bottom line appears to be the profit of the large shopping centres with respect to the small retailers.

I made representations on behalf of the fruiterer, and I thought that, somehow, they would give this tenant a fair go. But that was not to be the case and, as I said, he was locked out of the shop, and 10 years of goodwill and all the work that had been put into that business came to nothing. As I said, it appears that the small retailers in larger shopping centres are at times in a situation similar to that of the poor peasants and the feudal landlords in olden days.

I support small business and the smaller centres for many reasons. When the time comes that we do not have small shopping centres and small retailers and there is a conglomeration of the big centres, what will happen to an ageing population which can no longer drive to the big centres? Will the big centres pick people up to do their shopping? I very much doubt it. Unfortunately, the motive is about profit. If one knew the rent that these retailers in the shopping centres

must pay and the conditions that are placed upon them, one would understand how the small retailers feel that somehow they are really treated unjustly and not given a chance—especially, as I said, when in this case the person had paid his rent regularly and on time, and he had given me an undertaking to pay the higher rent.

Time expired.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I comment today on the appalling response by the state education minister to the very real dilemma faced by both government and non-government schools in South Australia as we head towards the introduction in July of the goods and services tax. South Australian schools are facing the huge dilemma of how to manage this tax. This education minister cannot tell them what will and what will not be taxed, yet these schools have to make financial decisions that will impact significantly when a 10 per cent impost is added to their expenses. It is a headache for principals, teachers, parents, fund-raising committees and school councils. Yet, this minister speaks of their dilemma as though it is insignificant and trivialises it. That is certainly not good enough.

In response to pleas that he fix up this situation, all the minister was able to say was that one year ago he wrote to the federal government and that he is willing to pass on information to schools when he receives it. The minister's federal Liberal colleagues have introduced this tax, yet the minister is unable to say even today, only a couple of months before the introduction of the GST, how schools will be impacted.

Schools have already levied their materials and services charge, the school fees in public schools—and tuition fees in private schools—for the year. Do parents now have to fork out an additional GST for the second half of this year, or do schools have to cover that charge? The minister is still unable say what will and what will not be taxed.

What about those schools that have entered into fixed global budget arrangements under the Partnerships 21 scheme? There is no allowance within those budgets to cope with the GST. Indeed, what about other schools that are not in the scheme? How will this minister manage those costs? It seems to me that his response is simply 'hands off, step back'; it is a problem for the schools; it is not his problem. Indeed, the minister has given conflicting advice to this House about what will and will not be taxed. On 29 March, in response to a question from me about what aspects of the materials and services fees would be taxed, the minister said, 'We know that many items such as pens, pencils and paper will not be GST taxable.' That was two weeks ago, on 29 March. Today in this House the minister said 'We know that those items will be taxable.' If the minister does not know what will and will not be taxable no wonder the chaos in the schools today as those administrations try to grapple with the costs that will arise.

Today I raised the issue of fundraising, for instance, how a cake that markets for \$5 in a store, if sold for \$3 by a school council at a school fete will be GST taxable; if it is sold for \$2 dollars at another school fete it will not be GST taxable. Parents will be asked to become experts on putting market values on common items such as cakes made by parents and sold at fetes. Yet this minister in response to that question talked about how trivial the question was. It is not trivial to all the schools grappling with it.

In addition, how do schools administer raffles? It depends whether there are cash prizes or non-cash prizes or a combination of both. There are different tax treatments. It is a mess

and school parents are being asked to wade through this mess and to decide how much tax they must pay and how they recoup this cost. This minister is offering schools no joy in covering those costs. He cannot say how he will go about covering GST costs for schools: the implication is that he will not be. Schools will have a extra 10 per cent burden on many items fundamental to the education of our children. This comes from a federal government that promised an education system free of GST.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like to address issues pertinent to my electorate. I was pleased last week to hear that the CEO of the Department of Education, Training and Employment has indicated work should start shortly on a replacement facility for Sunnymeade Drive Kindergarten on the site of the four campus schools at Aberfoyle Park. Some two years ago it was agreed to replace that kindergarten because it is under high voltage power lines—not because of any fear about electromagnetic radiation but because helicopters fly along the power lines to check their condition and it was felt appropriate to move the kindergarten. Even though it has taken some time and the delay has been of some concern to parents, we are close now to seeing the contract let so that we will have a brand new kindergarten in Aberfoyle Park.

The second issue relates to the need for a youth facility in the Happy Valley region. I know the City of Onkaparinga is committed to providing such a facility but it needs land. It might appear to be an area with a lot of available land, but that is not the case, and I would appeal to the Minister for Government Enterprises (the Hon. Michael Armitage), who is the minister responsible for SA Water land in that area, to look generously upon a request from the council for land in Happy Valley so that we can get a much needed youth park in that vicinity to serve what is a huge teenage population. We need things such as a skateboard facility, an area for other physical activities and picnic areas to be used by not only young people but also the wider community. I would implore the minister, when the delegation from the City of Onkaparinga meets him in the near future, to be in a generous and sympathetic mood to accede to this request.

Last Friday I had the privilege of attending the launch of LYNX, a youth service which operates out of Taylors Road at Aberfoyle Park and which includes counselling, health advice through SHINE, JPET services, and so on. It was opened by the Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga, Ray Gilbert. Along with many people, I was delighted to see that service provided. I was delighted that Mr Richard Hicks from the Department of Human Services has advised, and the minister has confirmed, that out of the budget of human services they will find money to provide an entrance to that service so that teenagers can access it without having to come through the same entrance as the preschool children and their parents.

Last Friday night I had the privilege of attending the investing of the award of Queen's Scout to Jeffrey Smith, a constituent of mine. He is the third young person to receive this award in the past two weeks. He is a member of Reynella venturers. This ceremony took place at his home in Happy Valley, and I was delighted to be there with many of his friends, members of the Reynella venturers group, dignitaries from the scout association and many other people. I get a tremendous kick out of seeing young people achieve positive things. We often hear negatives about young people. In my experience over 90 per cent of young people are fantastic,

they are doing the right thing, and it is great to see someone like Jeffrey in the company of family, friends and fellow scouts being acknowledged for the great achievement of becoming a Queen's Scout. I look forward to seeing other young people in the area achieve that worthwhile badge and going on to become leaders in the community not only locally but also within the nation as a whole. Well done to Jeffrey.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

ROAD TRAFFIC (MISCELLANEOUS No. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 March. Page 713.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The opposition has studied the bill and the debate in another place most carefully. We are disappointed to have to go into this debate without the responsible minister present, and that is a dereliction by the government. There is no-one to whom the opposition can direct questions on this bill, and I will certainly be asking one question about it. So, it would be nice to have the responsible minister here. The bill introduces a new section 83 to the much amended parent act. The proposed section requires—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are dealing with the Road Traffic (Miscellaneous No. 2) Amendment Bill—completion of debate.

Mr ATKINSON: The junior minister is interjecting on this. I would have thought he would know that it is a normal courtesy in debate on government bills to have the government minister present. The government minister responsible for this bill is not present.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Come on!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: The proposed section requires a motorist passing an emergency vehicle that is stopped on a road and is displaying a flashing blue or red light to reduce speed to the point that no person is endangered and, in any case, not to drive at more than 40 km/h. These requirements do not apply if the road is divided by a median strip and the emergency vehicle is on the other side of the road. An emergency vehicle is a police vehicle or as defined in the regulations of the act administered by the Minister for Transport. If the substitute junior minister we have here today reads the administrative arrangements act of this state, he will know that not he but the minister (Hon. D.C. Brown) representing the Minister for Transport is responsible for this bill. I understand that the definition of an emergency vehicle will be broad.

The minister says that she would have liked this matter to be dealt with in the Australian road rules but, because those are sign-based rules, this matter was not included. South Australia is striking out on its own with this modest proposal. The government is right to be relying on flashing lights as the trigger for the requirement to slow down. Placing signs around the scene of a road accident would carry risks for those emergency workers assigned to do it and be awkward by comparison with the simple expedient of turning on flashing lights. I understand that emergency workers will be provided with incident forms to report motorists who violate the new section. A three-month grace period will apply

during which police will caution motorists. After this, the full rigour of the new section will apply.

Although there is already a duty on motorists to drive with care and consideration for road users, there has not been a dedicated provision in the Road Traffic Act requiring that motorists reduce speed when passing an emergency incident. The dedicated offence will make prosecution slightly easier because there were more elements for the prosecution to prove in the general offences of careless driving (section 45) and reckless and dangerous driving (section 46) of the Road Traffic Act. Of course, most drivers will use their common-sense and slow down upon seeing the flashing lights but enough motorists have not been slowing down to justify the passage of this proposal.

The proposal emerges from a working party on which the fire services, the ambulance service, the police and the SES were represented. I have only one question of the minister representing the Minister for Transport and it is this: will the new section 83 apply only in emergency situations, or will it also apply where an emergency vehicle has its lights flashing but the situation is not one of an emergency? If the minister can answer that question satisfactorily by reference to the text of the bill, the opposition is happy to support the second and third readings; and, if not, we will go into Committee and we will drag a detailed answer out of the minister. I note in passing that the bill is called 'miscellaneous' because there is a second change which makes more flexible the authority to make regulations under the Road Traffic Act.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to support this bill. I particularly want to pay the highest tribute to emergency services workers, who do a magnificent job, often in very traumatic circumstances. I live on a major highway, where high speeds are prevalent, and I have seen the horrific accidents that can happen on such roads. I also see the magnificent work these people do as volunteers, and I take my hat off to them. I have come upon many of these accidents, and I have stood back purely because I did not wish to become traumatised as a result of seeing the shocking results of such accidents. However, volunteers do this work time after time, often with traffic screaming past. The least we can do is show some care and compassion to allow these people to go about their valuable work without being exposed to the increased hazards of high speed vehicles going past.

Those vehicles can travel at 110 km/h, which is too fast, particularly when you realise that a lot of accidents happen at the scene of other accidents. That incidence is too prevalent. Sometimes it is a matter of people having a stickybeak at what is going on and not slowing down themselves. They just look sideways and, all of a sudden, they collide with one of the stationary vehicles or even a vehicle coming the other way. You need to be on the side of the road—and I used to work on the side of the road spraying roadside weeds—to appreciate just how fast a car is travelling at 110 or even 115 km/h. If you happen to be working there, it can be quite a shock, because many of the cars today are very quiet and you do not hear them approaching until they are right on you. I pay the highest tribute to these people.

When we discussed this legislation with the minister some months ago, I was wondering how we were to know what an emergency service vehicle was and, secondly, when it was actually stationed at the scene of an emergency. I am pleased that the flashing lights will be the telltale that allows the travelling public to know that, if the lights are flashing, the

maximum speed at which they must travel is 40 km/h. If the lights are not flashing, normal speed limits apply. I have a lot of support for this measure, which I am amazed has not been introduced earlier, because there is nothing more frightening than the occurrence of a serious accident and irresponsible motorists driving past at 110 km/h or even faster. The first thing you learn as a first aider—and there are many of us in the parliament—is that, before you carry out any first aid, you should consider the danger to yourself. This measure deals with that very matter. If motorists slow down, people can go about their good work without being exposed to any danger. It also reduces the exposure to danger for motorists driving past who, if they are more interested in looking at the accident and are not paying attention to their driving, could themselves otherwise have an accident. I support this bill.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I want to speak only briefly on this matter. On Sunday, I attended a demonstration at Peterborough where a large number of emergency services personnel put on a display with their equipment and demonstrated the services they provide to the public. Of course, the majority of these people were volunteers. I support this proposal. Like the member for Schubert, I spend a lot of time on the roads and have seen a lot of horrific accidents. I sincerely hope that the police will not hand out those dreadful on-the-spot fines for a breach of this measure; if anyone is convicted, I believe that they should be brought to court.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, you won't get me voting for another one; let me tell you that. I was foolish enough to take the word of your former minister, like a lot of your colleagues—

Mr Atkinson: You're going to do something about it, are you?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We know that the honourable member has never done anything constructive in his life. We know that he has been a malcontent and a number of other things, but he has never—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: One wouldn't want to comment on the honourable member's political activities of recent times, or we will still be here at 6—

Mr Atkinson: They have all been successful; that is all you need to know!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Only in your view. Sometimes success comes at a considerable price, and I would say that, before this escapade is over, a considerable price will be paid by the honourable member and some of his colleagues. However, I do not want to be sidetracked in relation to this measure. I support it because I know how difficult it is in certain parts of the state to get people to remain in these voluntary organisations and give their services freely, and when they do that we should support them. This measure will do that, so I do not have a problem with it. However, I sincerely hope that this is not another one of those measures where these on-the-spot fines are handed out like confetti because, if it is, the public again will think that we are only passing revenue-raising measures.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I, too, wish to place on the record my support for this bill. I do so because, as the member for Spence and others have stated, generally speaking, the sensible motorist does what is required by this bill, anyway. However, the reality is that some do not slow down and therefore are not showing consideration for the valuable work

performed by the police, emergency services in general and the many volunteers who risk their lives in order to help someone in an accident. I believe that it is only right and fitting that this provision be put in place and that the bill be passed to make it clear that we cannot put emergency services volunteers and others in any danger when they are carrying out that important work for the community.

As the member for Schubert said, vehicles travelling at 110 km/h past an accident scene could cause havoc. All you need is the wrong set of circumstances, and you could have other casualties on your hands. I commend the minister in another place for bringing this bill to the attention of the parliament and for ensuring that it is enacted quickly so that it becomes an offence to travel over 40 km/h past flashing lights where emergency services are attending trauma situations or accidents in the best interests of the community.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I thank the member for Spence for his support for this bill. In answer to his question, I wish to advise that if, for example, a police car is on the side of the road with its lights flashing, the intent of this bill would be that the motorist would need to slow down to 40 km/h. The reasons for that are, first, the occupational health and safety of the police officer, as with any other emergency services worker, and, secondly, one would never know when they went past that vehicle whether a person on a bike was in front of the police car and the police car was protecting that person, and so on. Having said that, it is incumbent on police to ensure that their flashing lights are activated only when they are at an incident, addressing a speeding offence, and so on.

As the member for Spence said, it would not be in the interests of that officer to work outside general orders and the good intent of this bill. In fact, I concur with the member for Spence that I would expect that sort of behaviour from SAPOL as well. Having said that, I as Minister for Emergency Services would like to put a couple of things on the public record. This is an important bill for me as Minister for Emergency Services, representing as I do tens of thousands of paid and volunteer staff who make themselves available 24 hours a day seven days a week to look after our community.

I commend my colleague the Hon. Diana Laidlaw (Minister for Transport) for developing this bill. As Minister for Emergency Services, I have enjoyed working through our agencies with her and her department to ensure that we now have an opportunity to protect our emergency services workers.

I would also like to congratulate particularly the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association, which, to a large degree, actually led this particular issue. Although a working party was set up in 1997, an enormous amount of effort has been put in by the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association, supported by the CES Association and others (SAPOL and the MFS), to ensure that this bill reached this stage. In fact, I know that thousands of volunteers and paid staff will be delighted to know that this bill is now going through this House of Assembly. One of the questions that has been asked continuously of me as emergency services minister for many months now is: when will this bill get through this parliament? I will not speak for a long time on this now, but I would like to say a couple more things before closing.

In one sense, one could argue that it is disappointing that parliament has to go down this track and enact this legislation. I would have thought that it was commonsense for motorists to be cautious when approaching an emergency scene and to slow down, but history has shown that this has not been the case and, in a worst-case scenario, we have had major trauma in emergency services and significant injury as a result of people not being prepared to slow down at an emergency services incident. An example occurred only recently when, sadly, there was another road death in my area—one of 14 that I can count in a 10 year period in my area.

The accident occurred on the Friday evening. At lunch time on the following day I was driving through my electorate, and two police cars with their lights flashing were on the top of Willunga Hill. Two police officers (with their vests on) were in the middle of the road. Clearly, they were investigating that incident, which was a very traumatic one. I slowed down because I could see the flashing lights, and I almost experienced road rage on the part of the driver of the vehicle behind me trying to push me off the road because they felt that it was their right to travel along that road at 100 or 110 km/h. That reinforced to me the importance of this legislation.

Why should anyone working at an incident such as that have their life put at risk because someone is not prepared to show common courtesy and commonsense? What the parliament in a responsible way has done is support a bill that will give much greater safety to emergency services workers in the future. Having said that, even at 40 km/h there is an inherent danger when travelling around a road trauma or an emergency services scene. I strongly encourage the community to slow right down and, if in doubt, effectively to get off the road and assess the situation before they travel further because they may not know what is in front of them, and it is better for drivers to be cautious than to cause problems for themselves and others in their vehicle, and indeed the emergency services.

I also thank the minister's department (Department of Transport) for the good work that its officers have put into this bill. As I said, it is a great outcome for everyone and I will have delight in advising all the emergency service workers under my portfolio that this legislation is now there to protect them. I commend this bill to the House.

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

DISTRICT COURT (ADMINISTRATIVE AND DISCIPLINARY DIVISION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 April. Page 745.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Many acts of parliament create appeals from tribunals to the District Court. The wording of these appeal rights varies. The bill tries to introduce uniformity regarding these appeals and if one looks in the schedule to the bill one sees that 47 acts are mentioned. The administrative and disciplinary division appears by this bill to have a jurisdiction for merits review of each administrative decision appealed. I do not welcome this expansion of jurisdiction, because I do not think District Court judges are the right people to be making or remaking administrative decisions. Judges are good at making decisions on the rights of opposing parties before the court, but they are not so good

at making decisions that affect consolidated revenue and the rights of an individual as against the public.

I confess that there is also some nostalgia on my part for the old forms of administrative review, such as the writs of prohibition, mandamus and certiorari which I learnt in law school 22 years ago. It seems that these are being usurped these days by a simple merits review, whereby a judge simply hears the case and tries to remake the original administrative decision. I think there was some wisdom in the old scheme of ensuring that judges did not engage in merits review but could only review administrative decisions on stated grounds.

The way merits review is expressed in the bill is that the court must examine the decision in light of the evidence and material presented to the original decision maker. The court may by this bill receive new evidence and substitute its own decision. The rules of evidence are relaxed for these matters. I have a fear that by relaxing the rules of evidence you may increase the cost of these appeals. The bill provides that the court must give due weight to the original decision and must not depart from it unless there are cogent reasons to do so. The Public Advocate, Mr John Harley, writes that the expression 'cogent reasons' has a long career of judicial interpretation ahead of it. Costs in disciplinary appeals may now be awarded where the interests of justice require; they will not necessarily follow the event.

The bill also allows the Guardianship Board to proceed on an urgent hearing without assessors, by whom are meant lay assessors, that is, non-lawyers who are advising the lawyer chairman of a board. Owing to assessors in this jurisdiction often being health professionals, they can be hard to obtain at short notice. The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists has real concerns about this bill, because it feels that a great deal more of its time will be taken up in appealing not just before the Guardianship Board but then appearing before the administrative and disciplinary division of the District Court.

The Guardianship Board before which the Public Advocate often appears generates more than half the state's administrative appeals each year. I ask the minister representing the Attorney-General whether the Public Advocate's criticisms of this bill have been satisfactorily answered. In case the minister representing the Attorney-General is not aware of Mr John Harley's criticisms of the bill in the state in which it was last year, I will mention some of them to him. Mr Harley, who is a Liberal Party member for whom I have the greatest respect, writes:

However, the court is a totally inappropriate forum for a far ranging and complex hearing to take place. It should be remembered that appellants are not charged with an offence; neither have they committed a civil wrong.

He goes on to write:

Some of the judges evince a strong antipathy to even sitting in the jurisdiction, let alone providing anything in their reasons which may add to the jurisprudence in this area.

Moreover, Mr Harley mentions that judges in this jurisdiction will be changing every two months on a rotation. Mr Harley writes:

It may be argued that the court will only bother to look at the transcript of the board hearing as occurs as present. However, the court now has a discretion to do so, and the appellant's counsel may well argue that the court should not, because of inaccuracies in the transcript or there are procedural or substantive defects in the board's proceedings.

Mr Harley shares the concerns of the psychiatrists that their time will be taken up in much longer hearings.

If the government has persuaded the Public Advocate, Mr Harley, that this bill is wise, I think it is important that we should know how it has persuaded Mr Harley and how the bill has been changed to accommodate him. If Mr Harley is not now satisfied, the government should inform the House of that, because after all he is the principal person appearing before the Guardianship Board, which is responsible for more than half the administrative decisions appealed in the state. I await the minister's answers with interest. If they are not satisfactory we shall just have to go into committee, consider the bill clause by clause and get it right.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the member for Spence for a well considered contribution to the debate. My advice is that the Public Advocate's criticisms were made last year with respect to a bill before the House that was in a slightly different form. That bill has now been replaced by this bill, which has gone through a public consultation process, including such people as the Public Advocate, the Guardianship Board and the Legal Services Commission. So, I understand that the issues the Public Advocate raised were dealt with through that public consultation process, and my advice is that the Public Advocate is generally happy.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Mr ATKINSON: Will the minister explain to the committee whether this bill allows pure merits review of administrative decisions by the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court or are there some qualifications on merits review? If so, what are those qualifications, and are the concerns of the Public Advocate, Mr Harley, and the concerns of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists that Guardianship Board matters will be entirely reheard—that is, reheard afresh by the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court—real; and, if they are not real, how have those fears been avoided by the changes between the two versions of the bills?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: In relation to the Guardianship Board, I understand that there is an examination of the transcript and there is a provision to take new evidence, which is similar to the current provision.

Mr ATKINSON: Will the minister explain to the committee how the law is changing by this bill? He gives the impression that almost nothing has changed. What substantive changes to administrative law are made by this bill, and what is the scope at District Court level for the traditional administrative remedies that I mentioned earlier, namely, the writs of mandamus, certiorari and prohibition?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that the bill is not designed to bring about any substantive change to the nature of the appeals. It is a broadening of the existing appeal provisions. As the honourable member rightly mentioned, it is designed to bring more uniformity to about 47 different systems.

Mr ATKINSON: And the old form?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that under this bill the court can consider procedural matters as outlined by the honourable member, but it is not confined to those matters, as it can also consider substantive matters.

Mr ATKINSON: I do not quite follow the minister's answer. Maybe there is some defect in my reasoning. If one is dissatisfied with an administrative decision under one of the 47 acts listed in the schedule, let us say an act under which there is already some subordinate tribunal to determine an administrative decision, if an individual is dissatisfied with a decision of the tribunal and seeks to bring a writ of mandamus to compel the tribunal to make a different decision—or, if it is a quasi judicial tribunal, a writ of prohibition to prevent the tribunal deliberating further on the matter—in which court would such a writ be heard; and, if it is the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court, what are the relative merits of bringing an action under this bill or an action under the old form of writ?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that someone seeking judicial review would go to the Supreme Court. However, the Supreme Court would be unlikely to deal with the matter unless someone had actually gone through the appeal process. I am advised that that is similar to the process that exists at the moment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 and 9), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATER RESOURCES (WATER ALLOCATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 April. Page 743.)

Mr HILL (Kaurna): This bill is necessary because of the workings of the Select Committee on Water Allocations in the South-East, and it gives legislative force to some of the recommendations in that committee's report. As members will know, the committee looked at the issue of pro rata allocation of the remaining resources and decided to recommend pro rata but in a way different from that originally proposed. It said that we should have pro rata allocations of the remaining resource, that full tradability should come into operation, and that, in order to encourage trading of water and ensure that the water would go to the best economic and environmental use, a rent or charge should be placed on the holding of that allocation. The government and the minister realised that they needed to introduce a new kind of water licence, so that is why we have been given a holding licence as well as a taking licence. It makes sense to me that, if we are to allocate potential use of water, we need to issue a particular type of licence, and that is what will be achieved by this bill.

In addition, the bill allows the minister or the various water authorities to charge a levy on the holding of the water as well as on the use of the water. The committee recommended that, and it is a sensible thing. There certainly should be a charge for the use of water. Water is a state resource: it does not belong to people, it should be owned by the whole of the population and, if people use water, they should be charged for using it. If an allocation is given to them, they should not be able to sit on it in perpetuity without any cost to them. Rather, they should pay a holding charge, the rate of which should increase as the value of the water in that area increases, so that there is encouragement for people to use the water or trade in the water so that it does not get held onto for generation after generation and not used.

The report aimed to get the best economic and environmental outcome, and the measure that the government has

before the House is a way of doing that. It seems to be a sensible approach on the surface and, in general terms, the opposition will support the bill. However, I have had discussions with the member for Gordon, who has raised some serious concerns about the operations of the bill. He spoke in the South-East recently and was interviewed by the *Border Watch*. He said in part:

I have got concerns about dealing with these matters in isolation. We are leaving the door wide open and have to fix up the problems before they begin oozing through our fingers somewhere else.

Mr McEwen said that in his usual rhetorical style. The honourable member has raised a number of issues and I have had a meeting with him. The minister has undertaken to have an informal meeting of the select committee, which the member for Mackillop, the member for Gordon and the member for Chaffey will be invited to attend, and we will go through some of these concerns and we will look at how the government is progressing on the committee's recommendations. I will not give a 100 per cent guarantee to the minister at this stage that I will support this legislation. I will say that I am sympathetic to the bill but I want him to answer the questions that have been raised with me by the member for Gordon.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: With great pleasure.

Mr HILL: The minister says he will do so with great pleasure, which is good, and, depending on those discussions, I will revisit this issue and I hope that I will support it. The issue of water has not gone away in the South-East. Last Thursday the front page of the *Border Watch* carried the headline 'Water loss crisis', and on Friday it was 'Water crisis talks'. The issue is still very hot in the South-East. It is absolutely vital for that area and this matter needs to be resolved.

Since August last year, when the report of the committee came down, water allocation has been frozen, and I know that has been a brake on economic development in the area. I know also that people are pretty keen to get access to water. I am of a mind to facilitate the government's measure, but I want to hear a proper accounting in the formal and informal committee stages so that the member for Gordon's questions can be addressed.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): As the previous speaker told the House, this bill fulfils the recommendations of the select committee which sat last year and made 37 recommendations with regard to water in the South-East. As the honourable member just said, it has been a very hot topic, and I have been very involved with it for close on three years. I have been virtually living and breathing this subject throughout my electorate, and it impacts very heavily on my electorate and that of the neighbouring electorate of Gordon.

The South-East of South Australia is undoubtedly one of the most productive agricultural areas in South Australia, if not in the whole of Australia, principally because of the abundance of ground water. I am somewhat disappointed that the shadow minister indicated that he was willing to hold this up for a while.

Mr Hill: Only until Thursday.

Mr WILLIAMS: I sincerely hope that is the case because it is essential for us to move forward. I know that the member for Gordon made some comments on another matter when moving a motion in the House nearly a fortnight ago, and I might return to those comments later. The South-East has a system of allocation of water, and that water is the annual rainfall that escapes the root zone of the plants on the land

surface. That water percolates through the soil profile into the aquifer, and it can be pumped out for any manner of use, whether industrial, agricultural, stock or domestic water. It is imperative that we look after that aquifer and that we have in hand policies that enable us to protect the aquifer, hopefully in perpetuity.

It is worth noting that, throughout the history of irrigation, over thousands of years, man has wrecked millions of acres on the surface of the planet through irrigation. Indeed, as we debate this matter, in the South-East land is being degraded and aquifers are being depleted by a series of things, including irrigation practices, which have probably gone well past their use-by date, and because people have been overzealous in their pursuit of creating wealth from their property. I believe that the water debate has been driven by greed and it is more to do with dollars than water, and it is certainly more to do with dollars than about protecting the resource in perpetuity.

The select committee recommended to the House that water be allocated on a pro rata basis. The definition of 'pro rata' that I have been using for some time is that a property owner should be allocated an amount of water that is commensurate with the contribution from his property to the aquifer. In other words, that property owner should be able to use the rain that falls on that property for any pursuit. The property owner should also be able to trade his allocation of water to other water users.

The previous speaker alluded to this point when he said that the form of pro rata that we came up with was different from that which had been talked about earlier, and I take him to task on that. I have often been quoted in the South-East as saying that I am anti-trade and that I want pro rata allocation that cannot be traded to others. That is nonsense. All the time that I have been involved in this debate, I have tried to talk people into accepting in the first instance what I referred to as a water bank, whereby there was an allocation to land-holders but the land-holders only had access to that allocation if they put the water to productive use and, if they did not use the water, their allocation was automatically deposited into the water bank, just like a bank into which we deposit cash, and others could borrow an allocation out of that bank, as we do with cash.

I think that system would have worked very well and would have served the purposes of the South-East better than any other system that has been brought before us since. However, large vested interests fought the political battle against that system and every ploy in the book was used, including misrepresenting what the pro rata lobby was trying to achieve in the South-East. That is why people like the shadow minister say that the pro rata system that we recommended as a select committee would be different from what had been talked about in the South-East previously. That was because the pro rata lobby in the South-East had been misrepresented and misquoted ad nauseam. Certainly, it was always in my mind that we had to have some form of water trading, because there are obviously many land-holders who are not interested in either irrigating or utilising the total of the rainfall that falls on their property.

The big issue in all of this is: who owns the water? Again, it has suited the purpose of the members of the irrigation lobby to say up to this point in time that the water is a community asset: it is owned by the government and, therefore, the government has a right to hand it out, and the government has chosen to hand it to them and now they own

it. That is the logic that they have used to say that they now own the water.

In the South-East in the last 12 months we have seen an incredible acceleration in the amount of forestry that is taking place. People have become stuck in this mind-set that the only way in which we can use the water in the South-East is to place a hole in the ground, put a pump on it, pump the water out and then spread it around over the surface, or use it for whatever other industrial or stock watering purpose that we have in mind. When we plant a forest we, indeed, are using the same water; we are using probably the totality of the rainfall that falls on the land where the forest is growing. I have been trying to point this out to everyone for almost three years now, particularly to those irrigators who had it in their mind, once they had convinced everyone that the government owned the water and could then give it to whom it liked and had given it to them, that they would have it in perpetuity. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Certainly, the members of the bureaucracy who have advised various ministers over previous years have never suggested that the government owns the water before it reaches the aquifer or, indeed, before it reaches the ground. As rainfall, it is not really owned by anyone, and if it is captured by any particular person it then becomes their property. I think that that is what the common law says, and always has said.

This is where we have the dilemma because there is a group of people in the South-East who, to protect their own wealth generating assets and their own vested interests, have chosen to say that the water becomes property and it can be theirs, and theirs in perpetuity. Yet they have no system, and have never accepted that they would ever have to worry about the person up the road who was providing the catchment. And now we have the person up the road being offered what would generally be seen as a price exceeding the going rate for his land by investors who wish to plant that land with blue gums. I must admit that I cannot fathom the reason for this; these offers have been made well above the market value for land to plant it down to blue gums. We are literally seeing tens of thousands of hectares being converted to forests in the South-East. Every time a hectare is converted to forest we are losing recharge to the aquifer of up to 1.3 megalitres per year. That is a considerable amount of water. If we plant another 100 000 hectares of forest in the South-East—and I would argue that, at the rate we are going, that could happen within the next 12 to 18 months—we will lose something over 100 000 megalitres of recharge to the aquifer. In some areas, this will impact on existing irrigators.

The Water Resources Act, as it now stands, gives a guarantee to existing irrigators. I believe that it gives a guarantee of a share of the permissible annual volume. I do not believe that it gives a guarantee that they will always, under any circumstances, be able to carry out the extent of activity that they carry out now because the act says that, if the irrigation activity impacts adversely upon the resource, the rate of extraction of water must be reduced. Irrigators in the South-East do not have their mind around that particular part of the act. Certainly, we have an example around the Keith area in the northern part of my electorate, where extensive irrigation activity has been occurring for over 25 years with extensive small seed production, principally lucerne. I am told that today there are people watering lucerne with water that has up to 7 000 parts per million of salts in it. That is not sustainable.

I am informed by those who should know—and, indeed, I believe do know—that, if we go on doing what we are now

without major changes, the life expectancy of the Padthaway basin (which is becoming a premium grape growing area) is limited to about 20 years, purely because of salinisation. I am also told that, under present trends, the Coonawarra has a life expectancy of about 50 years. So, when people turn around and ignore the facts and ignore that the practices that they are carrying out at the moment are leading to an unsustainable situation, they are leading us down a path where, in 20 to 50 years, we will see the landscape of the South-East vastly different from what it is and the production systems vastly different from what they are now. Those who choose to ignore that do it at the peril of themselves, their children and grandchildren.

As a representative of that area, I think it behoves me, and all members in this place, to make sure that we do everything we can to curb the desires of those people who have no care about what happens to the environment over the next 10 to 20 to 50 years. The only way in which I believe we can in the longer term protect the environment in the South-East—and I am referring particularly to the water and the water resource, and this most valuable resource—is through a pro rata water allocation, because then every land-holder has the commitment, because he also has the ownership of the aquifer. At the moment, we have quite an area in the South-East where, through the previous on demand allocation system, we have one group of farmers who have managed to get themselves ownership of large shares of the water resource, and next door to them and down the road there are other land-holders who have been locked out of that through the past allocation policy and who have no share of the resource. Consequently, they have no desire to protect the resource, and they have no incentive to ensure that the recharge to the resource continues, because they have been encouraged by previous practices to now sell their properties to afforestation interests. This will impact—and is today as I speak—dramatically on existing irrigators.

I have raised the matter of forestry many times. In fact, I said in a speech I made in the South-East last weekend that it would be a very brave government that told a land-holder that because the government had given away that land-holder's rainfall before it had even reached the surface of his land, had given it away to a neighbour down the road, that he could not plant trees on his land.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I am saying that it would be a very brave government that tells the land-holder in the South-East that he cannot use the rain that falls on his property, because we made huge mistakes in past practices. The minister has interjected, and I feel obliged to answer his interjection. I am not suggesting that we have to withdraw all existing licences. But I think that, over a period of time, those existing licence holders will have to accept—and they will have no choice but to accept—that their licences may need to be reduced as time goes on, as we find that the aquifers become overtaxed. In some areas it might happen in a very short period of time; it might happen within a couple of years in isolated areas. Over the majority of South-East I do not believe it will happen within a very short time. But if we do not proceed with these amendments and we do not hand out the water in the majority of the South-East on a pro rata basis we will compound this problem and, instead of having it in some isolated pockets, we will have it across the whole of the South-East.

In relation to most of the area where the minister and the government have agreed to the recommendations of the select committee report and where the pro rata roll out will be

occurring, there are opportunities for every land-holder to receive an allocation commensurate with the rainfall on that property. As the member for Gordon said, there are things we have to do; there are more steps we have to take. I would argue that some of these steps are so large that it would be difficult to take them in one attempt. I would argue that we should move slowly, as long as we know where we want to go. We have to take the community with us. I will set out the steps we need to take. First, once we have completed the pro rata roll out, people must be told that if they use that water, either by extracting it through a pumping system and irrigating or by planting a forest, they cannot on sell that licence.

We should not let someone on sell a licence if they are using it for irrigation. Under the present policy we would allow them to on sell it if they planted a forest over the whole of their land, and that is an absolute nonsense which must be addressed. That is different from saying to someone in an area where all the water has been allocated and whose neighbour is irrigating that he cannot plant trees on his property: that is a huge dilemma of which both we and the irrigators must be aware. I do not think there needs to be any knee-jerk reaction to that dilemma, but we have to be aware of it. We have to enunciate to the people in the South-East that there is a problem and we have to be up-front and honest with those land-holders about exactly what will happen.

I was at a forum in the South-East last night when this debate arose. Someone used an example of a large irrigator adjacent to the coast and asked whether the government intended to reduce that person's allocation. I pointed out that, if the resource was being taxed to the extent that we started to get saltwater intrusion into the aquifer and the irrigator was pumping saltwater from his bores, of course I would recommend that his allocation and the allocation of those around him be reduced.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is right: it is too late then. That is why we have to enunciate these things to the people of the South-East. We have to get out there and say that we already have problems with the aquifer; it is being overtaxed in the Keith area and the Padthaway basin. Where there has been intensive irrigation for a lengthy time we are seeing rising salinity levels. Having regard to the amount of water we can use from the aquifer, the amount of production on which we have set our sights might be too high. I suggest that we be honest with the people in the South-East and say that there will be changes in the future. In the meantime, I recommend to the House that the minister's amendments be supported. That allows us to move ahead with the pro rata allocation over the majority of the area of the South-East, and once we have that in place we can then move on and manage the system without upsetting individual land-holders and, by so doing, encourage individual land-holders to be responsible with this most important resource. I commend the minister's amendments to the House.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): If you do not work back from division, you are inviting disaster; or, as was said in *Alice in Wonderland*, 'If you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there.' I think that these amendments are foolhardy, not for what they do but for what they do not do. I think it is very dangerous to continue to allocate water when we do not know how much we have or how much is already allocated. I would have thought we would learn, from 100 years of incremental mistakes made in relation to the river,

not again to practise the politics of incremental creep, because that is what we are doing here: we are introducing something which includes a number of vagaries and unknowns. We do not know all the consequences of the next step. To my mind it would be better to pause a little longer and ask more questions and get more answers before we move forward.

Even the member for MacKillop says that there are significant unanswered matters, in particular, the conflict involving land use change, an extraction entitlement and a licence to extract. Land use change, in effect, decreases the water available for the other two steps. We have the potential for double dipping, as the member for MacKillop rightly says. Someone at the moment can take one of the new licences, train it and then use the same water again because he can plant forestry. The member for MacKillop says that it would be a brave government that would ban land use change. Of course it would be, because the honourable member is looking at the wrong place in the equation. It is probably a high priority use; it needs to be dealt with differently.

His solution in a speech on Saturday was that, if someone sold the water, a caveat be put on the land to disallow any further land use. That is going backwards and, of course, that requires the Planning Act. There is another solution to the problem to which I alluded when I called for reconvening of the select committee. There is no point in moving forward and moving backwards, and that is what we are continuing to do: we are moving one step forward and one step backwards. We are still not dealing with some of the fundamental issues, and that is why this is a dangerous move. So, let us explore again some of the fundamental issues. We do not know how much water exists. We continue to get arguments about whether there is recharge under native vegetation under plantation forestry or under the impact of clay spreading or changing agronomic practices. We do not know how much water is available.

Interestingly enough, we are starting to have a debate about not only quantity but also quality. It is fine to specify the quantity but a range of qualitative issues is now starting to emerge. For example, yesterday I was given advice that the annual increase to the salt load in the South-East is 300 000 tonnes a year. That is impacting on quality, and unless we allow in more water to deal with flow throughs we will have major problems with salt load. On Saturday I heard the member for MacKillop say that irrigation had a finite life. There is a point at which irrigation practices are no longer sustainable, because quality issues overtake the quantity issues. That is a serious thing to think about.

I say that we do not know how much water we have given away because we have not yet dealt with irrigation equivalence to volumetric. I am told we are finding that the original constant is a huge understatement and that, to convert irrigation equivalence to volumetric, will take a lot more water than previously thought. Irrespective of that, you should know how much you have and how much you have given away before you give away any more. To my mind, that is a fundamental step. This bill is giving water to people who either do not have any water or have water of a quality that is not irrigable. This is a fundamental issue. We are saying to people that because they have land they can have water; that they will never be able to use that water for irrigation but they will be able to trade that water. You have given someone a windfall gain, something they never had, they never purchased and they never believed they had the right to have. This legislation will give them something they

have never had before and then allow them to trade it. This has an impact in two ways: first, they have this windfall which they can trade; and then they can plant forests, so they can trade it twice—they can use it twice.

I agree with the member for MacKillop that this must be fixed, and one of my criticisms of the select committee is that it put this issue in the margin. It did not know 12 months ago the acreages that would be planted. I refer members to the wording in the report of the select committee which I quoted earlier in the week.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in his seat.

Mr McEWEN: The water boy continues to interject. We have a major problem with the windfall gain. People are now being given a pro rata allocation over land where no water existed of irrigable quality. They can now trade that into another area, so a purchaser in another area can buy in water from elsewhere which immediately impacts on the pro rata rights of the people around him, because they will not be able to hydrogeologically use that water for irrigation purposes. So, they in turn will have only one option—to trade it. They have created a double whammy in allowing people to have access to a right that never existed previously. We must fix this before we allow anyone to have any pro rata allocation.

With regard to this problem of trading in and out of areas, again it is unclear as to what these zones are—whether they are hundreds, subaquifers or whatever. It is not clear, because it exposes the next problem. We do not have in place any water allocation plans. On 3 August last, the minister put in a moratorium on what was known as Wotton Mark II. We do not have in place a water allocation plan, because the minister said he is not prepared to go back to Wotton Mark II. I might add that the member for MacKillop believes that that forum which developed Wotton Mark II was a sham forum, and that was an interesting comment. That notwithstanding, we had in place a water allocation plan and, on 3 August last year, we said, 'Enough is enough.' Under the new act, we have a process such that we can in future put in place a new water allocation plan, and that is the responsibility of the South-East Catchment Management Board. In the interim we have a hiatus: we have no water allocation plan in place.

My question to the minister is: how will he deal with this matter? We must have either an interim water allocation plan or continue with the moratorium until such time as the catchment board's water allocation plan is signed off. Either way, I would prefer to see that before I vote on the bill. It is matter of being once bitten, twice shy. When I supported the broad thrust of the emergency services levy, I was told not to worry about the detail. When I saw the detail I realised they had it fundamentally wrong. However, now I am told, 'How dare you criticise the detail; you supported the principle.' This time, I am saying to the minister, 'There's more than this in the detail.' I have some concerns about the broad thrust, because the minister is heading off into the unknown and it can create too many mistakes. I am also saying, 'If you are going to head off into the unknown, at least give me some idea of what your interim water management plan will look like, because there will have to be some trading rules.' There still will have to be the opportunity to do something with this water; otherwise we still have a moratorium in place.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: The minister must understand that I am just putting on the record the issues I have canvassed with him privately. I might say that, in so doing, I would have

preferred to continue that discussion rather than making a second reading speech at this stage. I now need to put on the record the concerns that may or may not be able to be addressed in discussions collectively with the minister and the select committee.

The issue of water quality is becoming a bigger and bigger one. I still do not think we have done enough work in terms of the quality implications of present irrigation practices and present allocations. Again, I am concerned about continuing to allocate water without having a clear view as to the impact of what we are already doing. I do not see how these new licences and the old licences can be treated the same. It begs the question to which I need to return, and it involves another interesting point which the member for MacKillop made on Saturday and which I have not thought about much yet. However, I will come back to that. The key issue is that people who are using water now in theory have spent an enormous amount of money on infrastructure to develop that water. If you are then going to give other people water that has an equal status, and they have not spent any money on infrastructure, then you find that if you take the water back equally, it is a very vicious backhander to people who have already done the right thing and invested huge amounts of money in infrastructure to use their water.

While the member for MacKillop was talking about this on Saturday, he said he believed that all existing licences were water taking licences, whether or not you were taking the water, and that has enormous implications in terms of a two-tiered levy structure. I do not know whether the minister has addressed that, but I can see where the member for MacKillop is coming from. It would be interesting to know whether all those people who presently hold allocations believe that they are water taking licences under the amendments and, if not, we need to clarify that, because again after the event we need to know the standing of licences pre-existing the event. It will be a very interesting debate. However, that will have to be answered again before we move forward in terms of the two licences.

That then brings me to the matter of the levies. I am now being told that there will be two types of levies for water takers. There will be a levy to do with holding the water and a levy to do with taking the water. I know that the member for MacKillop believes there should be no charge for holding the water—and I do not know whether that is true but that is what he is quoted as saying in the press. His attitude is, ‘You shouldn’t have to pay for water if you are just holding it, but you should pay for water if you are taking it.’ My understanding of the act is that you cannot have a division 1 and a division 2 levy. Now a large property holder who has been paying a reasonable levy because he owns land can be given a very small pro rata allocation and now only pay a levy on the allocation and, therefore, pay far less than he was paying in the past. Again, we need to address the issue of what are now three levies—one land based levy, and two types of water based levies. I really need the minister to clarify what will be the relationships between the two water-based levies and whether or not people will now be able to pay a lot less, simply because they have exercised their right for a pro rata levy and, therefore, will not have to pay a land-based levy.

The issue of who actually owns the water is also an interesting one. The member for MacKillop is saying, ‘If you catch the water you own it.’ That is a very interesting point. I do not know where that leaves industry but, in particular, I do not know where that leaves urban expansion in Mount Gambier. Are we now saying that there can be no further

urban expansion in Mount Gambier, because no more water is available as all water is now allocated? Or are we saying, ‘No, urban expansion is a higher water use priority and can continue but, as it expands, water will be taken back from other water users’? If it is to be taken back, will it be taken back from these people who have been given a pro rata allocation or from water users? Of course, that will depend on whether or not the hundred is fully allocated. In the hundreds immediately around Mount Gambier we are close to full allocation.

We need to get our heads around whether there is still a hierarchy of water users and whether the uses of urban, domestic, industry and livestock are of a higher order. Then we get to the select committee issue that still has not been answered of what we are doing with people who are still taking water without a licence or who have gained a licence through false pretences. We still have water holders who misrepresented the situation so that they would be given water; we still do not seem to be addressing that matter. A specific matter was raised, but a whole lot of general matters were also raised.

There are also a number of small irrigators who have never bothered to get a licence. Basically, when they put down their bore, it was considered for stock and domestic purposes. However, they are not using it for stock and domestic purposes. Instead, they have gone into small-scale horticulture, for example, and they are using the water. Where do they sit? What are we doing with them? Are we simply saying, ‘No, we will just leave them in the margin’?

The interplays between drainage and ground water still do not appear to have been answered, either. Obviously, on the quality issue, sometimes drainage is a higher priority than is recharging the ground water, because we are trying to take away salts. Again, a number of recommendations were made in the select committee report that do not seem to be addressed. I am not saying that they have to be addressed as part of the present amendments to the bill but certainly they ought to be addressed as part of the future vision.

Some of the issues I am raising ought to be dealt with broadly; others ought to be dealt with immediately, before we give out any more water. In all this, it is interesting to note that we still do not have any plans for the confined aquifer. Again, as soon as we put more pressure on the unconfined aquifer, there will be more demand for the confined aquifer. My understanding of that is that there is no moratorium on the confined aquifer—I could be wrong—and, again, it is a first in best dressed approach. All we might be doing is simply shifting a whole lot of pressures from one aquifer to another and, basically, we ought to be dealing holistically with one water budget.

Why am I saying that it is not wise to move forward now? I am doing so because there are still too many unknowns, and what seems on the surface to be a good idea will further compound many of the issues and make it even more difficult to resolve them later. We know that you can give but you cannot take away. That is particularly so with regard to the issues that are confronting us in relation to land use change, which is now having a significant impact on the amount of water available. In some hundreds, where the water is fully allocated, land use change is in effect taking away water that is already allocated and, therefore, denying a return on capital to a huge amount of irrigation investment. Where does that leave those investors and the government? We are just not answering this question.

We cannot put this on hold much longer—that along with the issues of what now seems to be a three tiered levy and the issue of there seeming to be no disincentives for holding and speculating in water and no incentives to trade. What we are now doing is antidevelopment. It will be so difficult now to bulk up these large number of pro rata allocations into a useable quantity of water, and it will be very costly to administer, given the bureaucracy needed to do it. I cannot see how it will be done. There are no disincentives at the moment, particularly if the levy for a holding licence is minimal, so there is no real reason to put this water back on the market. It will be very difficult to bulk up any of this water. I know industry is saying that that is of particular concern to them but, equally, we need more water for the environment.

As I said when I spoke to the amendments last year when we put the moratorium in place, it is my view that it would be better to get more of this right before continuing to make these incremental changes, because I do not think we are weighing up all the positives and negatives of each step. We are not working back from the future. We do not have a holistic view of the whole water budget and anything less than that is a silly stepping off point to be giving further water out to anyone.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I listened with interest to the member for Gordon and I know the honourable member has put all his points forward in a very positive sense—although, if one was listening to it, one would have to question some of the comments. However, I assume that they were put with the intent of advancing this whole exercise. I would have to say that one thing that surprises me is that the member for Gordon would know—as would everyone who was on the select committee—that this whole process is not about immediacy: it is about time to get some things right while other things are being looked at. Clearly, if the member had read the report in detail, he would know that one of the major recommendations—and I believe it was recommendation eight—was on forestry. We recommended that long-term work needed to be done on the expansion of forests. It was an issue about which the select committee spent some time in discussion. There is no doubt that, from the CSIRO's point of view, no water is gained or lost in forestry, but there is a question about it. As a consequence, we recommended that a lot more work needed to be done.

I know that the member for Gordon likes to have everything precise—and I have noticed that in other areas—but, unfortunately, in this particular area, you have to move on while you are also looking at the preciseness of certain calculations. I will mention one in particular. I do not think that anyone would disagree that the PAVs are not an exact science. They have not been an exact science for 100 years. Perhaps we ought to give the member for Gordon some advice: if suddenly you have to make a decision that tomorrow morning you will fix up an inexact science of the past 100 years, it will not happen.

What is sensible is to start looking at each of the districts, the hundreds in particular. I point out to the member for Gordon that the hundreds are a precise area and that the PAVs are related to the hundreds, which, in fact, are precise—

Mr McEwen interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Well, it is not. It is a fact of life that the hundreds do exist and the way in which the water is allocated under the PAVs is per hundred. Whilst the

exact amount of water per hundred is not known, a very good estimate has been there for years. One of the persons who gave evidence to us—and who was probably the most impressive—was the gentlemen from Mines and Energy, Fred Stadter. He has had years of experience in this area and in evidence he said that it was his view that, whilst they were not accurate, they were conservative. I think all the members of the select committee would accept that what Mr Stadter said was his best guess, and considering his status in the community it is one that we should accept.

No-one on the select committee suggested (nor did we report) that we should not be moving on and looking at some technology that would enable us to get better examples of PAVs. The select committee also accepted that, because it was such a huge job, it needed to be done in a staged way; that is, first, we ought to use some logical step to move on the ones that clearly were being overused or potentially over allocated and, finally, do the balance over a period. There is no question that that was something that the select committee recommended. It is similar to the Murray River exercise. What the member for Gordon is saying, in effect, is that we ought to stop the flow of the Murray, stop all the irrigation that is going on and fix it. We cannot do that; it is just illogical; it does not make sense. It is exactly the same in the South-East; you cannot stop all the change that is occurring, you have to work within a framework of change (which is what the select committee has recommended) and start at a point and continue on an area of improvement.

That brings me to the final point I would like to make, that is, quality. There is no doubt that the select committee recommended that quality was one of the most important issues at which everyone ought to be looking. Clearly, that is what this bill would initiate. However, as with all these issues of timing, you cannot go suddenly from a position of poor quality yesterday to good quality within 24 hours. I know the member for Gordon believes you can do that sort of thing, but let us get a little bit of commonsense and reality into it and actually move forward with this first step, recognising that it is only the beginning. If there is one thing for which I will give the member for Gordon credit it is that out of his 18 points probably six of them are agreed, six of them are today's problems and the other six are tomorrow's future problems. What we ought to be saying to the member for Gordon in this instance is 'Let us fix today's problems. Let us start on this, move forward and plan for the future problems.'

Mr McEwen interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The member for Gordon says that I may not be around. Give it a short time and there is a good chance that he might not be here, either. I do not like predicting too far down the track. I think it is better if we deal with today's problems and work—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Well, that is the only certainty; that is, if we both want to be here, we will be here. That is not necessarily the same position for the member for Gordon. That is not what we are arguing about today. What I am suggesting we should be doing is getting the thing in place and starting on the recommendations of the select committee. As a group we recognise that we have not given the perfect answer because there is no such thing, but we ought to be moving in some direction to try to correct the problems currently existing in the South-East. I would have been far more encouraged in listening to the member for Gordon today if some of the things he raised had been put to

the select committee, which was only finished some three or four months ago. However, I know how politics works. I know that some of these things are political, some of them are done with general practical interest and—

Mr McEwen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —I think generally we ought to be getting on with encouraging the minister to put in place at least the final recommendations the committee made.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I would like to raise two issues this afternoon. Since Christmas I have had a large number of calls from constituents complaining about the use of noisy fireworks at night and particularly during the early hours of the morning.

Mr Hanna: Me, too.

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Mitchell has also received calls. My constituents and obviously the member for Mitchell's have been highlighting to us the dangers that fireworks present to people as well as to property. Last year after lengthy delays the minister brought in new controls to tighten up the process for people who wished to purchase fireworks permits. The government enterprises minister was reported in the *Messenger* press on 13 October last year as saying, 'An inherent barrier will be built up to stop the spontaneous purchase of illegal fireworks.' The minister has also acknowledged the problems created by the illegal importation and sale of fireworks and stated that his department was working on a project to target that. Many of my constituents and people in other areas of South Australia, particularly rural areas, would very much like to know what progress has been made with the minister's project to target the sale and importation of illegal fireworks.

Since fireworks were made available for sale to the general public, there has been a major outcry against their use, with the exception of supervised official fireworks displays. This adverse public reaction has come about because of the very real dangers posed through bushfires and personal injury. Since Christmas I have received numerous complaints from people. Some of my constituents have been woken at night by the loud bangs of firecrackers and skyrockets, all of which are illegal. Some reports have identified people who were walking in the street and, as happened to some of my constituents, struck by fireworks. Others have reported fireworks falling out of the sky, landing in their garden and causing fire. When I raised this issue last year one of my constituents had their pergola damaged by the sparks from a skyrocket. There is also the effect on animals; dogs have jumped fences and run off, and the effects on other animals have caused major trauma. I know of several people who have had to have surgery performed on their badly injured dogs. We have also seen a lot of damage to property.

Restrictions on permit holders certainly have not stopped people from obtaining fireworks and using them in both the city and country areas. An example was that of a man in Tanunda on 16 December who was reported for not possess-

ing a permit to light fireworks and who was using them in the fire season; so it is obvious that people are being totally irresponsible. As a result of this fellow letting off fireworks, a blaze started at about 9 o'clock, burning some 9 hectares of scrub on the western side of Menglers Hill east of Tanunda. Children playing with fireworks were believed to have been the cause of a house fire at Ethelton in January this year, causing an estimated \$40 000 worth of damage. We have had reports of fences being set alight, particularly brush fences, and that is quite a problem. Many of my constituents are saying to me that they simply cannot understand why the government deregulated the fireworks industry in South Australia. We live in this very dry state and are susceptible to fire outbreaks, and we know the enormous damage that such fires inflict on people, property and our state's economy.

My constituents have pointed out that the fireworks industry is not a major employer and that their liability far outweighs any benefit to its small business growth: the cost to our health industry through burns and hospitalisation, the drain on our emergency services and the economic loss from fires outweigh the benefits of the fireworks industry, and I have to say I agree with that. Interestingly, these industry costs to the general public are often used in the smoking debate, yet the tobacco industry is a much larger employer and contributor to government taxes than is the fireworks industry. My constituents have asked me to protest again about the deregulation of fireworks and to put on the public record that they believe that South Australia should return to the previous regulatory practices whereby the sale and distribution of fireworks was for publicly supervised displays only. It is a pity that those people who are totally irresponsible and unscrupulous can restrict the enjoyment of the responsible members of the community but, given the problems that we have been experiencing since deregulation, it seems that we need to take some steps in this regard.

Another issue I want to talk about is the great concern that the general public has demonstrated quite vocally about the discarded syringes from drug users and serious health hazards they can cause to members of the public. I have received an enormous number of calls on this issue, and we have a petition under way. My constituents are incredibly irate. Some have found discarded needles thrown in their gardens, left outside their gates, along the fences and street gutters and, most regrettably of all, in children's playgrounds. There are many reports from all over the metropolitan area of used discarded needles being left in children's play areas, in public toilets, parks, golf courses and beaches—just everywhere—and it is becoming a major concern among people in the community.

We saw the media report of the train driver who was about to start his shift and who sat on a discarded needle. That needle had obviously been deliberately wedged between the seats, so that, if it was not put there deliberately to injure him, it certainly was put there to injure a passenger. Used syringes have been left maliciously in public places where they can inflict these life threatening diseases such as hepatitis B and C and AIDS, and that is totally unforgivable. I cannot begin to imagine the worry and heartache that individuals and their families must feel while awaiting the medical results from a needlestick injury.

People have told me and rightly identified that the disposal section of the state government's policy of treating drug addicted persons through the needle exchange program is causing a growing health and safety risk to the general public because of the way these needles are discarded. I acknow-

ledge that the minister is also concerned about this matter, and he made a public statement on setting up a 24-hour hotline to convey information to the general public as part of a statewide review of the needle exchange program. I feel that as part of the review the government should take a good look at the issue of retractable needles. If we are to supply needles we should start supplying retractable needles, and that will markedly reduce the risks to the general public. There needs to be greater accountability and responsibility and the return of needles should be sought from those on the needle exchange program. That might stop the current practice of leaving them lying around in public places. Regrettably, two families in my electorate are having to wait months before they find out whether their young children are victims of a user's callous behaviour. That must be a dreadful thing for a family to have to go through, especially as these are such young children.

I have also had many complaints from people who suffer from illnesses such as diabetes and need medication which is administered by injection, yet must purchase their own needles, whereas those who are addicted to drugs are supplied with syringes free of charge. While we do not want drug users sharing needles and infecting others, we also want a fair and just system. I want to put that matter on the record on behalf of my constituents, and I hope that the minister will take on board the call for retractable syringes. That is something we can certainly look at. They are slightly more costly than normal non-retractable syringes, but for the safety of the general public the cost of a few more cents is worth it.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): On Friday afternoon I had the pleasure of opening the new Cliff House Beachfront Villas at Moonta Bay—and what a pleasure it was. These villas are owned and have just been built by Mr David and Mrs Sally Rosewarne of Kadina and are replacing the former accommodation known as Cliff House, a magnificent building that was built in the last century and used by countless thousands of people over the years to enjoy a holiday at the seaside at Moonta Bay. It is wonderful to see that the new Cliff House Beachfront Villas are a replacement for part of the former Cliff House which will stand for generations to come and which will occupy pride of place at Moonta Bay.

In fact, they have five star accreditation. Four beachside villas are incorporated into this structure, and the importance of these villas cannot be over estimated because they will cater for the upper end of the market—for people who want first-class accommodation. The villas consist of either two or three bedrooms, are fully self contained and include everything from kitchen utensils to bed linen. They have full cooking facilities, a washing machine, a drier and, to top it off, the magnificent uninterrupted views of Moonta Bay.

When I had a tour through the villas prior to the opening and I was on their front deck, I felt that I was on the front deck of a ship that was going through the water, but I did not have any of the roughness associated with a luxury cruise liner. This is something that many people will be able to enjoy in the years to come. It is a credit to David and Sally, and I compliment them, as I did last Friday.

The whole concept was created by a firm called Concept Drafting, and it designed the villas. Although a Mount Gambier company, it has used almost all local tradespeople in the construction of the villas. In this respect I compliment all the local people involved in this construction. If anyone questions the excellence of local tradespeople, I urge them to take a weekend or a few days at any stage at the Cliff House

Beachfront Villas. They are at 2 Hughes Avenue, Moonta Bay, and bookings can be made through Elders. I am here not to promote the booking side but simply to promote the newest attraction to Yorke Peninsula, which is an integral part of this state's tourism industry.

Members should be aware that South Australia's tourism industry generates \$2.8 billion of annual economic activity. It directly supports 6 per cent of state economic activity and 34 000 full-time equivalent jobs. We are increasing our tourism attractiveness to visitors, and in 1998-99 there were some 5.7 million visitors to South Australia, representing 24.3 million visitor nights. In 1998-99 we had a record number of 313 000 international visitors coming to this state, and that is a credit to the Minister for Tourism, Tourism SA and all who have been associated with promoting South Australia.

There is no doubt that Yorke Peninsula is a favourite holiday destination, and at this stage it is particularly favoured by South Australians. There were some 400 000 visits to Yorke Peninsula in 1998 (not including people who simply came on a day trip), and that equates to 1.4 million visitor nights. We can see from those figures that, whilst Yorke Peninsula has only 400 000 out of the 5.7 million, we have a long way to go, but accommodation such as the Cliff House Beachfront Villas will help those figures increase. We will tap into the overseas market, which currently is not coming to Yorke Peninsula in any significant numbers. I do not have the actual figures in front of me, but I believe that about 1 per cent of international visitors visit Yorke Peninsula. We will work on that figure and increase it significantly.

I continue to be amazed that so many overseas visitors who come to South Australia indicate that they want to go to Kangaroo Island. I have nothing against Kangaroo Island as it has a lot to offer, but I believe that Yorke Peninsula has far more to offer than has Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: It's a beautiful place—they both are.

Mr MEIER: They both are, the minister says. I guess he has to be somewhat neutral as his electorate is closer to Kangaroo Island than it is to Yorke Peninsula. However, he has been to Yorke Peninsula many times, and for that I thank him. I appreciate the interest that he continues to show. Getting back to tourism on Yorke Peninsula, part of the reason why it is missing out compared to Kangaroo Island is that the word 'kangaroo' conjures up in the mind of overseas visitors the fact that they will see kangaroos hopping all over the place there. It has been some time since I have been there, but I suspect that that is not the case.

Perhaps, therefore, Yorke Peninsula has to be sold in a new way. Everyone here would know that Yorke Peninsula is the only leg Australia has to stand on. However, to try to sell that message to international or interstate tourists will not necessarily attract them to the peninsula. Perhaps we can extend a little. As the kangaroo is synonymous with Australia, one does not have to change the shape of the kangaroo that much from the shape of Australia to allow the kangaroo leg to be Yorke Peninsula. We will possibly have to go to go down the track of suggesting that Yorke Peninsula is the only kangaroo leg that people will be able to experience on a visit to South Australia. Whatever the case, as the local member I intend to pursue the issue further so that more people can appreciate the wonders of Yorke Peninsula and the many attractions we have.

Our one liability to some extent is a lack of tourist accommodation, although some of the current tourist operators would say, 'Hang on, I think we can offer a fair bit.' Many of the towns, certainly Edithburgh, has a lot of accommodation, and accommodation at Marion Bay is increasing significantly. In most other towns there is some accommodation. Port Vincent and Stansbury also have accommodation. In the north we have accommodation of a motel and villa style. Two or three years ago I opened The

Mac's villas at Wallaroo, and they are also excellent. We need more of this type of accommodation, and I simply congratulate David and Sally Rosewarne on their great venture into establishing the Cliff House Beachfront Villas at Moonta Bay. I wish them all the very best for the future.

Motion carried.

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 April at 2 p.m.