

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 30 May 2002

The SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis) took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

MURRAY RIVER COMMITTEE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I move:

That this house establish a standing committee of this house on the River Murray.

Mr Speaker, in moving this motion, you and other members will be aware that one of the things that the last government was most proud of, and I in particular as Minister for Water Resources, was the establishment (I think on the motion of the member for Chaffey at the time) of a select committee to investigate the River Murray; and you, sir, were part of that select committee.

I think that you and other members would agree with me that it was a particularly fruitful committee which worked very hard. The select committee report on the Murray River is a document that should find currency in all parliaments of Australia because it highlights what is, after all, a national issue, and it does so in an intelligent and rational way. It points out the things that need to be done in the short term and medium term, and it has some vision as well for the long term. It would do well for the parliaments in Victoria and New South Wales, which are rather Sydney and Melbourne-centric, to look at some of the work that this parliament has done on this matter. We cannot claim to be all virtuous. We are in the unique position—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, we would like to. We are in the unique position to be literally at the drain end of one of the largest and most important river systems in this nation. By being at the bottom end, we are obviously the first to see signs of stress and suffering, and indeed members of the select committee know that is the case.

The current Minister for Environment can, with some pride and a lot of moral authority, go to any council in this nation. While it is fashionable in Sydney and Melbourne to decry South Australians as whingers and grizzlers over the river, it was in fact South Australia and this parliament, of its own accord, that in the mid-70s, because of a series of dry years—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Sorry? This state. If the Attorney wishes to assist in legal matters, I would be most grateful. If he would like to assist me with my English, I suggest he desist, because his English is not that good. So Good is a brand of drink, I believe, and I think you should go and have one. Sir, as I said, and as I think you know, because you were around at the time, in the mid 70s there was a series of dry years and South Australia, realising that the Murray was not an inexhaustible resource, voluntarily put in place a cap on its extractions, and in fact went further. It went back subsequently to the withdrawal rates of the late 60s and capped South Australia's use for extractions from the River Murray at late 60s usage. In contrast to that, Victoria, and certainly New South Wales and Queensland, which are latterly in the game and which have yet to sign-off on the cap, continued to develop and to extract vast amounts of water. Members of the select committee will be aware that there is one irrigation

system in one private irrigation aggregate group in New South Wales whose losses through evaporation and seepage exceed South Australia's usage of water, and that is a major indictment on the system.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Who's that?

Mr BRINDAL: Murray Irrigation Limited, in New South Wales. The fact is that with the great storages of our river systems, the Menindie Lakes, for instance, while we complain, and rightly about the unfettered development of cotton in northern Queensland, and Queensland's ability to not resist farmers—who have literally channelled rivers into their property, and Cubbie Station is an excellent example—it faces as a government a diabolical situation where there are farms which can throw millions of dollars at the state government in legal challenges. So the government there is constrained to being particularly careful because they have a level of resource to fight this battle and a need, because the water is in fact so valuable to the producers.

Notwithstanding that, the losses from the Menindie Lakes in evaporation exceed the total usage of the cotton irrigators to the north. And so it is not just the use of water that needs examination; it is the whole structure of the system, how better we can improve the system. If we look in our own state, sir, as you would be aware, just above the Barmera bridge we see some of the wetland swamps that have been permanently flooded. They give a profile to the river that in fact—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Barmera or Blanchetown?

Mr BRINDAL: I will need to get back to *Hansard*; I think it might be the Blanchetown bridge. I thank the Attorney for the correction.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: And you are not always right. You are very rarely right, but in this instance I think you may be.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: It's good it's recorded because it is a rare occurrence.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes. My colleague points out to me that it is wonderful that *Hansard* has actually recorded that, for once, you are right, and we will treasure that little memory of this parliament. Sir, the building of the locks, and the consequent flooding of wetlands, as you would know, has disconnected in South Australia much of the flood plain from the wetland, and if you fly, as our committee did, from the mouth of the Murray along its length and into Victoria, you can actually see in South Australia a parlous state. It is true to say, I believe, that the River Murray in South Australia, if not dead, is in the terminal stages of a terminal illness.

If you look at independently assessed criteria, developed by the Murray Darling Basin Commission, on about eight different levels the River Murray is seriously ailing from its mouth at the sea to about Lock 5, which is in Victoria. The only measure in which performance in South Australia has shown an improvement is salinity, and the reason that the salinity measures have shown an improvement in South Australia is that necessity has forced us to act on this measure rather more quickly than other states and to have actually halted the rising salinity levels. But this house is well aware that unless we continue and are completely vigilant in this matter, and I note the last government put aside \$100 million for the purpose and that the commonwealth government is contributing as well, within 25 years the water in this city will be undrinkable on two days of the week because of the salinity levels.

The river system captures 7 per cent of the rainfall and supplies 80 per cent of the irrigation needs of this entire

nation. In addition, it provides the basis of a primary water source for approximately 3 million Australian citizens. So, it is not just a source of national wealth through horticulture: it is a source of survival for many South Australians. Towns like Woomera, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and much of the Upper South-East could not exist without the Murray River.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And now the Clare Valley.

Mr BRINDAL: Having crowned himself with glory, the attorney now exposes his complete ignorance by saying, 'And now the Clare Valley'. The Clare Valley water scheme is to buy water from the river from within existing use, and to supply it for horticultural purposes.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I was talking about the survival aspect.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Are you talking about drinking water?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, the survival aspect of water. The Attorney, as usual, half hears things and then gets them half right. Be sure you get it fully right on Bob Francis, or I will be ringing up tonight.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I was on Bob's show for 17 minutes last night.

Mr BRINDAL: We are 12 minutes into the day and you have got one thing right and one thing wrong. I hope you did better in those 17 minutes. The point is there is no more important issue for this house than the Murray River. As I started by saying, that was exemplified in the last parliament by the truly bipartisan, cross-party spirit exhibited by all members of the committee. I note sincerely that the current minister appears equally determined, as I hope I was, to ensure that the Murray River is an issue for this parliament, that it is equally considered by both sides of the chamber and that all members of this chamber can and should be informed on an issue that must transcend party politics, individual egos and, in fact, become part of the ethos of this parliament and this state and be something that we should all not be afraid to stand up for.

In that context, one of the recommendations of the select committee was that this parliament, in order to be fully informed and to keep the public of South Australia fully informed, should establish a standing committee on the Murray River. I believe, sir, that you will know that, should I have been sitting on the Treasury bench and holding that portfolio, I had given the committee my commitment that in this parliament I would honour that particular recommendation.

I have no reason to believe that minister Hill will do any less. Nevertheless, because I made that undertaking, because I think that undertaking is important—as important for the government as for the opposition, and even more important for the people of South Australia—I believe that an informed parliament on this issue is of paramount importance.

I conclude my remarks by talking about an issue of which you may be aware, sir, and that is the irrigators at Wall Flat, which explains some of the complexities of the river. There is an environmental levy placed on everyone who extracts water from the river, including us. We, as users, pay 1 cent per cubic metre of water extracted from the Murray River in our water bill which goes to the River Murray Water Catchment Management Board. The irrigators on the river pay one-third of a cent for the water.

Some irrigators in the big private schemes pay that levy on the water they use. So, 100 megalitres of water might be extracted from the river and 90 megalitres might be used by

the irrigators, because, of course, some evaporates; some, when we did not have the closed system that we now have right throughout South Australia, except the Lower Murray swamps, seeps out of the channels; some evaporates; and some is needed to flow through the pipe and into a swamp at the other end. You actually have to have a flow through system. None of that is charged, but in government swamps there is a slightly different rule. In government swamps, the amount of water that is extracted is the amount of water on which the levy is paid, so the lessees in government swamps have to pay, if you like, an additional levy on the water that has to be used to make it available to them.

I have no pride in saying this, but that matter was drawn to the attention of SA Water two years ago, and my officers looked at it for the last six months. In researching this speech, I came across a letter that was sent to me in December by my colleague the member for Schubert on this issue. I am embarrassed to say that it is a typical example of public servants who have taken two years to solve a problem that should be solved—

Mr Snelling: It must have been your chief of staff's fault.

Mr BRINDAL: It is no-one's particular fault. It is my fault for perhaps not having a system as efficient as it should have been. I say this to the house: no minister can be better than his public servants, and public servants are there to serve the public. It is a bit embarrassing to stand here and admit that I did not know for six or nine months that something was happening that involved a matter of some natural justice for the electors whom we all serve. I hope that this minister will not only establish this committee but also do something to provide a more efficient service to the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SNELLING secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOOD SAMARITANS (LIMITATION OF LIABILITY) BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to limit the liability of certain persons for injury arising out of genuine attempts to help victims in emergency situations. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

During the term of the last government, I raised with the premier of the day a suggestion that a new area of policy focus could be volunteers. I put a case to the then premier John Olsen that a whole range of volunteering issues could be picked up by government and given further consideration by governments across Australia. I note with some interest that, as I introduce this bill today, there is a federal meeting in Melbourne, which the Treasurer is attending, about public liability issues in relation to a whole series of groups, including the significant impact on volunteer groups. That was certainly one of the areas on which we had done some work, our being aware that that was an emerging issue for the South Australian community.

As a result of my suggestion to the Premier, I ended up being made minister responsible for volunteers and started to implement many suggestions, which the government adopted. The member for Mawson, Rob Brokenshire, took over that role just prior to the election. I want to place on the record my thanks to the member for Mawson for his agreeing to let me

introduce this bill, as it is of particular interest to me and much of the work was done by my staff at the time. I thank the member for Mawson for his agreeing to let me introduce this particular bill. This bill is different from the volunteer protection legislation bill which was previously passed by the parliament. I note today that Senator Coonan, the federal minister responsible, is saying that Australia's volunteers need to be protected. I would direct her to the South Australian volunteer protection legislation as a good starting base, at least as to how other states could protect their volunteers or start to go down the path of better protecting their volunteers.

For new members who were not in the house previously, the volunteer protection legislation is about protecting formal members of volunteer groups; that is, incorporated associations going about their normal voluntary business. The Good Samaritans Limitation of Liability Bill proposes a broader form of coverage for a broader cover of volunteers. This bill is about ensuring that a person who provides emergency care, advice or counselling to a person in immediate need of aid will be protected from liability for civil damages unless that person is grossly negligent, reckless or engages in intentional misconduct. The intent behind this proposed law is clear.

The bill is designed to encourage more people to act and become involved in emergency situations; if you like, to step in and lend a hand. This immediate attention is often critical at the scene of accidents or emergencies, but is also equally important in a whole range of emergencies, especially those that occur in remote areas of the state where ambulance or rescue help is often some time away. Despite this, at present the civil liability risk of persons who provide emergency care, advice or counselling at the site of an emergency remain somewhat unclear in South Australia. In fact, while there are very few decided court cases on the subject, it seems to be accepted that a good samaritan who freely tries their best to assist could be liable if, through their actions, the victim's situation is unintentionally worsened.

In our increasingly litigious society it would seem that the incentive to attempt to provide emergency care, advice or counselling to victims could well be under threat. The disincentive is even greater in the case of health professionals where professional indemnity insurance does not apply when actions are taken outside of their normal course of duty. However, this bill does more than help save lives: it is designed to promote community spirit in the face of adversity. It makes it clear that well intended efforts voluntarily undertaken by would-be rescuers, including doctors and nurses, are protected and, most importantly, are encouraged.

However, this bill does not make it compulsory to help. The duty to assist remains a moral issue and not a legal duty, and, of course, a victim is, if conscious and aware of his or her situation, entitled to refuse the assistance offered by a good samaritan. However, if there were ever an argument for protecting those who choose to help, I believe now is the right time. In some countries, as I understand it, there is a legal duty to assist. We are not proposing that in this particular bill. What we are saying is that society is becoming more litigious: more people are concerned about whether they should step in and assist in various circumstances. The lack of understanding and clarity on the issue in the general public debate means that, more than likely, more and more people will choose not to assist or give advice in emergency situations.

For the house's information, this bill was introduced prior to the election but was never debated owing to the election intervening. So we reintroduce it now because we believe that

this is another plank where the parliament can say to the community that we believe in the principle that those people who seek to do the right thing should be protected. That is really the principle the parliament is being asked to adopt in relation to this bill. I do not wish to speak any longer. I know there are a large number of items on the *Notice Paper* today, the first day of private members' bills. In fairness to other members, I will not continue. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Good samaritans

Clause 3(1) establishes that a good samaritan is a person who, with no expectation of payment or reward, comes to the aid of another in an emergency situation or gives telephone advice for the purpose of assisting in the provision of emergency treatment.

Clause 3(2) limits the liability of a good samaritan for any personal injury suffered as a result of well intentioned intervention in an emergency situation. If a victim suffers harm as a result of a good samaritan's genuine attempt to provide assistance, the good samaritan is not liable to pay compensation to the victim. The good samaritan is not entitled to this protection if it is established that the victim's injury is the result of gross negligence on the part of the good samaritan.

Clause 3(3) states that the section does not apply if the victim's injury is covered by a policy of third party motor vehicle insurance.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

AIR PASSENGER TRANSPORT (ROUTE LICENSING) BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I seek leave to introduce a bill for an act to establish a licensing system for regular passenger air services on declared routes between airports in the state; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light seeks leave to introduce a bill for an act regarding licensing air services in South Australia notwithstanding the interesting constitutional dilemma that poses. On the basis that the question in my mind is not yet resolved and the house may choose—I cannot determine that—is the motion seconded?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is seconded; leave is therefore granted. For the information of the member for Light, I point out that it may not be in order for us to proceed with this matter. However, notwithstanding the fact that the house has decided it wishes to debate the matter, I suggest that whether it is constitutionally possible for such a bill to become an act is another matter.

Bill read a first time.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In making my second reading explanation, Mr Speaker, I note your comments regarding the constitution. My advice from Parliamentary Counsel is that this bill could be proceeded with. However, I will check that advice later today after debate on this bill has been adjourned. The bill provides a legislative framework for the establishment of a licensing system in South Australia for the conduct of regular passenger air services on declared routes between airports in regional or rural areas of the state.

There are various reasons why this legislation is required now and for the foreseeable future. Until recently, all South Australian regional air routes have operated viably without state government intervention in any form, although some routes have been operating only marginally profitably. The collapse of Ansett and its regional subsidiaries, combined with world events since 11 September 2001, have created significant instability and uncertainty in the South Australian and Australian aviation markets. This is particularly so in regional markets because of the low capital base of most regional airlines that operate in South Australia and the cost pressures that they all are now facing.

Over the past year regular air services have ceased to Leigh Creek, Cleve and Wudinna depriving these communities of time-efficient passenger and freight services and undermining access to medical personnel and other important services. In the Year of the Outback the loss of these services may also have tourist implications. Traditionally in South Australia, regional air services have not been regulated. This is not the case in some other states with populations also spread over vast distances. Both Queensland and Western Australia have successfully maintained a system of route licensing for some years. Both states also provide a subsidy on some regulated regional air routes. I know that in Queensland only a few weeks ago that subsidy was increased to some \$6 million by the state government, and there is also a significant subsidy by the New South Wales government of regional airlines in that state running into the millions of dollars as well.

New South Wales has also legislated for route licensing of regional airlines and controlled competition on some routes as determined by the Minister for Transport, but to date has not subsidised the operation of any airline on a regulated route. The absence of air route licensing in South Australia, enabling an approved airline to gain exclusive route access, contrasts sharply to similar provisions in the state statutes for other modes of transport operating in regional and remote areas of this state. Various acts provide for the restricted access on rail services, while the Passenger Transport Act 1994 provides for the Passenger Transport Board to negotiate contracts for exclusive route bus services.

Incidentally, all intrastate bus routes in South Australia have operated on this basis for decades and, if they did not do so, all bus services to many centres across South Australia would cease immediately because they would not be viable in a competitive market. I know, for instance, in my own electorate the Barossa coachline has the exclusive contract for that particular area and, if it decides not to take up a particular route, then it can be offered to other bus services within the area. For the interest of members, it is important to recognise that the national competition policy principles do not apply to intrastate service delivery.

The bill I have introduced today as a private member's bill was prepared earlier this year by the former minister for transport and urban planning, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, for introduction as a Liberal government initiative in this session of parliament, as the Liberal Party continues to regard the initiatives outlined in this bill as potentially critical to the future viability and operation of air services to some of our more remote country centres. Overall, the bill enables the minister in the public interest to determine a route between airports in the state to be a declared air route for the purposes of controlling entry on the route. Part 3 of the bill provides that the minister may invite applications for a route service licence or licences for a declared route by means of a

competitive tender process or any other basis as the minister thinks fit. In turn, the minister can award an operator exclusive rights of operation where a route does not generate sufficient regular passengers to support more than one operator. A declared route will initially have effect for a period not exceeding three years. Other conditions of a route service licence that may apply are outlined in clause 7 and include options for the minister, on behalf of the government of the day, to provide for the payment of subsidies or other forms of financial support.

The bill does not specify the criteria that must apply before a route is declared, because it is considered that the prescription of criteria may limit or prevent future policy initiatives or result in the bill not catering for the changing circumstances in a rapidly changing airline environment. Accordingly, the bill deliberately sets out to provide a degree of flexibility in the operation of the proposed scheme. This degree of flexibility even extends to circumstances where there might be a case for the minister to declare a route, on which air services are already in operation, if the services are deemed not to be meeting community needs. In such circumstances, clause 11 of the bill provides some protection for existing operators. In addition, part 4 of the bill provides various grounds for appeal to the District Court against a decision by the minister.

In summary, licensing a marginal air route to a single operator can significantly reduce the risk to the operator in considering investment in a route service and can also guarantee a level of service that a route might not otherwise attract. In addition, a route licensing bidding process can provide a transparent and fair structure under which the government might choose to apply route subsidies or other forms of assistance, such as start-up costs, in order to ensure the delivery of service on any declared air route.

All these matters are particularly relevant at the moment, because on Tuesday this week I noted that the Ansett administrator awarded preferred bidder status for the Kendell and Hazelton regional airline carriers to Australiawide Airlines. That company has received some backing from the federal government to the tune of some \$6 million, I think. I stand to be corrected, but I think that is correct. The South Australian government has now indicated that it would be prepared to look at either waiving payroll tax or other matters that might help the airline in its cost structure.

The company has stated that it hopes to sign a binding agreement within a few weeks. I am aware that last Friday was the closing date, and I believe that discussions are still continuing. However, according to the *Australian* of 8 May, Australiawide Airlines made it clear as follows:

... Government support is one of the conditions crucial to the bid proceeding.

So, we will wait to see what the discussions currently being undertaken by Australiawide prove and provide in terms of a service to regional South Australia. If that bid does not proceed there may well be other options. I am advised that Qantas is also considering regional routes around Australia, so one will have to wait to see what happens if Australiawide does not succeed.

In this context, I suspect that an early indication by the Rann government that it would support this bill that I am introducing today would be a most helpful tool in the government's negotiations with Australiawide Airlines, with the ultimate objective being to secure viable, sustainable airline services to a number of country centres of the state

that are currently vulnerable to losing some or all services. The loss of such services would be disastrous for these centres in terms of transport efficiency, economic development and social justice.

This bill provides a positive framework to help government ensure that such a dire outcome does not unfold. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short Title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the measures on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause provides the definitions of words and phrases for the purposes of this Act.

Clause 4: Declared Routes

This clause provides for the minister to declare a route between airports in the State for the purposes of this Act and allows the minister to do so 'in the public interest', taking into account various matters specified in sub clauses 2—8.

Clause 5: Requirement for Licence

The operator of a scheduled air service on a declared route must be a holder of a route service licence for that route.

Clause 6: Applications for licences

This clause outlines the terms for an operator to apply for a route service licence.

Clause 7: Conditions

This clause outlines the conditions that may apply to a route service, including the payment of subsidies or other forms of financial support—clause 7(1)(e).

Clause 8: Special Terms

This clause provides that a route service licence may confer on the holder an exclusive right to operate scheduled air services on a declared route, plus other matters relevant to the operation of air services.

Clause 9: Assignment of rights order licence

The holder of a route service licence must not transfer or otherwise deal with the licence, or any powers conferred under the licence, except with the consent of the minister.

Clause 10: Special Fees

This clause relates to the fees the minister may require under Part 3 of the Act.

Clause 11: Existing Operators

This clause outlines the conditions the minister must observe in relation to any existing operator following a declaration of a route under section 4(1).

Clause 12: Related Matters

This clause enables the holder of a route service licence to surrender the licence, and in certain circumstances provides that no liability may attach to the minister or the Crown arising on the account of the issue of a route service licence to a particular person.

Clause 13: Appeals

This clause provides the framework for appeals to be made to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

Clause 14: Authorised Officers

This clause provides for the minister to appoint authorised officers, the terms of the appointment and the powers of the officers.

Clause 15: Delegations

This clause relates to the functions and powers that the minister may delegate under this Act.

Clause 16: Exemptions

This clause provides the terms for the minister to confer exemptions from this Act or specific provisions of this Act.

Clause 17: Annual Report

This clause relates to the presentation of a report that must be provided to the minister on or before 30 September in each year on the operation and administration of the Act during the previous financial year.

Clause 18: Immunity of persons engaged in administration of Act

This clause confirms that no personal liability attaches to a person engaged in the administration of this Act for an act or omission exercised in good faith.

Clause 19: False or misleading information

This clause provides the grounds for an offence by any person who makes a false or misleading statement in any information provided under this Act.

Clause 20: Continuing offence

This clause relates to a person convicted of an offence for a continuing act or omission against a provision of this Act.

Clause 21: Liability of directors

This clause outlines the grounds for a Director of a Corporation to be guilty of an offence, if a corporation commits an offence against this Act.

Clause 22: Evidentiary

This clause relates to documents in proceedings for an offence against this Act.

Clause 23: Obligations under other laws

This clause provides that nothing in this Act relieves a person of any obligation to hold any licence and the like which the person is otherwise by law required to hold.

Clause 24: Regulations

The Governor may make Regulations for the purposes of the Bill.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LANDOWNERS PROTECTION (RECREATIONAL USE OF LAND) BILL

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to limit the liability of certain landowners for injury suffered by persons who enter their land for a recreational purpose; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Outdoor recreational activities, as we all know, are growing in popularity in South Australia. While health and fitness are important, equally South Australians are seeking a sense of adventure, achievement and certainly fun whilst enjoying the outdoors environment. South Australia already boasts a network of recreational trails in excess of some 3 000 kilometres.

The Recreational Greenways Act 2000 was introduced to provide for the negotiation of access and management agreements, and to ensure the continued access and development of the recreational trails system. This bill continues this work by providing a framework to negotiate access to recreational land on a temporary basis outside the trails system under the Recreational Greenways Act 2000. It also provides increased recreational opportunities and enhances the tourism potential of the state.

Until 1987 the duties that landowners owed to an entrant to their land broadly fell into three categories. The lowest duties were owed to trespassers; the highest duties were owed to those who entered to provide a benefit to the landowner—a simple example being a doctor making a house call; and a middle range of duties was owed to a person who entered with permission but for his own benefit. People requesting access to rural land for their own recreational purposes and without paying a charge would have fallen into that last category.

Prior to 1987 landowners only had to warn entrants of any hidden hazards of which they were actually aware. The common law was changed by a High Court decision in 1987. The same general duty of care in negligence was applied to all lawful entrants.

The South Australian parliament amended section 17C of the Wrongs Act to reflect the High Court decision. The effect of section 17C is now to leave the question of liability largely to the court's discretion. At the present time rural landowners allowing access to their land for recreational purposes are

exposed to an uncertain level of risk. It is clear that they can now, for example, be held liable by a court for injuries caused either by obvious dangers which a court holds ought to have been eliminated or by dangers of which a court thinks the landowners ought to have been aware but were in fact not aware. This was the case before the High Court's decision. This creates a great deal of uncertainty for landowners.

Ultimately, the 1987 amendments to the Wrongs Act serve as a practical disincentive for landowners to permit their land to be used for recreational activities. It is reasonable to expect recreational entrants to assume greater responsibility for their own safety. As the landowner derives no benefit from the entry he should not assume more of a burden than to warn entrants of hidden dangers of which he is actually aware. This act will remove present uncertainty and provide greater protection to landowners who permit access to their land for recreational purposes, provided they do so for no charge. This protection will apply to the following two categories:

Category 1. This section of the act will apply only to land classified by regulation as land to which the section applies. The landowner will be protected from liability when they, upon request, give permission to a member of the public or the organiser of an event, to enter land for recreational purposes unless:

- The cause of the injury to the recreational entrant was hidden to the entrant; and
- The landowner actually knew of the danger but did not warn the recreational entrant of its existence.

In the case of an event, once the landowner has notified the event organiser of any danger, the event organiser would take on the responsibility to notify event attendees of the danger and the landowner would then have no liability to the event attendees.

Category 2. This act will enable the landowner to enter into a recreational access agreement with the state or a local government body. Again, this section will apply only to land classified by regulation as land to which the section applies. The landowner would be protected from liability in all cases when the government or a local council had secured rights to access to the land on behalf of the public unless:

- The occupier actually knew of the danger but did not warn the government or council of its existence within a reasonable time of becoming aware of it.

This would relieve the landowner of any duty to carry out regular inspections and maintenance of the property that was provided on an ongoing basis to members of the public. Such a duty would be effectively transferred to the state government or local council. In this second category the government or local council, as the entity which has negotiated access arrangement, will be liable to recreational entrants under the test in section 17C of the Wrongs Act, but with a right of indemnity against the landowner if they failed to warn it of hidden dangers of which they knew.

The act will:

- Encourage landowners to make available their rural landholdings to persons seeking to use them for recreational purposes; and
- Define clearly the duties owed by the owner to recreational entrants.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause contains definitions of words and phrases necessary for the interpretation of this measure.

In particular, a gratuitous entrant is a person who—

- (a) obtains permission from an occupier of land to enter the land for a recreational purpose; and
- (b) enters the land without paying a fee or providing any other commercial consideration.

Clause 4: Limitation of standard of care to gratuitous entrants in certain cases

This section applies to prescribed land unless the land is subject to a recreational access agreement (explained in clause 5).

If a gratuitous entrant suffers personal injury as a result of the poor condition of prescribed land, the occupier of the land is not liable to pay compensation to the entrant. However, this exemption from liability does not apply if the defect in the land that caused the injury was not apparent to the entrant, and would not have become apparent with the exercise of due care, and the occupier was aware of the defect but failed to give the entrant a reasonable warning.

In the event that this section is inconsistent with the ordinary law of occupier's liability, the section prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

Clause 5: Recreational access agreement

An occupier of prescribed land may enter into a recreational access agreement with either the State or a local government body for the purpose of making the land available to members of the public for recreational purposes.

The agreement must be clear as to whether it covers all recreational users of the land or applies only to a specific class of recreational user.

Upon entering into a recreational access agreement, the occupier becomes exempt from liability for any personal injury sustained by a recreational user caused by a defect in the land. Instead, liability attaches to the authority with which the agreement has been made. The ordinary law of occupier's liability applies in determining the existence and extent of the authority's liability to the injured party.

However, an authority liable to a recreational user who suffers injury may recover an indemnity from the occupier of the land if the occupier, before entering into the agreement, failed to disclose a defect in the state or condition of the land, or misrepresented the condition of the land. An indemnity may also be recovered if the occupier became aware of a defect after entering into an agreement and failed to notify the authority of the defect within a reasonable time.

Clause 6: Regulations

The Governor may make regulations for the purposes of this measure.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIVE VEGETATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991 and to make a related amendment to the Development (System Improvement Program) Amendment Act 2000. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Out of courtesy to other members I will be fairly brief, because there are a number of other items to be dealt with today, this being the first day for private members' business. For the benefit of the new members, a form of this bill was introduced during the last parliament. It was the subject of extensive debate just prior to the last state election, and I refer members who are interested in following the debate and the issues to refer to the relevant *Hansard*, rather than tie up the time of the house with me repeating all those arguments here today.

This bill reflects the successful bill that was passed through the lower house during the last parliament. It adopts

all the amendments that were successfully debated during that time and places them into the one consolidated bill. So, it reflects the position of the lower house during the last parliament with respect to the native vegetation issue.

The bill on which this bill was based and which was previously amended by the parliament went through some extensive consultation. I know that the Hon. John Hill (then in opposition) undertook extensive consultation with respect to a whole range of amendments that he moved. This bill is the finished product of that debate. Again, I refer those members who wish to follow the issues regarding this bill to the relevant *Hansard*, and they will get a very good understanding of the arguments for and against the various issues raised in the bill. I have no doubt that the government will have other amendments, because amendments moved by the then opposition were soundly defeated on the floor of the house. I assume that the government may well want to reintroduce some of those amendments during the debate on this bill, and we look forward to debating those matters in due course.

The main feature of the bill is the clarification that the act will limit broadacre clearance. While that has been the practice of the Native Vegetation Council for some time, the bill now certainly locks that in and clarifies it. The bill contains a number of measures that seek significant biodiversity gain in return for clearance approval, and there are some improvements there that have been met with very good acceptance by the various community groups that were involved in the initial consultation.

The bill also encourages and provides voluntary protection for revegetation. This is particularly the case where landholders have revegetated land of their own choice and then seek to put that under the auspices of the Native Vegetation Act. They could not do that previously, and this allows them, by a voluntary decision of the land-holder, to place areas of revegetation under the auspices of the act.

The bill also looks at cost recovery for data collection. It also looks at introducing an appeals process for landowners with respect to administrative procedures. It does not involve a third party appeal—and I know that that will be of some interest to some members in the environment movement who seek to have third party appeals. That issue was fully debated in the last parliament. For those members who wish to follow that debate and gain a good understanding of the intricacies involved, I again refer them specifically to the previous *Hansard*, because I have no doubt that the government will move to allow a third party appeal mechanism when the bill is debated.

It also improves enforcement capability and looks at the powers of the officers in trying to get the right balance. Importantly, it also introduces, in an Australian first, a system of environmental credits and there is a good explanation of the environmental credit system, which provides an incentive for land-holders to revegetate land with local indigenous plant species. To be entitled to an environmental credit the landholder must enter into a heritage agreement with the minister and, to ensure that revegetation is appropriate, the minister must have regard to the regional biodiversity plan or plans and any associated pre-European mapping, if any, that applied in the vicinity of the relevant land.

Money gained by the land-holder when selling a credit is paid into the fund and the Native Vegetation Council will retain a portion of the payment required to manage the heritage agreement land for a period of 20 years. Any surplus is returned to the heritage agreement owner. In this way the

heritage agreement owner will be ensured of funds to manage the heritage agreement area and may also gain an additional payment to use as he or she likes. In any event, we think it is a positive incentive to revegetate land with the appropriate species. That is a new concept that was introduced in the last bill, which did not get through both houses because of the intervention of the state election and we now reintroduce it here.

For the interest of the member for Fisher, the native vegetation bill we are introducing today still holds true to the agreement we as the previous government made with him in relation to his previous amendments; so that might save him having to do any detailed reading on the matter. I guarantee to the member for Fisher that the agreement made when debating this bill prior to the election in regard to the amendments he wanted are in the bill as agreed at that time, indeed as are all the agreements we made with the then opposition and now government. It truly reflects the position as agreed by all parties in the lead up to the last state election.

I look forward to debate on the bill, which is an important piece of legislation. We would like the bill to be given some priority, if possible, through the private members' time business because we think it is such an important piece of legislation and because so much work and debate has already been done on it. There would not seem to be a lot of new work that the new government would have to do, given that there was such an extensive debate last time. The now minister, John Hill, spent some considerable time preparing himself for the debate and consulting on the then opposition's own ideas in regard to the bill. With those comments I seek leave to insert the explanation of the clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3-Interpretation

This clause relates to the definitions that are relevant to the operation of the Act. 'Land' is to include land submerged by water. Various consequential changes are also made to the section.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 3A

For the purposes of the Act, a stratum of native vegetation is to be taken to be substantially intact if, in the opinion of the Council, the stratum has not been seriously degraded by human activity during the preceding 20 years, disregarding human activity that has resulted in a fire.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 4-Application of Act

It is necessary to revise the provisions relating to the area of the application of the Act, particularly in view of changes to councils, and changes to terminology under the Development Act 1993.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 6-Objects

The objects are to be revised to an extent. Reference is to be made to the commonly held desire of landowners to preserve, enhance and manage native vegetation on their land, and to the need to prevent additional loss of the quality and quantity of native vegetation in the State.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 8-Membership of the Council

The Council includes a person nominated by the LGA, who will be selected by the Minister from a panel of three persons who have been so nominated.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 14-Functions of the Council

This clause makes an amendment to include reference to degraded vegetation.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 15-Delegation of powers and functions

These amendments relate to delegations to a local council or council officers.

Clause 10: Repeal of Division 2 of Part 3

The provisions relating to conciliations under the Act are to be repealed.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 21-The Fund
Exemplary damages awarded under other provisions of the Act are to be paid into the Fund. Money paid as a penalty or by way of exemplary damages under the Act is to be used (as far as practicable) to establish native vegetation on land within the vicinity of the relevant land, and to maintain that vegetation once it is established.

Clause 12: Substitution of heading
This amendment is consequential.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 23-Heritage agreements
This amendment makes express provision as to the purposes for which a heritage agreement will be entered into.

Clause 14: Repeal of s. 23C
This is a consequential amendment.

Clause 15: Insertion of Division 2 of Part 4
Certain revegetation arrangements are to be recognised.

Clause 16: Insertion of heading
This amendment is consequential.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 24-Assistance to landowners
An owner of land who proposes to undertake revegetation in accordance with an arrangement approved under new Division 2 of Part 4 will be able to apply to the Council for financial assistance.

Clause 18: Amendment of s. 25-Guidelines for the application of assistance and the management of native vegetation
Draft guidelines that relate to land within the catchment area of a catchment management board will be submitted to that board for comment. Specific power to vary or replace guidelines is to be vested in the Council.

Clause 19: Insertion of Part 4A
This clause establishes a scheme for environmental credits.

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 26-Offence of clearing native vegetation contrary to this Part
Penalty provisions under section 26 are to be revised so that the specific monetary penalty is \$50 000. Civil proceedings will also follow if a conviction for an offence occurs (unless such proceedings have already been commenced).

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 27-Clearance of native vegetation
It will now be generally the case that the Council may not consent to the clearance of vegetation that comprises or forms part of a stratum of native vegetation that is substantially intact.

Clause 22: Amendment of s. 28-Application for consent
An application for consent under the Act will now need to include information that establishes that proposed planting will result in a significant environmental benefit, or information that establishes that it is not possible to achieve such a benefit (which may then be accompanied by a proposal to apply environmental credits). It will also be necessary to provide a report relating to the proposed clearance that has been prepared by a recognised body.

Clause 23: Amendment of s. 29-Provisions relating to consent
The scheme under section 29 must be revised.

Clause 24: Substitution of s. 30
Separate provision is to be made for conditions of consent. Various kinds of conditions may be considered.

Clause 25: Substitution of s. 31
The civil enforcement proceedings are to be revised. An application will now be made to the Environment, Resources and Development Court. Specific provision is made for certain orders and notices to be made or issued by the Court.

Clause 26: Amendment of s. 32-Appeals
These are consequential amendments.

Clause 27: Amendment of s. 33-Commencement of proceedings
The period for commencing enforcement proceedings is to be changed from 3 years to 4 years.

Clause 28: Insertion of Division 3 of Part 5
This clause makes specific provision for the appointment and powers of authorised officers.

Clause 29: Insertion of Parts 5A and 5B
Certain matters will be the subject of appeal rights to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court. The appeal will be in the nature of a judicial review of an administrative decision.

Clause 30: Insertion of s. 33J
This provision is associated with the vesting of jurisdiction in the ERD Court.

Clause 31: Amendment of s. 34-Evidentiary provisions etc.
Certain facts determined by the use of devices are to be accepted as proved in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Clause 32: Substitution of s. 36
The repeal of section 36 is consequential. Costs and expenses incurred by the Council in taking action under the Act are to be

assessed by reference to the reasonable costs and expenses of an independent contractor.

Clause 33: Repeal of s. 37
This is a consequential amendment.

Clause 34: Amendment of s. 41-Regulations
Certain fees may need to be prescribed by reference to the Minister's estimate of the cost of the service that is provided.

Clause 35: Amendment of Development (System Improvement Program) Amendment Act 2000

The Development (System Improvement Program) Amendment Act 2000 contains provisions relating to the areas of the State to which the Native Vegetation Act 1991 applies. These provisions have now been superseded by amendments made by this Act.

Schedule
These are technical amendments.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTION SIGNS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I move:

That by-law No. 2 of the City of Tea Tree Gully under the Local Government Act 1999 relating to roads, made on 11 December 2001 and laid on the table of this house on 5 March 2002, be disallowed.

The Legislative Review Committee has had concerns over a period of time about election signs and the way in which they have been treated in council by-laws. The Tea Tree Gully council is not the only council which has failed to deal with these signs appropriately. There is considerable history of the dealings of the Legislative Review Committee over the past couple of years with various councils. Following considerable correspondence and discussion with the Local Government Association and a number of individual councils, the time has come for the Legislative Review Committee to recommend the disallowance of by-laws which fail to treat this issue according to law.

The house will be aware that currently there are specific measures designed to allow the display of electoral signs under certain circumstances, particularly at election times. A number of councils have proposed by-laws which have failed to be enacted according to law. With those brief comments I move that this by-law be disallowed. I will make similar submissions in relation to by-law No. 3 of the City of Tea Tree Gully with which we are about to deal.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I move:

That by-law No. 3 of the City of Tea Tree Gully under the Local Government Act 1999 relating to local government land, made on 11 December 2001 and laid on the table of this house on 5 March 2002, be disallowed.

I reiterate the comments that I just made in respect of by-law No. 2 of the City of Tea Tree Gully. It is the recommendation of the Legislative Review Committee that this by-law also be disallowed by the house. Accordingly, I maintain that this by-law should also be disallowed so that the Tea Tree Gully council will give full and proper consideration to its by-laws and enact them according to law.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

Mr MEIER: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

TOURISM DISCUSSION PAPER

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this house congratulates the federal government and the Minister for Small Business and Tourism, Hon. Joe Hockey MP, on the launch of a discussion paper in Adelaide on 2 May 2002 which, through industry consultation, is to lead to a white paper and a final 10 year plan to secure the future for the tourism industry in South Australia and across the nation.

Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, for calling on Notices of Motion No. 1 20 minutes early. I am delighted to be here, and I am enthused that, under the new government, private members' time is progressing with such alacrity and enthusiasm. I hope that is the tone of events and, in moving this motion, I welcome the encouragement of the member for Mount Gambier.

There are few industries more vital to this state than the tourism industry, which employs thousands of South Australians of all ages and genders, of all professional backgrounds—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The last time I checked there were only two, actually—from all circumstances, and with a variety of educational and vocational experiences, and which occupies the attention of so many small and major businesses in its success.

The discussion paper launched in Adelaide at the Australian Tourism and Export Council's meeting is to develop into a green paper, which will, in effect, be a draft plan for the next 10 years for tourism in the nation and then, in stage three, to a white paper that will be a federal policy document that will guide the growth of the industry in South Australia, of course, and, indeed, the whole country. The discussion paper is a very interesting read. It not only contains a number of very interesting facts but also picks the eyes out of the key challenges facing tourism in the years ahead. Members will be interested to note some of the information contained in the report, particularly the growth rate in international visits.

The international visitor numbers for East Asia have the highest growth rate (in fact 14.3 percent in 1999-2000), with Malaysia, China and Vietnam the strongest performers. This is due, in part, to the overall economic recovery in this region following the Asian economic crisis of 1997. But it also partly reflects improved accessibility by air, with more flights serving most destinations and airports increasing their capacity. One of the themes that comes out of this discussion paper is the extent to which Australia relies on air transport for its tourism industry; of course that is particularly important to South Australia.

The satellite account figures for the year 2000-01 show that the tourism sector directly contributed 4.7 per cent, or \$31.8 billion, to gross domestic product in that year. As an export earner, tourism is significant. In 2000-01 the sector contributed 11.2 percent of Australia's total export earnings, making it the fourth largest contributor after mining, manufacturing and agriculture, and the largest export earner within the services sector.

Total tourism consumption in 2000-01 was \$71.2 billion, an increase of \$13 billion from 1997-98. Of that, 76 per cent, or \$54.1 billion, was consumed by domestic visitors and 24 per cent, or \$17.1 billion, by international visitors. As the discussion paper points out, the number of people employed in 2000-01 was 551 000, or 6 per cent of all people employed in Australia. This is an increase of 35 000 people from 1997-98. Furthermore, according to the Bureau of Tourism

research estimates, the sector indirectly employed an additional 340 000 people in 1997-98, or another 4 per cent of those employed. This is a healthy child for the Australian economy. It is a booming sector and one which warrants the focus and attention of this state government, and merits active and vibrant contribution to this discussion paper and the policy document that will flow from it.

The paper asked the question: what emphasis should be placed on maximising yield rather than tourist numbers in developing the tourism plan? It talks about investment and infrastructure and discusses the issue that tourism is traditionally focused on demand. However, it points out that tourism growth will not occur unless Australia makes the necessary investments in tourism product and the related infrastructure to meet that demand.

This was a key focus of the former government. As the former minister for tourism, I can say that one of the great challenges that I identified very early when assuming that portfolio was that we need to improve the products we offer: products like Kangaroo Island; products like the Outback; products based around the Adelaide to Darwin railway and products based around the other jewels we have here, particularly in our regions.

I have previously mentioned in this house the total lack of any policy on tourism from the now government during (or before) the election campaign. It was a portfolio flicked off in the shadow capacity, as a very much secondary responsibility, to the member for Port Adelaide. I note that the government has now given the portfolio to a very busy minister, whom I wish well, but who, I fear, will not have the time to give it the attention that it, the small businesses and the employees in the tourism industry in South Australia so badly need.

The paper also raises the issue of developing a system of grading for tourism infrastructure that could assist in setting priorities for infrastructure development, and points out that domestic tourism constitutes more than 75 per cent of visitor nights and visitor expenditure in South Australia—a very interesting statistic. Some of the most interesting observations in the report have to do with expected growth in the tourism market for South Australia and how that might impact on the Australian and South Australian economies.

Arrivals from Europe are expected to maintain steady growth levels averaging 6.8 per cent per annum to 2012. This represents about 3.5 million visitors from Europe and North America in 2012. But the Asian market is set to grow: those markets (other than Japan) are expected to be less affected by the events of 11 September 2001 than the European and North American markets will be. As a result, visitor arrivals from South Korea are forecast to grow at 13 per cent per year on average until 2012. Singapore visitors to this country will grow by 6.1 per cent, and visitors from China—and this is a significant point—will increase at a rate of 20.8 per cent.

Other Asian countries combined will grow by 9.9 per cent, representing in total about 4.6 million visitors from Asia (excluding Japan) in 2012. As an aside, the Japanese market as a base for South Australia's tourist industry is not tipped to grow that greatly, but we need to now start preparing our tourist industry for a large increase in visits from Asia. We need the language skills, particularly in Chinese, and we need our businesses, our restaurants and our hotels to start to cater for the increasing numbers of Asian visitors who will be coming to South Australia to see the things that South Australia so uniquely has to offer.

Of course, New Zealand will remain a major source of inbound tourism for us and is forecast to grow at 2.5 per cent per annum on average to 2012. Having clear, practical targets can assist governments and industry to focus on what can be achieved and to identify the resources needed to achieve it. The government in this state so far has set no targets and has shown no resolve to undertake the sort of planning that needs to be carried out.

No doubt, the new minister has sat down with her very professional South Australian Tourism Commission and its very capable staff, has picked up the Liberal government's policies and plans and is about to reinvent them as her own. I commend her for that and I hope that she does, because, if she picks up the work that we have done and reinvents it, she will finish up with an intelligent and resourceful tourism plan for the state.

I give notice to the minister that the opposition and I, as shadow tourism minister, will be watching most closely the preparation of our response to this discussion paper and our contribution to this effort by the federal minister to set up a national plan and national vision, because it is so important to South Australian businesses and to the many people who work in the industry here in this fantastic state.

The minister needs to consider not only the yield but also operating profit margins, for this is an industry that is very much in the hands of the private sector. Profitability in tourism was higher than for manufacturing in recent years but lower than for other non-service industries. We need to look at ways to enable small business to make money out of tourism so that they can then reinvest those profits in developing new and better products for the South Australian tourist destination. Institutional investors need to be encouraged more and more in the industry.

Certainly, our airport needs upgrading, as I mentioned earlier. I welcomed the Premier's announcement earlier this week that he supports that, and I hope that the minister is no longer of the view that to do so is 'crazy'. There needs to be a strategic road ahead for development of infrastructure in the tourism industry and for the industry more broadly, and I hope that, within the context of the forthcoming budget, tourism infrastructure funding is not slashed. We will certainly be watching for that.

Accommodation products here in South Australia, of course, need to be constantly improved, and opportunities need to be provided for the tourism labour force. Sectors such as sport offer a great deal for the future of tourism, and I am sure that we could do more with football fixtures. I commend the government for not slashing and throwing on the rubbish tip the World Cup rugby, which was an initiative of the former government. I hope that they are able to develop national sporting competitions, junior sports, non-elite level competitions and other sport related products as an impetus for encouraging further domestic and intrastate travel, because by far the majority of visitors to the state, of course, come by road for events such as those. Increasingly, tourists are attracted by Australia's diverse and rich natural environment. The former government, and I as minister, put a very high priority on ecotourism, with assets such as the Coorong, Kangaroo Island, Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula, the Far North, the Outback.

Dr McFetridge: Glenelg.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The member for Morphett mentions the fabulous beaches of Glenelg. These natural resources are what people come to see. We need to pluck the eyes out of what it is that makes South Australia different. In

conclusion, I commend this discussion paper to the house. I encourage every member to send copies to the small business operators in their constituencies. I encourage them to use the web site and to notify the Minister for Tourism of their views and those of their constituents so that South Australia can make a vibrant and active contribution to the formulation of this policy, so vital to the jobs of young South Australians and the future prospects of the small businesses that are deeply involved in the industry. I encourage the government to consult with all industry organised bodies. So far, the feedback we are getting is that that consultation is not happening. I encourage the minister to get out there on the road, meet with people, get their views and encourage a vibrant and active contribution to this most worthwhile initiative by federal minister Hockey for the future of the industry.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I move:

That this house congratulates South Australian athletes Tatiana Grigorieva, Viktor Chistiakov, Brooke Krueger, Liam Murphy, Brett Cartwright and Arianne Wynen, who have been selected to represent Australia in athletics and lawn bowls at the 2002 Commonwealth Games.

I would like to highlight some of the remarkable achievements of our track and field athletes. Athletics, particularly at international level, is an impressive sporting spectacle with competitors striving to run or walk the fastest, jump the highest and throw the farthest.

I am pleased to announce that five South Australian athletes have been selected to represent Australia at the 2002 Commonwealth Games in Manchester. Selection to compete at this level of sport is strongly competitive and I congratulate the South Australian track and field athletes on their selection and take the opportunity to highlight some of their individual performances.

Tatiana Grigorieva is an outstanding South Australian athlete, and I understand that she is a constituent of the member for Elder, who has doorknocked her many, many times. Tatiana has been selected to represent Australia in the pole vault event. A former national level 400 metre hurdler in Russia, Tatiana took up pole vaulting after she migrated to Australia in 1997. Since that time, the Adelaide resident has vaulted her way to success, winning the silver medal at the inaugural Olympic women's pole vault event in Sydney. In a superb competitive display, Tatiana equalled her personal best of 4.55 metres to claim the equal fourth in the pole vault at last year's World Athletics Championships. At a more recent competition held in Japan, Tatiana cleared 4.56 metres to set a new personal best and edge closer to Emma George's national record of 4.6 metres.

Another South Australian vaulter, Viktor Chistiakov, has also been selected to compete at the Commonwealth Games. Like his wife Tatiana, Viktor was born in Russia and has achieved some remarkable performances in the pole vault event. Some of the high points of Viktor's sporting career in Australia include finishing equal fifth at the Sydney Olympics in 2000. Last season, Viktor went on to record a personal best, clearing the bar at 5.8 metres and placing tenth in the World Athletic Championships at Edmonton. Brooke Krueger has been selected to represent Australia at the Commonwealth Games in the hammer throw event.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: A good event. Brooke, a South Australian Sports Institute scholarship holder, has become only the seventh Australian to throw over 60 metres. Coached by former hammer thrower Sean Carlin, Brooke continues to improve her performance. Earlier this year in Auckland, she again raised her personal best by recording a throw of 64.63 metres, very impressive. How far do you think she could throw the member for Hartley?

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Probably her personal best. Congratulations to past SASI scholarship holders, Liam Murphy and Brett Cartwright, who will represent Australia at the Commonwealth Games in long distance running and walking events respectively. Brett is an Australian Institute of Sport scholarship holder and is currently based in Canberra. His top performances include achieving third place in the Zatopek 10 000 metre event. Brett equalled his magnificent performance in the same event last year and also placed third in the national 5 000 metre event. Already this year Brett has been placed fourth in the trials for the World Cross Country Championships and set a best time for the 5 000 metre event in the recent Telstra A Series that was held in Melbourne.

Liam Murphy also holds a scholarship at the Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra. Aged just 21, Liam began to really achieve tremendous results in his event of road walking when he won the national 50 kilometre walk, which doubled as a trial for the World Championships. He went on to record a personal best for the 50 kilometre road walk at last year's World Championships.

I again congratulate Tatiana Grigorieva, Viktor Chistiakov, Brooke Krueger, Liam Murphy and Brett Cartwright. They are all outstanding performers in the sport of athletics and I wish them all the best in their respective events, as I am sure do all members of this house, when they represent Australia at the Commonwealth Games.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I concur with the comments of the member for West Torrens. Arienne Wynen is an excellent lawn bowler. The other night, at the presentation of the prizes for the Holdfast Bay Lawn Bowling Club, I was told that she is an outstanding A grade bowler. I wish her and the other athletes the very best in their competition. I know that the thoughts of all South Australians and all Australians for that matter will go with these people when they go to Manchester. These people do a huge thing by sacrificing their lives. They put the rest of their lives on hold—the same as some parliamentarians! Certainly when a window of opportunity comes along, athletes grab it.

These people are to be admired not only for their athleticism, prowess and expertise but also their dedication and the sacrifice that they make. That is all I have to say on this matter. This is a matter where everyone needs to be completely focused on the excellence of these athletes.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE PURA MILK 36ERS

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I move:

That this house congratulates the Adelaide Pura Milk 36ers for their outstanding victory in the 2002 National Basketball League Championships.

It is with great delight that I move this motion. This is another outstanding performance by one of our premier sporting teams in South Australia. The Adelaide Pura Milk 36ers, in the space of five seasons, have now won three premierships, and that alone is something that should be richly acknowledged. I do not think that it happens too often in elite sport that anyone is successful at a national level so frequently. Of course, when talking about basketball, we are talking about a growing sport. We have had a great growth in basketball in South Australia as a result of not only the success of the Adelaide 36ers but the way in which basketball has conducted itself over the past number of years.

For the Adelaide Pura Milk 36ers to have been successful three times in five seasons is something of which we should all be very proud. It is a record which I do not believe has happened before in basketball. For them to be able to perform with the consistency that they have is certainly a tribute not only to the team but also to the support staff, the sponsors and all the various people who make up the Adelaide 36ers in South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Out of respect for the minister, would members on my right please show some courtesy.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The Adelaide 36ers had a season where there was no great expectation for a premiership. At the start of the season there was even speculation that they might not make the final eight. Not only did they make the final eight, they were also catapulted into a situation where, as a result of some upsets late in the season—I think after the first round of finals, where they defeated the Titans who had been the favourites throughout the season and for a large part of the season had remained undefeated—they were able to go into a semifinal situation where they were able to host the final; and then, once again, as a result of winning the semifinal, they were able to host the final at the basketball stadium in South Australia.

The subsequent victory against the Razorbacks was certainly another great performance by the Adelaide 36ers. They won the first final here in South Australia; they then went across to New South Wales and lost the second final narrowly; but in the third final of the grand final series they had a resounding victory by something like 15 or 20 points. I was delighted to attend with the Premier on behalf of the government. For members on this side of the house, it was our first premiership since coming into government, and we are certainly very proud of the performances that have been put forward by the Adelaide 36ers—and I know members of the opposition are as well.

It would be right to acknowledge the wonderful contribution that Phil Smyth has made as coach of the Adelaide 36ers. During the five seasons to which I have referred, when they have won three premierships and made the semifinals in the two other seasons—the semifinal which would have led them into the finals—he has been coach of the Adelaide 36ers. Phil has demonstrated not only a great capacity in his role of coach but also in the management of players, the way in which he has conducted himself with the media, and the way in which he has represented the state. I think we all can be proud of Phil, not just for the premiership victories but also for the way in which he has gone about his business.

We all know Phil Smyth came into coaching with an impeccable record as a player. He was successful on three occasions as a player in NBL championships. As a player and coach he holds the most number of premierships, that is, six. This is an outstanding record to which Phil will add in future

years. Phil was also for many years, and I think four Olympiads, captain of the Australian basketball team, the Boomers. I am talking about one of the great athletes of Australian sport. Phil Smyth can be put alongside some of the great names, whether it be from Australian Football, track and field, or swimming.

Phil Smyth is certainly recognised not only in Australia but also world wide as one of the leading people in his profession both as a player and as a coach, and his record is impeccable in both areas. If he were to be lined up with other major sports, both nationally and internationally, he would be right there at the very top echelon of sporting people, now including coaches. The way Phil Smyth was treated by the Australian basketball selectors in regard to his position as the Australian coach of the Boomers was an absolute travesty of justice. Phil Smyth was appointed as the Australian basketball coach, as he should have been, and was treated very shabbily by the Australian basketball selectors. They were not mature enough to put in place the infrastructure that he as the coach wanted put in place so that the team could perform to its highest level. Phil did not go to the media about that, because he is not that sort of person. However, I place on record here in the parliament today that the way in which Phil Smyth was treated as an individual and as a coach of the Australian basketball team by the national selectors shows how far behind they are in the way people are treated in other sports around Australia, as well as showing how poorly the Australian basketball selectors go about their business.

Ms Thompson: What about all the community work he does?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Another important point made by the member for Reynell is Phil Smyth's role in the community. This is another example of how this individual goes about his business. I am sure that Phil Smyth will return one day as Australian coach of the Boomers. He should be there now, but I guess that his not being there simply highlights once again—with the premiership result of the Adelaide 36ers—what a wonderful individual we have in South Australia. We are very proud to have him here as coach of our team, and we are disappointed at the way he has been treated by the Australian national basketball selectors.

I believe it would also be appropriate to acknowledge the wonderful work of his assistants. Phil always goes on record to acknowledge the wonderful support he receives from the two assistant coaches (Steve Breheny and Scott Ninnis), the General Manager (Mark Robinson) and Bernie Lewis. The support crew that makes up this wonderful team should all be acknowledged. I will not run through the names of all the players today, but suffice to list people of the ilk of Brett Maher (Captain of the Adelaide 36ers), Willie Farley, David Stiff, Paul Rees, Rupert Sapwell and, of course, all the other players as well. I acknowledge the wonderful work and the wonderful performances of the team throughout not only this season but also the past five seasons, and I acknowledge also the way they have presented themselves and represented South Australia.

It should also be acknowledged that Brett Maher has capped off an outstanding season, finishing in the top five vote getters in the NBL's Most Valuable Player award. He was also recognised—and rightly so—as the premiere player during the grand final series and received the appropriate award for that. We wish Brett all the best for his future duties not only as the Captain of the Adelaide 36ers but also for future Australian basketball commitments. The Adelaide

36ers have been an inspiration to their fans throughout South Australia.

I also acknowledge the wonderful support of the spectators and fans who have been there for the Adelaide 36ers for the past five seasons—and beyond. On most occasions, games at the basketball stadium are sold out. Certainly throughout the three separate finals series—the quarterfinal, semifinal and then the grand final—on most, if not all, occasions we had a sell-out or so close to it that it did not matter. The spectators have been wonderful in their support of the Adelaide 36ers and of basketball in general. We have another sporting team here in South Australia that has been a wonderful example of sporting excellence for all of us in this state. The Adelaide 36ers have been an inspiration to both young and old throughout the state, and they have shown us what they can really achieve when they set their goals and obviously commit to the highest level.

In conclusion, on behalf of the government, I would just say how proud we are of the Adelaide 36ers and acknowledge not only the success they have had this season in winning another premiership but the role they have played in South Australia for many years now, and in particular for the past five seasons. Basketball has never been at the level that it is currently, as a result of the level of commitment and inspiration that the 36ers have been able to show us, and this all goes well for the grassroots of basketball.

The example the Adelaide 36ers are able to set in the community, but for basketball specifically and for young people to take up the sport, is something very important for us all in trying to encourage young people to be involved in physical activity. Some will go in the direction of basketball, and that is good for all of us. The role played by the Adelaide 36ers in that is something of which we should all be very proud. We all look forward to another strong and successful season next year.

The Adelaide 36ers have not sat back as a result of the premiership this year. They have already signed some major players for next season, including Martin Cattalini, who has been involved in the competition in Europe for the past two years. He is a previous premiership player, I think on two occasions, with the Adelaide 36ers. We read in the *Advertiser* today of another major coup in the signing of Paul Rogers, who will be returning from Western Australia to play for the Adelaide 36ers next season. He has signed a five year contract. So, they are two major signings post their recent victory.

The next big signing that we need to secure is the return of Willie Farley. He has gone across to the United States to try out with the NBL. We wish him all the best, but we also hope that he will return to South Australia and will be a part of the Adelaide 36ers combination that seeks another premiership next season. Of course, these premierships do not come easily. It is not like shelling peas. It is actually a very hard task, but we are confident that the Adelaide 36ers will represent South Australia again very strongly next season. The Premier acknowledged the wonderful premiership victory of the Adelaide 36ers by hosting recently a glittering event at the Adelaide Convention Centre in recognition of their achievement, and he looks forward to doing exactly the same next season when they are again successful.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise on behalf of the opposition to support this motion. Phil Smyth, like the minister, is one of my constituents. I had the pleasure of being down at McDonalds Saturday week ago when Phil

Smyth and I were together selling Big Macs to raise money in this particular case for Camp Smokey. We all recognise the achievements of the 36ers. Every time I walk into my daughter's bedroom, there is a basketball signed by the 36ers, and there is a sweatshirt, also signed by them, up on the wall.

Our family has followed the 36ers' fortunes and, like members of the government and all South Australians, we congratulate each and every one of the 36ers, and all their support staff. Without the support staff you do not have a team, and certainly the Adelaide 36ers are a team of champions and a champion team. The effort they put in on the basketball court needs to be recognised and needs to be rewarded. These people put in 110 per cent. I attended Big Mac Day at McDonalds at Glenelg on Saturday and Phil Smyth was there. People were all over him like a rash and, even though it is very difficult for people in such a situation to maintain their cool and their dignity, they do it with the aplomb of professional sportspeople. It is fantastic to see that they are professionals both on and off the court.

On that particular day at McDonalds we had Phil Smyth and Peter Motley and quite a number of other sporting stars. In fact we have a plethora of sporting stars living in Morphett. Phil Smyth and Mark Williams live almost outside my back door and Peter Motley, the fantastic ex-AFL footballer, Mark Bickley, Graham Cornes and all the stars of the Glenelg football club are there and, like the 36ers and Phil Smyth, they all put in 110 per cent. Like the opposition here, the 36ers are a strong team and their premiership is well deserved.

In light of the wonderful comments the minister has made about the 36ers I would like to mention an article I noticed in the *Advertiser* the other day which reported on the outstanding debt on the Powerhouse. I wonder whether the minister would be so obliging as to say that the government will forego the debt on the Powerhouse in order that the 36ers may continue without having a debt hanging over them. That would be a wonderful gesture on behalf of this government, and certainly the 36ers deserve the state's support and the government's support, and they deserve more than words but actions as well. On behalf of this government—I wish we were the government—on behalf of the opposition I support the motion.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): As the only MP, I think, with a relative who played for the 36ers during this championship year, it seems appropriate that I place on record my congratulations to the 36ers for yet another successful season. Without taking away from the other members of the team, I would like to congratulate in particular my nephew Jacob Holmes, who, playing in his first full season with the 36ers, was lucky enough to be involved in the championship this year. He is a product of the South Australian sports system to some degree and is a good example of how that system works. He was picked up at a junior level, put through the various SASI programs, moving ultimately to the Australian Institute of Sport. He was then picked up by the 36ers and subsequently had the opportunity to be involved in the championship this year. We are certainly very proud of the great achievement of the 36ers, but I am particularly proud to be able to stand in this house and congratulate Jacob on his role.

I advise the house that he did not make a mistake in the three finals, and members might find that hard to believe but for the fact that he was not lucky enough to get on the court—he sat on the bench. It is something we still remind Jacob of from time to time, but he does take the opportunity to flash

his championship ring to members of the family as a reminder that he was actually there and we were not. Congratulations to all the 36ers and we look forward to more success in the future. Congratulations also to all the coaching staff, Phil Smyth in particular, and, as the minister mentioned, to all the support staff. We all know that these sort of groups do not win championships without considerable work by all their supporters. On behalf of the opposition, we pass on our sincere congratulations to the 36ers and all those involved.

Motion carried.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I move:

That this house congratulates South Australian netballers Kathryn Harby-Williams, Jacqui Delaney, Alex Hodge, Peta Squire and Rebecca Sanders, who have been selected to represent Australia in netball at the 2002 Commonwealth Games.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the government and the South Australian community, to congratulate these five South Australian netballers who have been selected to represent Australia in netball in the 2002 Commonwealth Games. Netball is one of the most popular women's sports in Australia, and this state has produced a number of very successful state and national level netballers. Not surprisingly, all the South Australian players who have been selected to compete at the Commonwealth Games have been part of the hugely successful Adelaide Thunderbirds squad.

Kathryn Harby-Williams is an outstanding netballer. She has been captain of the Adelaide Thunderbirds since the Commonwealth Bank trophy competition began in 1997. In April 2000, Kathryn realised a lifelong dream when she was named captain of the Australian Netball Team. She has played in two winning world championship teams, in 1995 in Birmingham and in 1999 in Christchurch. Kathryn was also proud to be a member of the Australian team which won a gold medal for netball in the last Commonwealth Games held in Kuala Lumpur. Kathryn makes a tremendous contribution in the defence positions on the court, and is considered by fellow team members to be an inspirational player.

Jacqui Delaney has also experienced a high level of success throughout her netball career. The talented goal shooter and goal attack was named player of the match in the same year that her team, the AAMI Thunderbirds, took out their second consecutive grand final in the 1999 Commonwealth Bank Trophy. The same year she was also a member of the Australian team which won the world championships in Christchurch. A persistent knee injury forced Jacqui to cut short her 2000 season, but she returned to the Thunderbirds in 2001 in sensational form and that year received the most valuable player award for the second time.

Rebecca Sanders made her first appearance in the Australian colours during the 1998 Caribbean tour. Later that year, Rebecca was a member of the team that won the inaugural netball gold medal at the 1998 Commonwealth Games in Kuala Lumpur. In 1999, Rebecca achieved one of the milestones in her sport when she played in the Australian team that won the world championships in Christchurch. As centre and wing attack, Rebecca is an integral member of the AAMI Thunderbirds and will be a great asset to the Commonwealth Games netball team.

Peta Squire is another tremendous South Australian athlete. Peta began her national netball career in 1996, when

she was part of the team that won the World Youth Cup in Canada. That same year she assisted the South Australian team to win its first national championship in 12 years. Peta began her career as a circle defender, but her exceptional speed saw her shift to wing defence. She has enjoyed excellent form in the last five years, and played a major part in the Thunderbirds winning back-to-back titles and also the Australian side which beat New Zealand in the 1999 world championships.

Alex Hodge is another top netballer who will play in the Australian Netball Team in this year's Commonwealth Games. Alex played in various junior representative teams early in her netball career before making her mark on the Australian netball scene at the age of 20. For the last five years, and in round one this year, Alex was a central member of the AAMI Thunderbirds which won two Commonwealth Bank trophies. Alex also captained the Australian Fisher & Paykel Cup against New Zealand, and she recently moved interstate to be part of the Sydney University Sandpipers to further progress her playing career at a national level.

I would like to congratulate Kathryn Harby-Williams, Jacqui Delaney, Alex Hodge, Peta Squire and Rebecca Sanders who, quite clearly, are all outstanding athletes. They are performing at the pinnacle of their sport. I wish them all the best in their preparation and for their performance in the Australian netball team at the Commonwealth Games and we look forward to their homecoming.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to support this motion on behalf of the opposition. The netballers in question are, like the 36ers, fine athletes and models for our youth of today. I have watched the ladies in question progress through the various levels of netball over the years. My daughter is a keen netballer who played for the Matrics and is now playing for Blackwood Panthers, with the amalgamation of some of the southern district netball teams. She certainly idolises these ladies and hopes to emulate the performance of these fantastic players.

For the information of members, the South Australian netball association was originally known as the South Australian Women's Basketball Association, formed in 1928. In South Australia records from newspaper clippings show that the first state A1 premiers were the YWCA, in 1922—four years before the first recorded interstate match and six years prior to the first official all Australian carnival. It certainly has a long history in South Australia and we are continuing that fine history by going on into the future and rewriting history, which we hope this government will do with the help of Netball South Australia with the performances of fine players like Kathryn Harby-Williams, Jacqui Delaney, Alex Hodge, Peta Squire and Rebecca Sanders, who will be in Manchester in July for the Commonwealth Games.

It is interesting to see the fantastic following that netball has. Part of that fantastic following is all the merchandising, without which many of these clubs would not continue. The clubs have also had a lot of support from previous governments. ETSA Park is a fantastic facility. It is disappointing that you have to pay when you go to watch your daughters and other family members play there. The government could look at that. It is a huge leap forward from the open-air netball courts on Anzac Highway next to the cemetery on West Terrace. I concur with the sentiments of the previous speakers and I am more than happy to support this motion.

Motion carried.

SCHOOLS, FUNDING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I move

That this house condemns the federal government for ignoring the needs of government schools in Australia by failing to match the increases provided to the non-government school sector.

The recent budget was noted by the *Sydney Morning Herald*. On 15 May, commenting on Mr Costello's speech, an article stated:

Education received no mention at all, other than a glancing reference to the importance of national literacy and numeracy.

In the *Financial Review* special budget 32-page lift-out, you have to go to page 22 before education gets a headline and then all it talks about is universities getting less in future. That sums up the federal government's view of the importance of education. The need for publicly based education available to all simply does not rate.

The OECD is of the view that both individuals and countries benefit from education. For individuals the potential benefits lie in general quality of life and in the economic returns of sustained, satisfying employment. For countries the potential benefits lie in economic growth and the development of shared values that underpin social cohesion.

For many years, spending on public education in Australia has been an investment in our economic and social wellbeing. It has been a symbol of our commitment to justice and equality and allowing all children, no matter their background, to have the chance of a good go in life. I am happy with and applaud the federal government's initiative to extend the quality teacher program which complements that of this state, but it is clear that education just does not rate in terms of the federal government. The federal government did not talk about middle schooling, retention rates, primary schooling or, what is now getting much of the focus in education, the early years.

Many teachers in our state schools have recently attended seminars on research into child brain development. The way in which a child's brain develops in the early years sets the foundation for lifelong learning, behaviour and health. It is now commonly held that early childhood learning is the foundation of a world-class education program, yet did we see any support for this new research for children attending state schools in the recent budget? There was not a dime, let alone a cent.

Australians want their children to have more opportunities in life than their parents did. This is the commitment of every parent I know, and we as a community want to do all that we can to make sure that children get a good start in life. Our state government recognises these issues and is targeting additional resources at the early years, including extra teachers for smaller class sizes in the early years, the development of literacy and numeracy teaching skills of early years teachers, and a focus on the early identification of children who are at risk of falling behind. However, the federal government, as it does with most areas of education, completely ignores the early years.

It also seems that the federal government is still intent on its ideological plan to drain money from government schools while increasing funding to private schools. The budget makes clear the education priorities of the federal Liberal government. It is a further attempt by the federal Liberal government to make public education a residual system rather than the focus of education in our community.

Private schooling has always offered parents an alternative, but the difference now is that the recent policies of the federal Liberal government put the private and public education sectors in competition with each other. It is my opinion that the public education system has been seriously disadvantaged by not receiving funding comparable to what has been going to private schools in recent years. I acknowledge the right of parents to choose to send their children to private schools, but I wonder about the Liberal government's policies which have just shovelled huge amounts of money into the private school system—and it has not even done that in an equitable manner.

Some private schools, particularly the older, better established private schools in my area—parish schools such as the Antonio Catholic School, the Calvary Lutheran School and the Southern Vales Community Christian School—are struggling because they have not been benefiting from some of the largesse that Prime Minister Howard has been directing towards the more recently established and wealthier schools in the private system.

The Socio-Economic Status (SES) funding model introduced in 2001 included a windfall gain for the wealthiest private schools in the nation and a 'no-worse-off' guarantee maintained in real terms, but this has simply not benefited some of the worse off private schools—the small parish schools which I have mentioned—and it has certainly been to the detriment of funding to our state schools.

On 15 May 2002, the *Sydney Morning Herald* reported on the \$600 million blow-out in private school funding, a fact to which Mr Costello made no reference in his speech. The federal government estimated that it would need to pay an additional \$800 million for the flow-on effects of the SES funding model. However, the federal budget estimates, 'show that the cost of the scheme has jumped from \$3.36 billion last year to \$4.74 billion in 2004-05, far higher than the government's original \$800 million dollar estimate.' South Australia's figures reflect this blow-out. The 2001-02 budget of \$214 million includes indexation of 7.48 per cent, yet the actual outcome was almost \$256 million, reflecting a further 9 per cent increase. If only that sort of increase could have gone to our state's schools.

The federal government will argue, of course, that public schools are predominantly the responsibility of the states. However, the federal government simply cannot ignore the difference in the tax base available to the federal and state governments and the high degree of state government reliance on commonwealth grants. The imbalance arises from the dominance of the commonwealth in the taxation field, while the states remain responsible for substantial spending. So, when the federal government targets its specific-purpose payments, it is clearly making national level spending decisions and imposing them on the states. In this case, the decision is to favour direct funding of private schools over public schools. The *Australian* also has been following this debate and, on 10 December 2001, an article appearing in that newspaper reports Dr Brendan Nelson as follows:

I will be doing everything I can to support government education (and ensure) that the commonwealth meets its commitments to support government schools.

Ministers of education across Australia resolved to set policies that safeguard the entitlement of all young people to a high quality schooling when, in the 1999 Adelaide Declaration, they agreed 'The National Goals for School Education in Australia.' Common and agreed goals for schooling establish a foundation for action amongst state and territory

governments with their constitutional responsibility for schooling, and the commonwealth—in seeking the best possible outcomes for young Australians—to improve the quality of schooling nationally.

The preamble to the National Goals states:

Australia's future depends upon each citizen having the necessary knowledge, understanding, skills and values for a productive and rewarding life in an educated, just and open society. High quality schooling is central to achieving this vision.

This suggests an agreed view among ministers for education across the states, territories and the commonwealth that the future of this country depends on the quality of the education we provide to all students of today, with expenditure targeted to where it will be most needed and where it will have the most benefit. I have time to refer to an editorial in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on this topic. On 27 May, under a headline titled 'Spelling out the education split', the editorial states:

Australia is being denied a full and open debate on how the education of its 3.3 million school children is most equitably funded. The federal budget's failure to explain the need for yet another substantial shift to resources to private schools is but the latest example. A year ago, the federal government expected its new method for private school funding (the socioeconomic status formula, based on the wealth of student's home areas) would cost the commonwealth an extra \$800 million over five years. Without explanation, the extra cost jumped in this month's budget to \$1.4 billion. The increase was evident only to those who made the effort to compare budget papers year to year. The concealment gave the impression of a government curtailing transparency to discourage vigorous public discussion of an issue directly tied to how Australia maximises education outcomes from the money pool available.

In the \$6.2 billion allocation to schools, government schools (mostly in state domains) will receive an extra \$56 million—or a total of \$2.1 billion—while private schools will receive \$4.02 billion—a rise of \$300 million. By 2005-06, federal spending on private schools (which was \$3.7 billion in 2001) will reach \$5.1 billion. I believe that the *Sydney Morning Herald* has very accurately pointed out some of the problems involved in the way that the federal government is going about funding private schools. It is not just the fact that it is happening, it is the fact that it is happening surreptitiously, without a public debate, on the value of the public education system (being our major system), with the private education system available to those parents who make a choice, for whatever reason, to provide something different for their children.

Our community depends on a healthy public school system. It has shown a great record of providing cohesiveness in our community. I was thrilled when I heard on public radio an eminent surgeon, who went to Henley High School, talking to a car salesman, who had been a classmate, in a friendly manner, understanding and respectful of each other. I am very fearful that our children will not hear those conversations in the future, because those who become brain surgeons will have gone through a private school system which is receiving great benefits from the Howard federal government, while the children in the public school system will be further struggling if their parents cannot put the extra funds in that are required to enable them to reach their full potential.

Already we see inequality in relation to access to university education. I am confident, sir, that you know as well as I do that brain power is not distributed by postcode. However, postcodes etc. are used by this federal government to deliver funding to private schools. Postcodes should be used to deliver funding to those schools that are most disadvantaged and to ensure that when we look at the

university entrance results in five to 10 years we see no evidence of discrimination by postcodes; that we see that all children, wherever they live, have brains that this nation needs to use and needs to develop.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like to make a brief contribution, because this is a very important topic. I say at the outset that all my schooling was through the state system—and people can interpret that how they like—but I am a great believer in having a fair and equitable arrangement in terms of the funding of all schools, and I accept that people have a choice as to which school they send their children. I think that is a fundamental right. It is obvious to anyone who takes an interest in the subject that in recent years—and it has been a trend for some time, going back even more than a few years—the federal government, which does not have any direct responsibility for education, has become actively involved and created considerable inequity in the funding of schools.

We know that the state government has principal responsibility for funding, but over time the federal government has increasingly put money into schools, and it would argue that through the grants system it contributes towards the funding of state schools; and no one would deny that. But if you drive around any of the suburbs and look at the major non-government schools, you will see that they have had enormous funding from the commonwealth in recent years—funding that is not matched in any way in the state system. I do not decry what they have in terms of gymnasias and new buildings, but what I do decry is the fact that that generosity has not been extended to the state school system. In effect we have a two-tiered system in relation to most of the non-government schools and the government sector in general.

It is not true of all non-government schools: some of them are struggling and come into the category of poor schools. But the Department of Education and Training itself operates a system of discrimination because it has certain favourite state schools vis-a-vis other state schools, and that is an issue that I hope the new minister will address. If you look closely at the state school system, you will see that some schools get considerable funding and attention from the department that is not given to other areas.

In my own electorate the schools are in reasonable physical condition. Some of them need additional facilities but, overall, being in a new area, they have reasonably good facilities. But if you look in the northern and southern suburbs, further south in my electorate and some of the western suburbs, you will see that, in many of the state schools in those areas and in some country regions such as Kangaroo Island, some of the facilities in the state schools are absolutely substandard. And it is not just because of the physical facilities: sadly, some of the blame must go on elements within the teaching profession.

I am not knocking the union, because I was always a member of the union and quite active in it. It is a difficult role, because it is not only an industry body but also a professional body. But there is a small group of teachers who, for one reason or another, have their own particular agenda, and they actually do great harm to the state school system by pursuing some of those agenda. What we get is a vicious circle. People hear the negativity about the state school system, see the extra funding on the non-government sector and then send their children in increasing numbers to the non-government sector.

The commonwealth then says, 'We have to fund the non-government sector more because more people are going there,' and what you get is a continued vicious cycle of people going to the non-government sector. The more they go there, the more funding they get, and so it continues. Somewhere along the line, that issue has to be addressed. I acknowledged before that the state government helps fund non-government schools and students at those schools. Once again, I do not have a problem with that, provided that the responsibility also extends to ensure that we do not have a two tiered system of education in this state or in this country.

Education, after all, is the passport not only to employment but also to improving one's life chances. I am a great believer in making sure that everyone has the opportunity to reach their potential. We hear that often as a catchcry but it is not implemented fully in this country and, sadly, as a nation we are less egalitarian, less committed to equity, than we were 100 years ago. People should reflect on that. Collectively, we are wealthier than we have ever been but, increasingly, we are becoming a society that has at least two tiers to it, crudely called the haves and the have nots, reflecting that inequity in our system.

The most harmful thing you can do to someone is deny them an opportunity for the very best in education. Australia has gone in the opposite direction from countries such as Ireland and many of the countries in Europe, which see education as an investment and not simply as a cost. There are a couple of interesting aspects to this debate. One could ask how private or how non-governmental are the non-government schools. How Catholic is the Catholic school system when it is hard to find a member of the clergy actually working in some of those schools?

I do not say that as a criticism: I am just stating a fact. Many of the students attending are not of that particular faith. I know that some people within those various faiths have expressed concern about that, because they see that as a threat to one of the reasons why they set up their schools in the first place. Many could argue that that is a positive thing, but it reflects, I suspect, to a large extent the fact that many parents feel that, with the current funding differences and the provision of resources in those schools, and probably a different attitude by some of the teaching profession, they will choose those schools in any event.

The issue of equity, as I have said, must be addressed; it is blatantly obvious. One would hope it is not a positive act of discrimination against state schools, but my sceptical nature suggests that it may well be. I would urge federal members and every member in this place to familiarise themselves with the situation in state schools and to see their physical condition—not just the few state schools that are lauded all the time, the favourite ones, but all of them. Some country members have told me of classrooms which have mould and which leak when it rains.

One can point out numerous state schools that do not have adequate physical facilities for recreation: they do not have halls, gymnasias and so on. I defy members to show me any of the well-established non-government schools that do not have those facilities—perhaps the only exception would be some of those still run by the Sisters of St Joseph. I am not decrying the levels within the Catholic system, but there is almost a pecking order there, too, in that some schools are incredibly affluent yet, down the road, there may be one run by the Sisters of St Joseph that is very much the poor relation.

The Catholic system has been a little more astute—the Anglicans are now catching up—because it has presented a

case to the commonwealth that all its schools should be treated as though they are in the same category, when obviously they are not. Loreto cannot be compared with some of the poorer Catholic schools in the western suburbs. The reality is that, however, they are bundled together and are funded on that basis. The Anglican church has discovered that formula and is now starting to seek similar treatment.

The system does not address the underlying discrimination that exists and has been perpetrated by federal governments, not just the current one, in recent years: it has been a trend over time. Over 15 or 20 years we have seen, at the state level, a reluctance to fund state schools properly, when once we led Australia, and probably the world, in regard to state education. Now, however, we need, in my estimation, tens, if not hundreds of millions, of dollars spent on state schools to bring them up to the standard they should be at in a country and a state as affluent as ours.

I believe this motion has merit. The issue will not be resolved overnight, but I think it is time that Australians, and South Australians in particular, looked closely at what is happening to what is, after all, the community education system, that is, the state school system.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 p.m.]

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

A petition signed by 301 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House pass legislation providing for the prosecution of child sexual abuse offences committed before 1982 was presented by the Hon. M.J. Atkinson.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Public Sector Responsiveness in the 21st Century—A Review of South Australian Processes.

CRIME

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics has today released figures on recorded crime in Australia for last year, 2001, and they make sobering reading for people in this state. Despite what we were told in the lead-up to the last election, these statistics suggest that South Australia last year had the highest rate of recorded crime per capita in the nation. It is important to state that these figures are influenced by factors other than the actual amount of crime committed in our community and also depend on the reporting systems used by different police forces around the country. But the fact remains that crime and fear of crime is a major issue in this state.

Today I want to outline to the house the measures South Australia's new Labor government is taking against crime and to announce our latest measure aimed specifically at car crime. A comparison of the reported crime in 2001 compared with the previous year shows that South Australia recorded an increase in five major crime categories—assault, sexual

assault, robbery, blackmail and other theft. The increase in assault and robbery—

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

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise to the Premier for interrupting, but he seems to be quoting a document. Is the document tabled?

The SPEAKER: Premier, are you quoting from your statement?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My ministerial statement has just been circulated. I am happy to advise the honourable member and give him one in handwriting if it makes him feel better.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The increase in assault and robbery was lower than the national trend. South Australia showed a decrease in four major crime categories—homicide and related offences, kidnapping, unlawful entry with intent and motor vehicle theft.

The fight against crime is a major priority for this government. Measures already introduced within our first three months in office, or soon to be introduced, include:

- legislation to abolish the outrageous drunk's defence;
- controversial legislation to promote consistency in sentencing by the use of sentencing guidelines by judges;
- groundbreaking legislation to increase sentences for offences against the person where the victim is elderly or suffering from a disability;
- investigation of the banning of knives at night in and around licensed premises;
- increased police powers to take and deal with DNA samples from suspects and offenders;
- legislation treating bushfire arsonists as terrorists by creating a new offence of causing a bushfire with a new 20-year maximum sentence and requiring people who light bushfires and other arsonists—and I can announce this today—including those who set fire to schools, to confront the consequences of their acts;
- legislation to substantially increase the rights of innocent people to defend themselves against unlawful attacks in their own homes; and
- legislation completely overhauling the law of theft, fraud and related offences of dishonesty.

I would like to provide the house with more detail about what this government is doing to reduce motor vehicle theft. The public is sick and tired of car theft, and we will hit car thieves hard, and we will regard them as thieves, because that is what they are. Under the government's proposals, more so-called joyriding behaviour which would have been only criminal under the minor or illegal use offence will be able to be prosecuted as theft, attracting a maximum penalty of 10 years imprisonment. The government is proposing that the maximum penalty for theft is raised from five to 10 years.

Other significant changes are proposed. A person who dishonestly takes a motor vehicle without the consent of the owner intending, for example, to deal with the property in such a way that creates a substantial risk (of which the person is aware) that, when the owner gets it back, its value will be substantially impaired, will be guilty of theft of that car. This is clearly wider than the current law. More illegal use cases will be able to be prosecuted as theft, and exposure to the higher maximum penalty will result.

The government is also proposing a generalised offence of making off without payment. There has been a consistent demand from the petrol station industry for a general offence to criminalise drive-offs from petrol stations. This offence

will cover that situation, and I am pleased to announce it to the house today. The maximum penalty for making off without payment will be two years imprisonment. The new laws will also cover situations involving taxi runners, and the two year maximum penalty will send a strong message to those who are caught after running away from taxis without paying their fare.

PUBLIC SECTOR REVIEW

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In December last year the former government established a task force comprising the Hon. John Fahey AC, a former New South Wales Liberal premier and federal minister for finance in the Howard government; the Hon. Greg Crafter, a former state Labor minister for education; and Mr Rob Payze, a former public sector chief executive, to review processes in the South Australian public sector to improve its responsiveness. Following the state election I reaffirmed continuation of the review, which was already well progressed under the former government. The task force handed over its final report to me earlier this week when I met with Mr Fahey and his team. I am sure members of this house will find its recommendations both challenging and, in some cases, controversial. The task force's findings are based on evidence from a variety of sources, including:

- written submissions from, and meetings with, a wide range of individuals and organisations with the community and government, including the PSA and Business SA;
- two commissioned reports;
- research and interviews undertaken by its supporting project team;
- advice from a reference group of government chief executives; and
- two workshops with the Senior Management Council of the South Australian Public Service.

I have decided to release the report in full today, in keeping with the government's commitment to openness and accountability, and to seek comment and feedback in relation to its 121 recommendations. I hope the opposition, which commissioned the report when it was in government, and the Public Service Association will provide the new government with their responses. The government will closely examine the report and its implications and the responses to it that we receive during the next three months about which recommendations we accept and those which are not accepted.

Some of the points raised are already being addressed by the new government, and many others may be worthy of consideration. Other recommendations may be considered not to be practical or appropriate. The task force notes that the South Australian public sector, in general, comprises talented and hard working people with a strong commitment to serving the community and government. However, the task force suggests that there is a tendency towards risk averseness—to be overly cautious. It believes that there has been a lack of a whole of government approach and a tendency to what they call a 'silo mentality'.

The task force puts forward recommendations on a number of key areas and processes. In particular, the recommendations highlight the importance of leadership at all levels, as opposed to structural change in the public sector,

to encourage innovation, collaboration and a more confident 'can do' approach. In its recommendations, the task force says there is a need for:

- well defined and understood governance arrangements;
- the government's vision, priorities and outcomes to be clearly articulated and to drive planning and budget bids;
- budget processes to be multilateral instead of bilateral to encourage collaboration across government and to achieve integrated programs and whole of government outcomes;
- long-term capital investment planning and rigorous analysis of funding proposals, including public-private partnerships;
- more effective and efficient processes supporting cabinet, including—and I hope members opposite are listening—adherence to the 10-day rule, timely and adequate consultation on proposals before they are considered by cabinet and an effective cabinet committee system, steps this government has already taken;
- a variety of practical mechanisms for breaking down the 'silo mentality' and 'patch protection' in the public sector to encourage interagency collaboration and cooperation;
- risks to be appropriately identified—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Chairman of this review committee is the former Liberal Premier of New South Wales, and your government commissioned the report. The recommendations continue:

- risks to be appropriately identified, assessed and managed, instead of avoided;
- requests for legal advice to be appropriate and proportionate to the risks involved;
- more streamlined approval processes for major and other large capital investment projects without compromising high standards of probity and accountability;
- further refinement of the government's strategic procurement reform program to maximise its benefits;
- a number of guiding principles and practical measures to be implemented to facilitate more effective interaction with the community;
- priority to be given to valuing the public sector's most important asset—its people—through ongoing development, providing strong and capable leadership, encouraging mobility and ensuring widespread understanding of public sector values and ethics; and
- the roles and responsibilities of all departments to be reinforced to achieve the government's priorities, particularly the important leadership role of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet through collaborating with and empowering other departments.

I want to thank the task force members for their efforts and congratulate them and the secretariat which assisted. I hope that the report—and I want to be fair to members opposite—will not be seen as a criticism of the former government and its management practices. I am advised that the cost of the report has been approximately \$120 000 so far, but there will be some further funding for follow-up as the response is prepared. This is a report commissioned by the Leader of the Opposition when he was premier. It is important that government evaluates its processes in an open and transparent way. We must open the windows on ourselves and not be afraid to consider new ways of doing things. Government will carefully consider this report and the feedback to it and respond appropriately with a view to further improving the

quality of government and public service in this state. I seek leave to table the report.

The SPEAKER: The Premier does not need to seek leave to table. If he tables it, it stays tabled.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is very kind of you, sir.

QUESTION TIME

BODY DISPOSAL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier advise the house whether he has ordered a full investigation into the alleged body in the wheelie bin case? If so, when will the results be released, and, if not, why not? During the election campaign a story appeared in the *Advertiser* alleging that the Department of Human Services had disposed of a human body by placing it in a wheelie bin. The then opposition leader called for an immediate investigation. He said:

This is someone's sister or mother or wife or someone's daughter and yet there was no investigation. The police were called—there was no investigation. There was no investigation by the government.

The Premier went on to say that he was appalled that there had been no proper investigation despite the incident happening more than a month before. After almost three months in government, the Labor Party has either not held an inquiry into the matter or is suppressing any information about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader knows that the last sentence is highly disorderly and will not be tolerated in future by the chair, regardless of who attempts it. That is a clearly provocative statement of opinion that will only inflame the situation. We should see ourselves as role models, think of ourselves as being in a committee of the community trying to determine the best way forward, without us wanting to inflame each other to the point where we become combatants.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I remember the report on the front page of the *Advertiser* by its investigative team headed by its chief reporter or former chief of staff. I remember being asked to comment on that front page story and my memory, which may fail me, is that the government at the time, which was your government, said that the matter was being fully investigated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Was the former minister for health correct when he said on national TV that \$2.5 million towards a new cancer centre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for Reynell might like to talk to me about that question.

Ms THOMPSON: To reword it? I can ask the minister whether—

Members interjecting:

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

Ms THOMPSON: Thank you, sir. Can the Minister for Health advise whether \$2.5 million towards a new cancer centre at the Flinders Medical Centre was included in the budget or is it something that was more recently announced on an unfunded basis?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I acknowledge the member for Reynell's interest in the Flinders Medical Centre and other health services in the southern region. What a stunt yesterday from the former minister for health, the man who closed nearly 500 beds from our hospitals and still overspent the budget by \$56 million! The announcement of funding for the Flinders Medical Centre was an election promise, approved by cabinet and signed by the then deputy premier on 15 January, the very same day that the election was called.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will cease barracking and so will all other members.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: On 15 January, the very same day the election was called, the Liberal cabinet approved funds for the cancer centre, which they said would be provided in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 financial years. The deal was announced on 18 January during the campaign and the caretaker period. Yesterday—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will come to order!

The Hon. L. STEVENS:—in a television interview the former minister said, 'It was budgeted for.' The minister said in this house yesterday that \$2.5 million is 'included in the forward estimates'. Both statements are untrue. The \$2.5 million was an unfunded commitment announced during the election campaign. It is not in the current budget, and it is not in the forward estimates. Once again, the former minister was spending money he did not have.

SA WATER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises if he will listen rather than speaking for a moment. Can the minister confirm to the house—as he failed to do last time—that significant job cuts are occurring within SA Water in regional areas of our state? On 16 May, the minister advised the house of a program to replace some older SA Water workers with younger workers. I am informed that, in addition to that program, SA Water is also in the process of reducing its work force by 40 positions, mostly in regional South Australia, including Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier and Crystal Brook, and that some of those targeted are actually young workers.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I am more than happy to answer and thank the leader for this question. I will go through this slowly for the leader. There is the program that I mentioned. I also indicated to the leader that no matter which angle he came from he would not get a snapshot of the budget. I will check, but I believe that the Leader of the Opposition's figures are roughly correct. I understand that there is a program for about 40 redundancies. Let me explain a few things—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I said that there was a program, but I said the other day that I would not guarantee that there would not be redundancies. I do not know what difficulty the leader has with that. We came to the election with some promises, which we will keep. We are not the government that enjoys getting rid of people in the public sector. For the Leader of the Opposition to stand up in this place again and have the gall to ask me about 40 packages in SA Water when they removed 3 000 jobs is nothing but the most utter hypocrisy.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is to the Minister for Health. Following the announcement of the generational review of South Australia's health system and the statement by the shadow minister for health that 'a review has become a weak alternative to action', can the minister advise the house how many reviews were conducted last year in areas under the control of the former minister for human services?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for her question. As people would know, reviews can play an important role in unravelling policy failures and developing strategic plans. Of course, it was quite predictable that the opposition would attempt to denigrate the generational review into health services because health was one of their great failures. As a matter of interest, I asked my department to provide me with details of how many reviews were conducted last year when the member for Finnis—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As a matter of interest, Mr Speaker, I will say it again so that you can hear. I asked my department to provide me with details of how many reviews were conducted last year when the member for Finnis was the minister for human services. The answer was—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Davenport. I am fond of all members in this house, but I assure you that it is not my province to determine whether affection is appropriate for their remaining in this chamber. The minister.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The answer to the question is a staggering 69 reviews in the Department of Human Services alone: one department, 69 reviews, which is three times more than the number for the whole of the new government.

An honourable member: Name them all.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I do not have time to name the whole lot, but I would like to refer to a few.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will come to order. The member for Unley will also come to order.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I am sure that members would like to hear some information about just some of the 69 reviews that the former minister for human services undertook last year. They included a review of asset management policies; a review of the epidemiology branch; a review to update environmental design parameters with key stakeholders; a review of records management; and to listen to this one—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: A review of the reviews?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: No, a review and audit of current work practices and established policies, procedures and systems which assist divisions and branches to comply in a changing environment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: He was really into it—and there is more. The former minister even had a review into regional self-assessment. Now that is a review into a review: you really did surpass yourself on that one. Time does not permit me to detail all 69 reviews the former minister had under way, but with your leave I would like to table the schedule—

The SPEAKER: The minister does not need my leave. If the minister wishes to table, the minister tables.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I am very happy to table the schedule of the minister's 69 reviews. I must conclude just by saying that, by the former minister's own assessment,

there really could not have been much happening while he was in charge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

HOMESTART FINANCE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I hope the minister just reads the 19 clinical reviews because if she reads those she will see that there is no need for a further review.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: How does the Minister for Health justify the breaching of a contract between the Kangaroo Island hospital and HomeStart over a loan to build eight aged care beds at Kingscote for which the federal government has already approved \$165 000 per year to cover the operating costs for the new aged care beds?

Under the previous government, a HomeStart loan of \$600 000 had been approved to build eight aged care beds at the Kingscote hospital. The hospital board had signed the contract with HomeStart, returned the contract and paid the \$1 000 establishment fee for the loan. On Tuesday of this week the hospital was notified by HomeStart that the contract would not now be honoured. The Naracoorte and Gumeracha hospitals have also signed contracts which have now been withdrawn. In the case of Naracoorte hospital a contract has been signed with a builder, subsequent to the contract with HomeStart, and the builder has started work, but that loan has been withdrawn.

Previous practice by new governments is that firm contracts made by previous governments are honoured. Examples include the Labor government's contracts for a cheap loan to the United Trades and Labor Council to build Trades Hall and the Labor government's contract with Bruce Guerin for more than \$1 million to go to Flinders University. However, the contract to provide high care nursing home beds at the Kingscote hospital has been cancelled by this Labor government, which shows that it has no moral conscience.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The whole issue of the HomeStart loans has been addressed by the Treasurer previously.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Government Enterprises. The member for Playford.

PARAFIELD AIRPORT

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Will the Minister for Transport advise the house what action he will take regarding the safety risk to the residents of my electorate of Playford from accidents involving light aircraft moving in and out of Parafield Airport? Light aircraft—significant numbers of which are flown by trainee pilots—fly low over residences in my electorate. Yesterday, an apparently stolen plane crashed metres from homes and businesses onto Montague Road.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Playford for his question and for his representation to me about this incident. I was shocked to hear that a light plane had been stolen from Parafield Airport and subsequently crashed onto Montague Road, narrowly missing homes and traffic. Parafield is known as a non-categorised airport, which means that the aviation security regulations of the Commonwealth Air Navigation Act 1920 do not apply. At categorised airports, such as Adelaide Airport, operators are required to remove access to unattended aircraft, such as the removal of steps to the cockpit and to lock unattended aircraft.

I am alarmed to hear that these statutory security requirements do not apply to Parafield and that no regulations apply to security of unattended aircraft. I am advised that it is common practice to leave aircraft unlocked and with ignition keys inserted. I am advised that classification of airports is risk-based. General aviation and secondary airports are generally considered by the commonwealth government to be low risk. However, the aviation security industry consultative meeting working group of categorised airports, operators and Australian Protective Services, chaired by the Department of Transport and Regional Services, met several days ago and raised the issue of security of general aviation airports and business aircraft at non-categorised airports.

An outcome of that meeting was a decision that the Department of Transport and Regional Services would discuss with the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) whether security aircraft on the ground should be brought under the civil aviation safety regulations. Following the incidents of 11 September, the commonwealth distributed a notice to airmen calling for the exercise of increased vigilance at all airports, with any suspicious activity immediately reported to local police. Security measures exercised at Parafield include the following: perimeter fencing with locked gates other than the main road access gates; and air-side fencing, which is only one metre high and which makes access by a pedestrian easy but more difficult for vehicles, which is its purpose.

They have lit aircraft parking aprons; periodic perimeter checks on an irregular basis by Parafield Airport Limited staff; visual surveillance by control tower staff, which is not staffed 24 hours; and commercial security company patrols, mainly of commercial premises rather than air-side areas. There is no Commonwealth Police or Australian Protective Service presence on Parafield Airport. The commonwealth Australian Transport Safety Bureau is responsible for the investigation of aircraft accidents and has powers to secure accident sites. It did not do so in this case because the matter is being treated as a criminal offence rather than as an aircraft accident. It does not plan to undertake an investigation in this case.

A criminal investigation of offences under section 7 of the Aircraft Offences Act by SA Police is in progress, and the Minister for Police has been fully briefed. I understand that the Commonwealth Police are not involved, except possibly as a matter of normal liaison. CASA will investigate breaches of the civil aviation safety regulations in relation to flying without a licence, taking off without clearance, low flying, and responsibilities prior to flight. The commonwealth clearly is responsible for the regulation of airport and aircraft security. Assessment of the adequacy of present arrangements at general aviation airports must now be a very high priority.

However, appropriate levels of security must remain related to proper assessment of risk. For instance, the cost

implications of increasing airport security measures are huge, and to implement all the measures required at categorised airports could result in the closure of Parafield and other regional airports. It would appear that the most practical and cost effective approach will be to require increased security of unattended aircraft which, as indicated above, is already under investigation. This government is calling for an acceleration of that process. It is amazing that, post 11 September, these alarming concerns have not already been resolved.

MURRAY RIVER FISHERY

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier please tell the house whether the Murray River fishermen who are about to have their livelihood removed will be compensated in a manner consistent with the public statements of the member for Hammond? The deal to close the river fishery was made in February, yet the licence holders still have not been informed as to how they will be compensated for loss of livelihood. The 30 families are extremely anxious, and SAFIC has written to you, Mr Speaker, pleading for a fair deal.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is highly disorderly. Leave is removed. The Premier.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Why, sir? On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order: the leader will be seated.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Do you want to go the same way? The Deputy Leader will be seated. I have called the Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I have withdrawn leave. That is a direct reflection on the chair and the chair will not tolerate it. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—under what standing order is that a reflection on the chair?

The SPEAKER: The reflection on the chair was when a comment was made by the Leader of the Opposition about remarks that the chair had made. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, I do not believe that what the Leader of the Opposition said reflected on or referred to what the Speaker had said. It simply said that a letter had been sent to the Speaker. That is not a reflection on the Speaker. That is why I ask: under what standing order, in fact, have you made that ruling? Saying that a letter has been sent to the Speaker is not a reflection on the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I have heard the explanation of the Deputy Leader. There is no point of order. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am not quite sure who is writing the Leader of the Opposition's questions—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move dissent with your ruling and I will sit down and write out that dissent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright will come to order. The motion is that the house dissent from the Speaker's ruling. The mover is the member for Finnis and it is seconded by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move this dissent with the Speaker's ruling and it disappoints me that I have had to do so now in two successive sitting weeks of this parliament. The reason it concerns me is that there are standing orders of this house and there is practice of this house that has been in operation for a long time. I am one of the longest serving members of parliament and I have seen those standing orders in operation under numerous Speakers—Labor and Liberal Speakers and Speakers who in fact have been put there as Independents. I think back to the time under Dunstan when we had a Speaker from Port Pirie who was an Independent member.

Your ruling today is that the Leader of the Opposition has reflected on the chair in explaining his question. As we are now dealing with a motion of dissent with the Speaker's ruling, I will read what the Leader of the Opposition said in his explanation:

The 30 families are extremely anxious and SAFIC has written to you, Mr Speaker, pleading for a fair deal.

There is no reflection on the Speaker at all in that—absolutely no reflection on the Speaker. In fact, I have sat in this place on numerous occasions and heard of various groups that have written to and pleaded with the Speaker of the day about a certain matter. I have seen people on the front steps of Parliament House with placards pleading with the Speaker of the day. Indeed, I myself have made statements outside talking about matters referred to the Speaker. But that is not a reflection on the Speaker. If I say I have sent a letter to the Premier, you can hardly say that that is a reflection on the Premier. It is fact: a letter was sent to the Speaker. Mr Speaker, that is not a reflection on you.

Therefore, I ask, as I did earlier: under what standing order is that a reflection on the Speaker? It clearly is not a reflection on the Speaker. If, in fact, some motive had been imputed to the Speaker or some statement made about the response from the Speaker, I would agree that that is a reflection on the Speaker. But a statement of fact saying that a letter has been sent to the Speaker is not a reflection on the Speaker. Mr Speaker, we either have standing orders and practice of this house or we rip them up and we have an entirely new practice for this house. You cannot have both.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I know. I am dissenting with the Speaker's ruling, and I am saying that we have standing orders and those standing orders, backed up by the practice of this house, have applied successfully for many years. I think this very unfair ruling from the Speaker picks on the Leader of the Opposition simply because the Leader of the Opposition, in explaining a question, said that, in fact, a letter was sent to the Speaker.

That is not a reflection on the Speaker. In all moderation, because I would prefer not to have to proceed with this, in the light of the fact that it was simply stating a fact that a letter had been sent to you without reflecting on what your response might have been, Mr Speaker, I would ask you to review your ruling to this house.

The SPEAKER: Order! Do I take it that the deputy leader has concluded his remarks?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, sir.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): In calmness I point out that, while I have some sympathy for the concerns of the deputy leader, there is a fundamental misconception about the motion of dissent. The

Deputy Leader of the Opposition has addressed almost his entire debate on your remarks, sir, about why leave was withdrawn. The fundamental issue is not those remarks but the withdrawing of leave which in my view is not something that one can dissent from. I will explain the absurdity of attempting to dissent from a withdrawal of leave. On my understanding of the orders of this house, leave may be given to explain a question. I recall the member for Stuart in a previous parliament off his own bat withdrawing leave for us to explain a question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I recall the member for Stuart calling 'question' one day; I remember it clearly. The point I make is this: the fundamental misconception of the Leader of the Opposition is that if he wins his motion of dissent the leader will get to explain his question. He would, but with the leave of the house; it would be open to any other single member of the house to withdraw that leave. It is not a ruling on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Let me explain it to these people. I have tried to do it calmly, but they simply will not listen. Leave can be withdrawn for good reasons or bad. When the member for Stuart did it, I guarantee you he did it for bad reasons, because he never operates on any other basis. He has been here for 31 years and we have never seen bona fides, only mala fides.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No; I am very fond of the member for Stuart and I take back some of that, but I simply make the following point. I personally would allow the question to proceed; I would not withdraw the leave, but moving dissent from the chair is a nonsense in these circumstances, because the leave can be withdrawn for good reasons or for bad.

The SPEAKER: Does the leader have a question or a point of order?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! Under standing orders there are two speakers, one for and one against the proposition. Before the house votes let me make it plain: the reason for my ruling was quite simply that the question was directed to the Premier asking the government what had been done about compensation. That is a matter for the government; it does not involve SAFIC or the member for Hammond. For the leader—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Bright have a point of order?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Not at this stage, sir.

The SPEAKER: Let me conclude that the reference to me or any correspondence there may or may not have been from any other organisation to me and from me is therefore gratuitous and unnecessary as part of an explanation to enable the house to understand the purpose of the question. Accordingly, I put the proposition.

Motion negatived.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted to answer the question, and I will simply give the Leader of the Opposition—I do not know who is writing the questions for you, but the point is—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Sir, you pulled me up for making a legitimate explanation; now you allow the Premier to get up and make gratuitous comments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will stick to the subject of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will try to ensure that the Leader of the Opposition keeps calm, but I am concerned that he is being set up by the deputy leader in these matters. As I said in reply to a previous question—I think a week or two ago when we were sitting—offering you a briefing, Rob, the fishers will be compensated, and it will be in the budget.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: As a supplementary question: will the Premier tell me when I will get a briefing? The briefing I was offered was cancelled until after parliament adjourns. By then the issue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: —will be that this parliament will have no opportunity to scrutinise the deal between the time that the fishermen find out and their licence is cancelled.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to help the Leader of the Opposition. That was not a question; that was a speech. You are no longer the Premier.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My point is that I have already mentioned to you that—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —you will be offered a briefing. It is in the budget; the budget is in July.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the leader.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The reason why the budget was delayed is that you would not accept electoral reality, because apparently you wanted to see the Queen or someone at the Adelaide Airport.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the member for Mawson. Does the member for Mawson wish to be heard in explanation for his persistent interjection after I had called him to order several times and warned him?

Mr BROKENSHERE: Mr Speaker, I did not quite hear you. I was listening to the Premier, and he was stirring us up. I therefore apologise to you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! If it has not been plain in recent time, let me make it absolutely plain now: people sitting in the public gallery do not see the kind of behaviour that has occurred here today as edifying. They do not see any role model for the resolution of differences in their organisations provided by us in the way in which we go about our business. They do not see anything to be proud of, and I do not either. I will accept the explanation on this occasion, but let us resolve to do what the public have stated they have expected of us: behave like civil people about the business of making South Australia a better place for all South Australians to live in tomorrow than it was yesterday, and provide an example to them by our behaviour and conduct here, especially during question time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly totally concur with the Speaker's comments and rulings. I have suggested in recent weeks to the Leader of the Opposition that we are most happy to provide him with a briefing. I have already said that there will be—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let me finish, Rob. A bit of courtesy!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will refer to the leader by his title or by his electorate—preferably his title.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have already told the Leader of the Opposition that he will be provided with a briefing. I will assist him in making sure that it happens, but the decision will be made in the context of the budget. You and I know why the budget was delayed—because the government ran over time from a eight-year term trying to stretch it out as long as possible. Even when political realities were revealed, you refused to give up your position in an unedifying spectacle that attracted international attention. We have all moved on from there. The Leader of the Opposition will be provided with a briefing; the fishers will be compensated; it will be in the budget; and you will get a briefing before the budget.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

Mr McEWEN (Mount Gambier): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations, whom I am looking forward to chaperoning at the Mount Gambier races tomorrow. Can the minister advise the house of the government's attitude to the substitution of the Adelaide Cup Day and Volunteers Day public holiday for a day of regional significance? I have been approached by a number of regional communities which believe that a day other than Adelaide Cup Day and Volunteers Day would be more significant for their regions and which wish to have a day other than that day as a public holiday.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question and for his invitation to come down to the Mount Gambier Cup carnival, which I am certainly looking forward to attending. I might also say that this is not the first time that the member for Mount Gambier has invited me to the local region for the racing. As members may be aware, in other states there is a practice of substituting a public holiday, which has significance for the metropolitan population but much less relevance for regional communities, for a holiday that is of great significance to the local community.

The most notable example is that of the Melbourne Cup public holiday in Victoria. It is celebrated in the greater Melbourne metropolitan area, and regional areas are able to celebrate a public holiday on days and in relation to events that have much greater significance to their own local communities. I understand that there are 33 local public holidays in Victoria governing local race days, agricultural shows and so on.

South Australia is a big state. The significant distances between Adelaide and a number of our regional centres can make it very difficult for individuals to travel to our state's capital to celebrate events such as the Adelaide Cup. Due to the tyranny of distance, the relationship between the event and the public holiday can sometimes become less significant for regional communities where a local event in a regional centre takes on great importance for the whole community. The previous government included Volunteers Day as part of the Adelaide Cup public holiday.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order. The minister is clearly giving a statement in response to a question he has been aware of for some time. It is a ministerial statement and I ask you to rule on that, sir, and to ask the minister to wind up.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The minister continues to make remarks that are relevant to the inquiry put by the member for Mount Gambier and, whether or not that may seem unedifying to the member for Waite, there is no standing order to prevent that. I would remind ministers, though, that it is more likely that there will be greater benefit to all members, including ministers, if their answers are succinct and, where considerable detail is to be provided, that it be done by way of ministerial statement. The minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We recognise the extremely important role of Volunteers Day, and the Rann Labor government will continue with it. Any changes to the Holidays Act in relation to the substitution of the Adelaide Cup public holiday will definitely continue to include the recognition of the work done by volunteers. I understand and have some sympathy with the member for Mount Gambier in relation to remote regional communities having the option to celebrate events of local significance. I acknowledge that those opposite also have had some sympathy for this proposal and issued a community consultation paper in October last year. Responses to that consultation closed shortly before the recent election.

Responses were received from a wide variety of stakeholders, including local councils, economic development boards, government agencies, metropolitan and country racing clubs and tourism authorities. I can advise the house that support for the concept is very localised and is particularly strong within the country racing sector. The government has been considering these responses, and I look forward to listening to the local views down at Mount Gambier tomorrow, and also to backing the winner of the Mount Gambier Cup.

ICT CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is directed to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. Given that the South Australian bid for a share of the National Information Communication Technology Centre of Excellence was unsuccessful, can the minister advise the house how the \$10 million provision already included in the budget forward estimates by the former government will now be spent on developing this important growth industry for South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Science and Information Economy): I am forced to repeat what has been said before in this place: this is another project for which there was no provision in the forward budgets.

SHIP PROGRAM

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Can the Minister for Education indicate whether the government is committed to maintaining the Students with High Intellectual Potential (SHIP) program, which currently exists at Aberfoyle Park High School, Glenunga High School and The Heights High School with support programs in feeder primary schools?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for this very important question on a topic that I know he, like I, is very passionate about, that is, the future of students in our schools with high intellectual potential. The provision and continuation of this program was something on which the Labor Party, in opposition, campaigned very strongly. In fact, I believe that between us, the then Leader of the Opposition

and I put out three press releases in the couple of months leading up to the election when the former minister was considering cutting the program to those three schools. It was a hard slog, ending in an election promise by the former minister that, 'Hands up. Me, too. We won't scrap the program.'

Imagine my surprise on being sworn in as minister when I found that money had not been allocated to those three schools: that they had not been given their funding, and that it had not even been identified. There was no funding for those three schools. I took immediate action and made sure that those schools received their funding for this year.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: The money was there.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It was not there. Like a number of other programs, such as all the non P21 schools, there was no money for back to schools grants this year. Funding was to be provided to only the P21 schools. The others were to receive nothing, which is another example of the discriminatory policies of the former government in picking winners, picking losers and not funding programs that they had promised to fund. This is an example. Why is it important to fund this program? It is because those three schools have been doing a magnificent job in assisting this particular group of students in accessing programs that are leading to a significant improvement in their performance.

The former government raised hopes that these schools would be funded, but let them down. All these sorts of impacts on the schools meant that their programs were threatened at the beginning of the year. Parents were threatening to pull their children out of the schools. You just cannot treat schools like the former government did.

This program is particularly important. The three schools are now finalising a service agreement for the program that will set out the school's role in providing leadership and support to other schools to establish or extend their gifted learners programs. They will host visits from primary and secondary educators, mentor educators who provide for gifted learners, share materials and information and establish those services throughout the system for other schools.

It does seem to me that there are groups of gifted students who do very well in their local school environment provided that they have the aid of an appropriately equipped classroom teacher, but equally there is another group of students who do benefit from interaction with like students. The programs that have been developed at these three schools, Glenunga International High School, the Heights and Aberfoyle Park High School, are particularly good at servicing that latter group of students. These are schools of excellence, and the knowledge gained is being used to support programs in other schools across the state.

The SHIP program is something to which this government has real commitment, unlike the former government that wanted to slowly shipwreck the program. Our commitment is part of our fundamental commitment to making sure that every single child in our public system progresses well.

ICT CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Given the answer given by the Minister for Science and Information Economy to my previous question, did she support the \$10 million state government contribution to the Innovation Lab South Australian bid for the ICT Centre of Excellence? Early this year the previous government supported the Innovation Lab Horizons bid for the ICT Centre of Excellence. These facts

are easy to substantiate by ringing Innovation Lab and checking with the principals involved. The bid did not succeed. Last Friday the federal government announced that an alternative bidder had received the ICT Centre of Excellence funding. I hope the minister had not misled the house.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Science and Information Economy): There are some projects that South Australia could be involved in that would make a significant difference to our economy—

Mr Brindal: Answer the question please.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:—employment and small business. The ICT Centre of Excellence would have been a great opportunity for South Australia. It is worth noting, however, that we would not have been the main focus of this. It would have been based in Sydney. We would have been what is called a node.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Was it funded or not? You said it wasn't funded.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Waite.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: This node required funding of \$10 million and, like many of the projects in the science and technology budget, this was an item that went through cabinet and was discussed but was not within the budget, the forward estimates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: There was a need to look at the forward estimates and I am delighted that, despite the lack of money, the black hole, the lack of accountability and the failure of the former government to even begin to propose where they would get the money from, we found ways of funding something that we thought was important, in plant genomics, and we put the money in. We did that because we recognised that there would be benefit for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Unley. I warn the member for Schubert.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: We have a question about how we would fund a project we do not have. This has lapsed into fantasy. We are not in a position to fund it because we have not won the bid. I think someone has lost the plot.

VEHICLE GAS EMISSIONS

Ms BREUER (Giles): Will the Minister for Administrative Services advise the house about plans to reduce gas emissions from its motor vehicle fleet?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the honourable member for her question and note her keen interest in environmental matters. I also congratulate her appointment as Presiding Member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of this house. The government is committed to looking at its own operations to see what roles it can play in achieving environmental sustainability. As the minister responsible for Fleet SA, I am pleased to advise that I am presently exploring a number of initiatives that will assist in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from government motor vehicles, which include the following—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: One thing is certain: no greenhouse gas emissions will come from government

vehicles driven by members opposite; that is for sure. The serious measures that will take place are a practical way in which we can demonstrate our commitment and to take some leadership role in the community. Those measures include transparent operational costs so that each cost centre is aware of actual fuel usage; unscheduled maintenance and excessive wear and tear; the introduction of alternative fuel to the government's passenger and light commercial fleet (which currently number 810 LPG vehicles); and the evaluation of a Toyota Prius, which is an interesting innovation. It is a hybrid electric vehicle, and a number of orders for that vehicle have been placed. I know that the Premier has a real interest in being the first government member to alight such a vehicle.

Further initiatives include a driver training and education program, which was originally introduced to deal with accident levels but which has produced an additional benefit of reducing fuel usage in the way in which people use cars; and, finally, giving preference to diesel engine vehicles with computer-controlled electronic fuel systems when purchasing light commercial vehicles.

These initiatives, together with a continuing range of measures, which were announced by the Premier earlier this week and last week, demonstrate this government's commitment to environmental protection. It indicates that we are prepared to play a leadership role in our own activities to show the way for the rest of the community.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Will the Minister for Education advise the house the estimated cost of the provision of six weeks maternity leave that has been offered to teachers and what the total cost of the recently negotiated teachers' package will be?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): No, it is all right; I do not need any notes—the question is too easy. Do I have the call?

The SPEAKER: The Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I would like to thank the shadow minister for education—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, I don't, actually. I would like to thank the shadow minister for education for her question. The muckraking of the opposition with regard to questions about enterprise bargaining is, of course, an attempt to push this issue off the rails, as it used to go off the rails when they were the government. What the opposition should be made aware of is that we have put in place a process, unlike the previous government when it was responsible for enterprise bargaining negotiations, and it is a pretty simple formula.

We have a budget review committee, of which the Treasurer is the chairperson. Within that particular committee I am responsible for the negotiations as the Minister for Industrial Relations, obviously working with the responsible portfolio ministers. Questions have been asked previously about the firefighters' negotiations that are occurring with regard to enterprise bargaining. Also, a range of questions have been put to the Treasurer with respect to the negotiations that are taking place with the teachers. Those negotiations are

ongoing and the opposition may be heartened to know that there has been good progress in that regard.

There has been a range of negotiations. Obviously, there have been negotiations that relate to salary and negotiations with regard to non-salary. With regard to the cost, an agreement is reached post the negotiations, not during the negotiations. The opposition is not aware of the process with regard to enterprise bargaining. As you are aware, Mr Speaker, it is a process that involves negotiations and, when those negotiations are complete and an enterprise agreement is reached, that is when the detail of those negotiations will be made available not just to this house but to the broader public of South Australia.

RUGBY WORLD CUP

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Will the Minister for Tourism explain to the house the benefits that will flow to South Australia through Australia's hosting the 2003 Rugby World Cup?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I have to say that it is a tragedy that question time has gone on for so long because the opposition has been playing such antics and games. The Rugby World Cup is probably one of the most significant events in the Asia-Pacific region and, certainly, the largest and most financially important event for South Australia between now and 2006. The event will have a significant impact for us because, whilst there is a belief that South Australians are not big rugby fans, I would like to tell South Australians that in fact we are the only state whose Premier has been a renowned, albeit schoolboy, player, and who with me will be attending the two matches on 25 and 26 October next year.

This is the first time that South Australia has had an opportunity to see world cup rugby but, on top of that, this will be the first time that world cup rugby with the Wallabies as the world leaders will be played in Australia. We will have an opportunity to see the Wallabies on 25 October next year. The following evening Argentina will be playing, and the Wallabies will play one of the African winners and the Argentinian team will play the first ranked European winner.

We know that rugby fans travel in hordes, and there is an expectation that each team will have 1 000 camp followers. We already have 2 252 beds booked. On top of those bed night bookings we will have 200 media people coming from Australia and around the world. Rugby is a key event for Italy, France, the UK and Ireland, and we know that, with the expected television viewers, there will be three billion people worldwide watching this event.

The matches in Adelaide will be played at Adelaide Oval to 30 000 people, and I have every expectation that this is an event that South Australians will enjoy, as I will, because it will be world-class rugby in a world-class venue with world-class organisation, and it will have a great impact on the local economy.

PUBLIC SERVANTS, RETRENCHMENT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier advise the house whether the government has identified those senior public servants earning more than \$100 000 a year who will need to be retrenched to fulfil its pre-election commitment?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Is the leader finished? I was wondering what those bizarre hand movements were

for. I thought he had got excited by this rugby tour. I can absolutely announce to the house that you will be very excited about what we are saying in the budget.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Can the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house of plans for World Environment Day 2002?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the obviously suffering member for asking this question. I acknowledge her great interest in environmental matters. I think the best thing that she can do on World Environment Day is probably keep out of it as much as possible. Next Wednesday, 5 June, is World Environment Day. This will be the 30th anniversary of World Environment Day, the original one having been established in 1972 by the United Nations General Assembly.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It would add up, yes. A good year, 1972, if I recall. When it was first established it was, of course, a fringe event, whereas now it is much more mainstream and celebrated internationally by large numbers of people. The theme for International World Environment day this year is 'Give Earth a Chance', an appropriate theme given the approaching world summit on sustainable development. There are a number of events planned for the day by the government and by the community and I would like to highlight some of them for the benefit of the house and to encourage members to participate where they can. Part of the day will feature a round table forum convened by the Environment Protection Authority and about 350 people from environmental groups and industry from across the state.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: They are actually doing it in the round. It will be a very exciting event and 350 people from the community will be there. I advise the house that at lunchtime on that day I will be launching a local environmental initiative by a major international business, but the house will have to wait until Wednesday to find out the name of the business. The government's environmental agencies—the Department of Environment and Heritage, the EPA and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity—will share a marquee in Rundle Mall to promote FrogWatch, Landcare and AirWatch, as well as offering water conservation hints. In addition, there will be advice on environmentally sustainable design for home building, provided through the DEH's environment shop. Other government departments are also participating. Energy SA, for example, will promote tips for energy efficiencies and Transport SA will have a series of events about transport emissions.

Schools and environmental groups generally, of course, will be involved in the day. The Nature Foundation of South Australia will hold a gala event to celebrate World Environment Day at the Old Adelaide Gaol, and both the shadow minister and myself, given the availability of pairs, will be celebrating there with them. In addition, school groups will visit the Botanic Gardens for the Quiz Trail, which will feature native animals from Adelaide's travelling zoo, Zoophoria, garden guides, roving musical performances and free entry to the Bicentennial Conservatory. Literally thousands of students will be involved in activities that develop environmental awareness. I encourage all members to participate.

SOUTHERN DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Can the Minister for Health explain to the house why she has not finalised a three year rolling budget for the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital, agreed to in spring last year and budgeted for? The opposition is aware that the contract for a three year rolling budget for the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital still has not been provided to the hospital in spite of a letter of intent signed and funded for by the previous government in spring of last year. This is making planning—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I also want to hear the explanation.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: This is making planning for the future of the hospital difficult and the community is concerned at the minister's inaction over this extremely important issue.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for the question. I do not have the answer with me at the moment but I will certainly get it for him and give a report as soon as possible.

MAGILL YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

Mrs HALL (Morialta): Will the Minister for Social Justice, Housing and Youth advise the house on the future of the Magill Youth Training Centre, on the issues related to the redevelopment and disposal of the site, and on a possible time frame for the relocation of its clients to the new facility at Cavan? Funding resources of some \$22 million have been allocated in the forward estimates for this project but, as the minister would know, as the local member I am well aware of the number of difficulties associated with this very complex project and I seek her advice to the house on its future.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I thank the member for Morialta for her question and take the opportunity to compliment her and the member for Schubert on their matching colours. They look very attractive sitting next to each other, a bit like the mother and the father of the bride—very nice; we now know what the bridesmaids are going to wear.

I know that this is a question that is very dear to the heart of the member for Morialta because it is of concern that the current detention centre at Magill houses young men and women who, unfortunately, have very difficult problems and are very hard to house in any other facility. The Cavan facility is a very successful operation, but full. This is an issue that I know the member is very concerned about. But there is also the matter of the real estate, which is not only of concern to people in the electorate of Morialta but also—as has already been pointed out by my colleague the Minister for Government Enterprises—is a matter that we will have to look at within the context of the budget.

I am more than happy to brief the member for Morialta, and anyone else who is interested, about what will happen to the inmates currently in Magill and some of the proposals that we have in relation to Cavan; and, secondly, how, through the budget process, we can come up with some options for that land. I think I should mention, as the shadow minister for youth has just pointed out, that the proper term probably is the 'clients' of the Magill Detention Centre.

The SPEAKER: Before proceeding, I want to apologise to the former Speaker for my oversight during the melee in question time. It is highly disorderly, can I tell the Minister for Government Enterprises and every other member, to reflect adversely on any member of the house at any time at a personal level, especially reflecting on rulings of previous Speakers in a way which could be construed as disparaging. I was distracted at the time. I want the house to understand that I will not allow it to happen again.

QUESTIONS, NOTICE

Mr McEWEN (Mount Gambier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr McEWEN: During question time the member for Waite accused me of giving the government of the day prior warning of a question without notice. Too right I did! Whenever I wish to ask a member of the Crown a question, I will obviously give them prior notice, because through that we will all get an informed answer. It is a courtesy I extended to the last government and it is a courtesy I will extend to this government, and I believe that everybody who would like this place to work in an ordinary manner ought to do likewise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier must remember that personal explanations are not for debate but simply for a member or minister to state where they were either mistaken in their remarks to the house or where, as in this case, what some other member has said about them is a misrepresentation of the truth. Members must state where it is wrong and what the facts are, and not engage in debate of the merits either way.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

GAS PIPELINE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Today I want to make a few comments to the house about the SEA Gas project, which will bring an extended gas supply into South Australia, principally into the Adelaide precinct but it will go through my electorate. Before I do that, with regard to some of the goings on that happened here today in question time, I want to make a comment about the Premier's statements in this house that he is offering the leader a briefing on the management of the river fishery and the impact on those families. I want to make sure the house understands that, yes, the leader was offered a briefing by the Premier in the house, as he was today. In fact, an appointment was made and the leader was ready to attend the briefing, but in the meantime the leader got a phone call to say the briefing had been cancelled, and that was the reason for the question today. It puts into tatters the claim of the current government that it is open, honest and accountable.

I move onto the SEA Gas project to bring an increased gas supply into South Australia. In the Premier's statement in the house and that of the Hon. Paul Holloway in another place yesterday, the government made much of, and tried to claim all the credit for, this project. Much work has been done on this project over a long period. I am well aware of this,

because I have been briefed by the two contenders who have been very active in this project over the 12 to 18 months, namely, the SEA Gas Consortium and Duke Energy, over the progress of their respective analysis and works to go towards this project. I would like to go back to a couple of documents that I have here. The first one is a media release dated 28 August 2000 put out by the Hon. Rob Lucas as the minister for industry and trade, where he announced:

... a short list of six significant national and international energy companies from 17 submissions received for the state's new gas options process. The request for submissions was announced on 16 June 2000.

The government's key objectives as enunciated in that press release were to:

- improve the security of gas supply into South Australia;
- increase the competitiveness of delivered gas supply in the state;
- minimise financial obligations and risk to the state government; and
- facilitate industry development and proposed state development projects including [the] SAMAG [project near Port Lincoln].

The press release goes on to state:

But it is important the marketplace understands that the short list of six does not have exclusivity in this process. ... We have not entered into a tender process. Rather, we have set out to assist and encourage the market to find the most suitable way to deliver additional gas into South Australia.

In another release, dated 3 March 2001, the Hon. Rob Lucas announced that the SEA Gas Consortium had won the preferred status from the government. In that release he stated that, by the terms of its agreement with the South Australian government, the SEA Gas Consortium would be obliged to do certain things, including applying immediately for a pipeline licence under the Petroleum Act. In return and by becoming the preferred company involved, they would get from government:

- assistance in discussion with the commonwealth, including ACCC;
- assistance in working with the Victorian government to secure cooperation including appropriate licensing;
- advice on easement access; [and]
- non-confidential digital and other data on potential corridors.

He also stated that 'there is no government financing or government underwriting,' but went on to state that, while endorsing the sea gas proposal:

... the agreement is not exclusive and facilitation is available to any pipeline licence applicants under the Petroleum Act. While endorsing the alliance's proposal as this project is most likely to deliver against the objectives set out in the government's request for submission process, we do recognise that there are other potential supply options for the longer term such as the Timor Sea. ... Accordingly, the South Australian government would welcome any such proposal and would be prepared to provide other projects with the same non-financial assistance.

I would have liked to see Duke Energy and the SEA Gas Consortium getting together on this.

Time expired.

PARAFIELD AIRPORT

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I rise today to speak about the crash yesterday of an aircraft apparently stolen from Parafield Airport and then crash landed onto Montague Road, Pooraka, in my electorate. Montague Road is a very busy road, particularly at the time of the day when the aircraft crashed. It is truly a miracle that no-one was killed or badly injured. Parafield Airport borders my electorate; my boundary is Main North Road, and Parafield Airport is on the other side

of Main North Road. I am not sure, but I think that with the boundary changes it is within the electorate of the Premier. It is one of the busiest airports in Australia, if not the busiest. I think there is an aircraft movement every 30 seconds at Parafield Airport, making it one of the busiest airports in Australia and probably putting it up there with airports such as Heathrow in terms of aircraft movements.

It has been an ongoing concern in my electorate for a number of reasons. I must point out that my predecessor, John Quirke, often pointed out the dangers of an airport of this nature located so close to a residential area, not just in terms of the nuisance from the noise of the aircraft but also because of the dangers posed by the aircraft flying at fairly low altitudes over residential areas.

A number of flight training schools are located at Parafield Airport, and pilots learn to fly by flying their aircraft around over residential areas where thousands of people live in my electorate. This obviously poses noise problems, but my predecessor John Quirke often expressed his concern that, as well as that, one of these days one of these aircraft would crash, and it would be a miracle if no-one was killed, particularly those people who make their homes in my electorate. There is a clear danger from crashing aircraft, and this was borne out yesterday afternoon. Fortunately, no-one was killed. In fact, the aircraft had been stolen, and this raises its own questions, but it was stolen rather than being in some sort of distress and crashing.

The trainee pilots who fly their planes over my electorate would be far better off doing their training to the west of the airport over the salt pans and over Gulf St Vincent, where they pose far less danger to people on the ground. It has been revealed today by the minister that under federal regulations there is no requirement to secure unattended aircraft at Parafield airport. I am absolutely shocked by that and, whilst there may be fences, and so on, around the airport, it is amazing that regulators could allow unattended aircraft not to be secured and to be so easily stolen and flown. I urge federal regulators to quickly adjust that regulation to provide that these aircraft, as a bare minimum, must be secured if they are unattended.

In conclusion, I would like to pay tribute to those residents who came to the assistance—at some danger to themselves—of the pilot of that aircraft, in particular, Joe Amodeo who is known to me and whose family and my family have been friends for many years. I reiterate that it is absolutely vital that regulations be put in place to ensure that these aircraft are secured.

Time expired.

WORLD NO TOBACCO DAY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I wish to bring to the attention of the house the quit smoking campaign that will take place tomorrow (31 May)—World No Tobacco Day. I commend the federal parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Health and Ageing (the Hon. Trish Worth), member for Adelaide, who has put out a press release to encourage Australian smokers to take up the challenge, make a special effort for tomorrow's World No Tobacco Day and quit the habit. I am proud to have been part of a government that did so much in the time that we were in office to tackle head on the problem of smoking and health. We are all aware that, despite all the efforts that have been made with regard to advertising and the significant measures that have been introduced in South Australia, 19 000 Australian lives are still lost each year due

to the effects of tobacco. It is one of the drugs that causes the greatest number of deaths in Australia—as I said, 19 000.

Smoking increases the risk of coronary heart disease, stroke, severe eye damage, as well as cancer and a range of other diseases and conditions. One of the most serious diseases, of course, is lung cancer. This year's international theme for World No Tobacco Day is tobacco free sports, and the federal government is encouraging Australian smokers to consider taking up physical activity to assist their quit attempt and we, too, in South Australia encourage that. As part of the regular World No Tobacco Day campaign, Ms Worth said:

... the award winning National Tobacco Campaign will run nationally, from tonight and into June, some of its confronting 'health effects' television commercials [showing] how smoking damages a smoker's arteries, lungs, eyesight and brain (as a result of stroke).

We are all reminded to call the Quitline on 131 848 and get a free World No Tobacco Day quit pack. As I have said, South Australia has been a leader in the fight against tobacco related diseases by creating an environment that will reduce the rate of smoking and, therefore, reduce the risk of people getting those diseases. The Anti-Cancer Foundation Annual Report 2001 states:

In 1998 tobacco control in South Australia was allocated funding of \$3.9 million per annum over five years by the Minister for Human Services with the important objective of reducing smoking rates in the community by 20 per cent over the period.

In the first 2½ years, that rate has been reduced by 10 per cent. So South Australia is doing well. I trust that the present government will continue with that thrust of reducing smoking in our community. The report continues:

The Tobacco Control Research and Evaluation program has responsibility for providing feedback about progress in tobacco control.

Further, it states:

It is pleasing to see that fewer people are smoking in South Australia in 2001 than in previous years. Progress is also being seen in important groups such as young adults.

That is very important, because the sooner we quit, the better chance we have of rehabilitating our bodies in order to lead healthy lives, and that will put fewer demands on the health of individuals in the future. I am pleased to have been part of a government that first introduced legislation to stop smoking in eating areas. I know that this will have to be expanded more widely to protect workers, and I support that. I look forward to the government's response in respect of hotels.

Time expired.

REFUGEES

Ms BREUER (Giles): Today I wanted to read from a letter I received last week after my speech damning what I see as child abuse perpetuated on children living in my electorate in the Woomera Detention Centre. The letter was from an elderly lady living in Pooraka, begging me to listen to her and not to pursue my quest to stop this detention happening. She says in her letter:

Ms Lyn Breuer. . . Please, please don't follow up on your suggestion. Those in detention longer are there for a reason. Some lie and say they come from Afghanistan, yet can't even speak the language. Others have diseases, others have DESTROYED their papers. (WHAT ARE THEY HIDING??). . .

She continues:

Please I do beg you—

She further says:

A man who spoke in Adelaide some time ago who knows Muslims VERY WELL, said they are AGGRESSIVE-STERN-UNYIELDING-HOSTILE & BEND EVERYTHING TO THEIR OWN WILL.

She concludes by saying:

If anyone has compassion I have, but know what is happening.

This lady's letter is typical of some of the reactions I have had to my speech. I have been encouraged by the dozens of letters and emails I have had supporting my stand, but there has been a very small number like this. That woman truly believes those stories, those myths and fallacies about these asylum seekers. Of course, this is perpetuated by the innuendo of the federal government and the minister (Phillip Ruddock).

She also provided me with a list titled 'Problems associated with unauthorised Asian and Middle-Eastern arrivals'. There are statements such as:

The Muslims have been told to infiltrate every country and take it. . . England has been extremely lax. . . whole suburbs have been taken. . . people cannot fly the union jack in their backyard. . .

There were also statements such as:

They are very different people and we needed people—

Vietnamese people—

when they fitted in. People from Iran, Afghanistan and so on, trained in terrorism even from 4 years old. They burn, destroy, whinge, do shocking things. . . A good Christian man. . . has said 'you cannot trust them—they can turn (Muslims)'. . . Muslims. . . have several wives and are breeding rapidly—in India this is causing havoc.

This is the unbelievable, illogical and dangerous sort of rubbish that is peddled. It is important that some of these myths about asylum seekers are put to rest. First of all, they are not illegal immigrants, as people like to tag them. They are asylum seekers and they are perfectly legitimate under Australian and international law. Illegal immigrants are people who overstay their visas, and we have thousands of them in Australia, particularly since the last Olympic Games. People who arrive without appropriate papers should not be interpreted as trying to defraud the system. By definition, refugees are people who are at risk of persecution, and in most cases the agent of persecution is their government, so applying for a passport or an exit visa at an Australian embassy can be far too dangerous for them. Such action can put their lives and those of their families at risk, so in most cases refugees have to travel on forged documents or bypass the migration channels, and they certainly arrive without papers. It is too dangerous for them to try to get the papers.

We have very few asylum seekers in Australia compared to other countries. Iran and Pakistan, two of the world's poorest countries, have hosted over one million Afghan refugees over the last couple of years, and no other country imprisons its asylum seekers. We hear about queue jumpers, but in Iraq and Afghanistan there are no queues for people to jump. I spoke to someone from Iraq today who said that there is no queue for them to join to get into Australia. There are no embassies where people can queue or official lists, so they are not queue jumpers. There is no queue for them to jump.

Yesterday I was dismayed to see in a SAPOL magazine a photo of officers of the South Australian police department, who did a very good job at the recent riots at Woomera. They were lined up in riot gear, they were on horses, and the little children behind the razor wire saw all that happened. What does it do to them to see that sort of thing happening? I am saddened to think that young children in the camp have to see that. I know that, when the fence was broken down, a

Christian church service was going on in the camp, and the children who were there heard all the noise and saw what was happening. I was accused by the Mayor of Whyalla of grandstanding on this. I am not grandstanding: it is political suicide for me to be talking about this because it is not a popular issue, but, as I said before, I cannot keep quiet.

Bishop Eugene Hurley of Port Pirie has issued a statement to his parish and to the people of South Australia in which he says:

I was able to witness first-hand their distress. I listened to their anguish, despair and sense of hopelessness.

Bishop Hurley agrees with me. I wish other people would listen to what I am saying.

Time expired.

AIRCRAFT THEFT

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): The first comment that I would like to make this afternoon relates to the unfortunate accident that took place in the Parafield vicinity, and I am surprised at the comments that have been made today about aircraft not being locked. As someone who has had a little experience out there—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We know you fly, Gunny.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I have had a little experience. I have never found any aircraft unlocked because, before the people who own the aircraft will let you have it, you have to get the maintenance release, fill it in and sign it before you take off with the aeroplane. The pilot is handed the maintenance release with the keys. Why would anyone leave a valuable aircraft with radios, a GPS and other equipment in it? You just would not do it.

I have known about people stealing fuel out of aircraft, and that would concern anyone because it makes one wonder what other damage those people might have done to the aircraft while they were at it. I share the concern to ensure that there is adequate safety, but I do not know whether the member in question has ever been to places like Rossair or the aviation college and had a discussion with those people, who have a lot of aircraft there. At this stage my status is not current, and I am about to do my medical and a flight review to maintain my private rating. However, from my experience these people guard their aircraft very carefully because they are very expensive and maintenance is very expensive. I know of no case where the aircraft is not locked because, like a motor car, the key locks the door and you need it to start the aircraft's ignition.

The second matter that I raise today is one about which there has been a great deal of discussion, and it concerns the decision of the government to cut funding to the Barossa Music Festival, which has a cost of some \$35 per head. I was fortunate to get hold of an article that appeared in the *Australian* on Friday 13 August 1999, and it gives some interesting figures about subsidies for the arts in South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Go for it, Gunny.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I think the minister will like this. The first one that was brought to my attention related to the State Theatre Company of South Australia. In 1999 (I do not know what it is today), it received a subsidy of \$60.31 per seat.

An honourable member: How much?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It was \$60.31. For the Australian Dance Theatre it was \$116.81.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Per seat?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Per seat. It gets worse than that.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The opera—tell us about that.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am coming to that. For the Adelaide Symphony, it was \$123.90, and the State Opera, \$120.30. I have a view that the government has a responsibility to give support and assistance to the arts, but there does come a time when there is a need to assess priorities very carefully and, if they are going to run the thumb rule over the Barossa Music Festival, I hope they do the same to the other. I look forward to their doing it with some zeal. These figures are from 1999, and I would think that they have probably not improved. I ask the minister responsible to provide us with a set of updated figures in relation to the subsidies per seat because it would be an interesting comparison to make. As I said earlier, I do not mind these organisations operating, but I think those people—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, if people want to attend, all I say is that they pay to do so, because I have a view that the money would be better spent on looking after the aged and the infirm, on elderly citizens' homes and such things, because there is a need in that area. I know there will never be enough money to fully support the health budget, but we need to put more money in that direction. I think that these figures certainly bring to the attention of the house the need to have a very close look at this matter, because we are spending \$23 million changing the Siegfried line down at the Festival Theatre, with all that concrete that they are cutting up and making it difficult to get around.

Time expired.

WOMEN IN BUSINESS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Last night I had the privilege and enjoyment of hosting at dinner a number of women in business from the south in this august building and I thought this would be an opportune time to put on record some of the achievements of women in business in the south. This government is very conscious of the fact that women, particularly women in small business, make a major contribution to business in our community. They often have to deal with difficulties that men do not face in terms of family responsibilities and barriers in attaining training and finances, so it is very important to recognise the achievements of these women.

One particular recognition of women in business in the south recently was the Zonta Women in Business Awards, which were jointly sponsored by our local Zonta Club and the Southern Success Business Enterprise Centre. We had a couple of functions to celebrate those awards—a business breakfast at the South Adelaide Football Club and the Zonta handover dinner night. There were two categories in this award, one for businesses established less than five years and one for those established more than five years.

The winner of category 1 (Young Businesses) was Kelly Bowen of Elska Studios. As a professional wedding photographer, Kelly noticed that many of the brides she was photographing were unable to make the most of this important day and the investment that they had already made. She felt that she could offer a full package of achievements that would allow women to make the most of their special day. So she took courses in make-up artistry and hairstyling as well as creative photography to put together a package that could be offered on a couple's wedding day. This has been a welcome undertaking, and she is doing very well. The way

she has gone about her business—the development of the business plan, the setting of targets, measuring herself against targets, and general plans for the future—were such that she won the award in the category of businesses established for less than five years.

I think all members would know about the winner of the award in the category of businesses established for more than five years, although they may not recognise the name. Susan Craig is the creator of Solarsuits, which we all see in chemists and the cancer shops around the place. Her business has been operating for over 10 years, and it is continuously developing to the extent where she is now exporting to New Zealand, Hong Kong, Singapore, the Middle East and America. I am very pleased that her business is based in Lonsdale.

Susan started her business like so many women do: they recognise a need that is not being fulfilled, they research it, develop a business plan and get on and do it. Susan started when she wanted to take her young family on a holiday by the sea. She recognised that they needed to be well covered but could not find a product that would do the job. She could find only skimpy bikinis or heavy cloth that would sag.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: They are not the best for young children. So she researched the matter and, together with her mother-in-law, made neck to knee costumes. While she was away, she found that many people approached her on the beach wanting to know where she had bought her children's clothing. So she thought that she was onto something that was a real possibility. She persuaded the Australian Radiation Laboratory in Melbourne to test some fabrics and found a finely woven stretch fabric with a UPF50+ rating, and she set about making costumes that were innovative and comfortable. It is really tremendous that her business has succeeded so well.

I acknowledge Southern Success Business Enterprise Centre and the Zonta Club for their support of these awards for women in business. There are many other businesswomen in the south who deserve mention. Amanda Wood, the Director of A Class Metal Finishes, has an amazing track record of supporting business development and cooperation as well as vocational education in the south. She has been the chair of Southern Futures, which is a vocational education program in the south. She has been the chair of the Southern Success Business Enterprise Centre, and she was one of the driving forces behind the Women in Business group. Amanda very much recognises the need to support training at all levels of her business. Training is readily available to her staff, and she has modelled that by undertaking a master's degree herself.

**NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY
(PROHIBITION) (REFERENDUM) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 May. Page 109.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Mr Acting Speaker, I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. Indeed, this is the first bill, other than the procedural type

of measure, such as the Supply Bill and the Address in Reply, to come before the lower house for debate—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It is unfortunate that the debate is not one minute old and the member for West Torrens has not listened. I said that this was the first bill to be debated in the house other than the Address in Reply and Supply, which are procedural measures, but the member for West Torrens did not hear me. So, I will restart my remarks so that the member for West Torrens is up to date; I would hate him to vote the wrong way because he was not listening.

It is interesting to note that this is the first bill the government presents to the parliament other than the procedural measures. It is unfortunate that this is a government that has gone out there and said that it had the right priorities, such as education and health. It has talked about budget honesty and all sorts of bills it will bring into the house for debate, but the first bill it introduces for debate is nothing but a political stunt. I suspect that the parliament will now be tied up for some days debating a bill that is nothing more than a political stunt. I will explain that particular point of view further into the debate. I think it is obvious to all that it is a political stunt. Many of the members of the opposition certainly share that view. I know that members opposite will not publicly say that but the chatter around the corridors is that it is all a bit sad that we are debating this bill rather than something which is more substantial and significant at the start of a new government.

So that we know that we are talking about the right bill, we are debating the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) (Referendum) Bill, which is really a bill knocked together in the dead of night, resubmitting the amendments that were lost in the previous debate in the last parliament on the government's bill that was successful regarding a nuclear waste storage facility. To ensure that we have something to debate and to keep the parliament going—and I acknowledge the earlier comments by the member for Mount Gambier in relation to the value of Monday sittings—the government has knocked together a bill so that we can talk about the amendments it lost last time. I think that is unfortunate, but that is what the government has delivered us, so we will play the game and debate the bill and the amendments again.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We have plenty of time. It is my understanding that I have unlimited time.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We will see. It is unfortunate, because I believe that there are far more substantial issues that could have been brought to the house early in the government's term. I say that because the decisions in relation to medium level waste, as the minister well knows, are months if not years away.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have sought the answer to that question, but I have yet to get it. However, I know the minister will have it for me when the bill is in the committee stage. We have months to deal with this issue so I cannot understand why they made it the first thing, because it is surely not the—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: It's what we promised.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You promised a thousand things first. I would have thought honesty mattered, but honesty does not start until 1 July, if you believe what has been said about the ministerial code of conduct. I will not go through the bill clause by clause, because I understand that we will be

going into committee, so we will deal with the clauses at that stage.

There are two key principles in this bill. The first key principle is that the government now wishes to amend the definition of 'waste' to include low-level waste (category A, B and C). Essentially, if that was successful, South Australia would be prohibited from accepting for a storage facility low-level waste generated outside South Australia, as I understand that principle.

The second key principle is whether there should be a referendum at the minister's discretion, at a time of the minister's choosing, on the question of whether South Australia wants the storage facility. I note there is a range of amendments for the further consideration of the house with a number of them put up by the opposition. I note also the government has even decided to amend its own question and the opposition may have to reconsider some of its amendment questions given those government amendments tabled just recently. We will not get to the committee stage tonight, so the opposition has some time to consider that point.

So, as I understand it, that is the nature of the bill that is before us. I would like to take this opportunity to comment on why I think this is a political stunt. I almost feel like apologising to the house and to those members who are not within government, because this will tie up some time in house, and there is a general view from those not within government that this is a political stunt, and we could have moved on to more serious matters, or gone back to our electorates and got on with business there, rather than re-run this debate. Even if the debate is successful my understanding is that the referendum will not be held because the federal government 'will not have the courage' or will not make the decision to trigger the referendum. So there is a view that this is nothing more than a political stunt.

This bill sets an unfortunate precedent within Australian politics because it seeks to provide government funding for the Australian Labor Party to run a campaign against the federal Liberal government at the next federal election. The minister opposite says that that is rubbish but let me explain the real meaning of the bill, not the legal meaning, but the real meaning. It is about a clever way to fund a campaign for the Labor Party and other anti-Liberal forces against the Howard Liberal government at the next federal election. Let us assume that the votes fall the way the member for West Torrens assumes that they are falling, and the bill passes in both house and the other place.

Let us say that the bill becomes an act and becomes law. What ultimately happens is that the minister then has the discretion to call the referendum whenever the minister wants. The minister made great play one day here in question time, answering a Dorothy Dixier, about the cost of the referendum. I do not have that document with me. It is one of the few documents I do not have here. I think I have left it in my office but the minister might like to forward me another copy as an act of generosity. I think the figure used was about \$5.4 million, and the minister was criticising me because I had been reported in the media as saying it might cost up to \$10 million. If I remember rightly, page two or three of the advice from Stephen Tully, the Electoral Commissioner, states that the cost will be around \$6 million. If you round it up to the year 2004, which is when the referendum will be held, if you believe the Premier when he says it will be held on the Saturday prior to the federal election, the Electoral Commissioner's advice then is that the cost is something around \$6 million.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: It was \$6.2 million.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Right. So, the minister could have been generous in the house and said that it was \$5 million now and \$6 million then; but he chose to pick the lower figure for his own political purposes. But I accept that: it is all good barter at question time. But this bill gives the government a legitimate reason to spend taxpayers' money promoting and arguing the referendum. It is all right to say that the Electoral Commissioner would only spend \$5.4 million or \$6.2 million on a referendum but, of course, the Electoral Commissioner has a very narrow band of duties in terms of what it has to do in the conduct of a referendum. Anyone who has been here more than 30 seconds will realise that as soon as there is a referendum the government agencies swing into play.

Does any member in this place for one second believe that the Department of Premier and Cabinet will not be trotting up to the Premier and saying, 'Premier, this is a matter of high state importance. This is a matter of importance between the state and the commonwealth and we need to be out there promoting it. We need to be out there arguing the state's case.'? Of course, the environment department, or whatever the name is, would be saying to the Minister for Environment and Conservation, 'Hey, we need to go out there and argue the case.' The Health Department would have to argue the case.

The radiation branch from the Health Commission would be going across to the EPA and the EPA would be saying, 'We have a statutory duty under the act [as it does] to run education programs.' What then will happen is that you have all the bureaucrats and all the public servants running the case and, indeed, the politicians running the case, all at taxpayers' expense, against the Liberal government. This is not a referendum about seeking South Australia's view. We know what South Australia's view is on the referendum. This is nothing more than providing an opportunity to pour funds into a public debate to try to bring down the Howard government.

Anyone who has been in this place more than five minutes can see that, and if this bill is successful in this house and then through the next it ultimately provides that opportunity. One question I will be asking the minister is: what is the amount in the forward estimates in the various agencies to cover the costs of the publicity campaign that will be associated with this referendum? We know that there will be one because, if you go back to the minister's transcripts when he was speaking to the media journalist—I think by the name of Sewell—from the Iron Triangle region (Port Pirie, or in that area) on ABC radio, you will see that he mentions a campaign that will be run. He mentions posters in the street.

Clearly, the government is committed to running a campaign. The member for West Torrens nods; I heard it rattle. The honourable member confirms that the government is going to run a campaign. I accept, the member for West Torrens, that the aim of the government is going—

Mr Koutsantonis: You will wear this.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Apparently the member for West Torrens says that I am going to wear this. I do not know whether that is a threat; all I am saying is that this bill provides that opportunity. The honourable member confirms that it provides the opportunity for a state government to use taxpayers' funds against a federal government. I think that is a dangerous precedent. You are now setting a precedent for a range of referenda. Maybe the Labor Party and the Liberal Party can get together and have a referendum a week out

from the next state election. It could ask, 'Do you agree with the Democrats' plan to introduce death duties?' We could use taxpayers' resources to run that referendum. If one looks at the referenda that have been held in the state, they are not about causing 'the most political damage to the Howard government' or, indeed—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, you have not; check what your leader said from the radio transcript. Referenda have not been about that. The use of the referendum has been about genuine attempts to seek the view of the South Australian public, but this referendum is not about that. Both the minister's leader and the minister when in opposition have been on radio admitting that they know what South Australia thinks on this topic. You do not need a referendum on this topic because you know the view. I think the parliament sets a dangerous precedent. It is an abuse of the referendum process by the very nature and intent of what the government seeks to do in relation to using taxpayer funds to run its campaign.

If a group of like minds ever got control of the parliament and this precedent gets through, referenda will be used as political tools and for political point scoring. Personally, I think that is a sad precedent for the state and it will come back to haunt those who seek to go down that path. I stick by my claim that the cost of this to the taxpayer will be around \$10 million. I know that the Electoral Commissioner—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No; I will explain why. The Electoral Commissioner tells us that it is about \$6.4 million in 2004 terms, but that does not take into consideration—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister says, 'Use today's terms because you cannot inflate it,' yet the minister's own information that he has provided—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If the minister is not going to take the word of the Electoral Commissioner, which he provided to the house, I do not know how the opposition is meant to believe anything the minister says. The Electoral Commissioner clearly states:

If the referendum were to be held in 2003 or after, the costs would need to be increased by around 5 per cent each year. In other words, the cost for option A would increase to around \$6.2 million in 2004.

I accept the Electoral Commissioner's view.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am glad that the member for West Torrens mentions the figure of \$10 million because, I think, by the time you add on—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This is a cost to taxpayers.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I said that it was my view. Once you add on the costs of the publicity and education campaigns that the—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It is not included. No, I am sorry. The Electoral Commissioner's costs include a leaflet on the yes case and the no case. The minister is on transcript saying that there will be a publicity campaign; there will be posters in the street, etc.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No—that there will have to be a public education campaign. The minister is saying that there

will be no public meetings from the health authorities; there will be no public meetings from the EPA; and there will be no public meetings from any of the government departments. No ministers will be out there—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, that is not in the bill. If the minister wants to move an amendment—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No; the minister is telling me that it will not happen. The minister has days to introduce an amendment which says that it will cap the expenditure across government only to the Electoral Commissioner's costs. If the minister is seriously saying to me that government agencies, bureaucracies and officers will not be out there running education campaigns, will not be providing briefings behind the scenes, and those sorts of things, that is a nonsense. I have had no experience for the referendum.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do not know how I have had experience of referenda.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order! The member for West Torrens will come to order. I ask the honourable member to resume his remarks, please.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If the minister wants to introduce an amendment capping the limit of government expenditure, that would be a good thing; otherwise, it is clear to all of us that this is nothing more than a political stunt to fund non-Liberal sources into a campaign against the Howard government at the next federal election. It all comes down to how the question was drafted in the bill. I know that the minister has since attempted to change the question to take some of the political inference out of it, but the question in the bill before the house states:

Do you approve of the establishment in South Australia of a facility for the storage or disposal of long-lived intermediate or high level nuclear waste generated outside of South Australia?

My understanding is—and the minister might want to confirm this—that no high level nuclear waste is created within Australia and therefore the federal laws prohibit the import of high level waste. I think I am right in saying that. The minister can correct me if that is not correct. That point, I think, is inflammatory in the question. The question may well have been designed to get a yes vote, or, more particularly, a no vote in the referendum. The minister, when speaking on Fiona Sewell's program in July 2000, indicated that it would depend on how the wording was put as to what the vote would be.

I am a little suspicious that the questions might have been drafted—and I know that this would be a surprise to members opposite—but the government may have sought to design the question to orchestrate the particular vote it wished to gain at the referendum. In fairness to the minister, I note that he has produced some amendments that opposition members are yet to consider, which we might do over the next few days. So, on the whole concept of the question being political, there is no doubt about that: this is designed as a political campaign. And there are plenty of radio transcripts available for members who may wish to look at that point. I want to touch on a little bit of Labor Party history in relation to this issue.

Mr Caica: A proud history.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Colton interjects (out of his seat) that it is a proud history. And indeed it is, member for Colton. The Labor Party does have a very proud history in relation to bringing low level and medium level

nuclear waste here from all over Australia and plonking it at Woomera. We remember the sounds of silence from members opposite when the Labor Party brought in truckloads of waste into Woomera in the dead of night. No call then for a referendum, of course. No call then for an act.

Mr Koutsantonis: How long ago was that?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It does not matter how long. You said you had a proud history: history is long ago. The interjection was 'proud history' and now you say 'How long ago?' It was within the last decade and certainly within the time that your two current leaders were around the place at senior levels within government; that is, your federal leader Mr Crean and your state leader Premier Rann, who were certainly around during the proud history of Labor's involvement in this issue.

If the member for Colton wants to get a pretty good handle on Labor's history on this issue, I can refer him to a very good contribution to the house on 22 November 1994 by Premier Brown in answer to a question about radioactive waste. For the benefit of the member for Colton, who is new to this place, I will refresh him on Labor Party history on this issue. On Tuesday 22 November 1994 the Hon. Dean Brown stated:

It was in 1986 that a commonwealth-state consultative committee recommended the establishment of a national repository for the burial of radioactive waste generated in Australia as an inevitable consequence of the use of radioactive materials in medicine, industry and research. It is important to recognise that these are low-level wastes. Following the recommendation of the commonwealth-state consultative committee, the commonwealth and the states began a cooperative site selection search. South Australia, under the former Labor government, cooperated in this study which, in its first phase, identified large regions of Australia likely to prove technically suitable. Some of those regions were in South Australia. In September 1991, the commonwealth sought further cooperation from the states in a further site selection study. Again, the former Labor government in this state gave full cooperation, although not all states did so. For the information of the house and the public, I table a letter dated 21 October 1991 from the then Deputy Premier and Minister for Health (Dr Hoggood), signifying to the commonwealth South Australia's cooperation. I quote from that letter as follows—

this is Dean Brown quoting Don Hoggood, who also had a proud history. It seems that Don and 'radioactive' both had a proud history in the Labor Party—

'The South Australian government acknowledges the need for disposal facilities for radioactive wastes to be established in Australia. Together with all other states and territories and the commonwealth, South Australia has radioactive wastes arising from medical, scientific and industrial uses of radionuclides awaiting disposal. We are also aware that future mineral processing opportunities could be jeopardised by the lack of a suitable disposal facility for radioactive by-products.'

The letter goes on, for the member for Colton's benefit:

'I agree—'

that is Don Hoggood, that is the Labor Party, that is cabinet in those days, and I think you will find that your current leader was involved with that cabinet—

'that South Australian officials should continue to take part in the desk study process with a view to preparing a short list of suitable sites for further discussion between the commonwealth and state governments.'

The house should note that the present Leader of the Opposition was a member of the cabinet which endorsed South Australia's full cooperation in that matter. As a result of this decision—

When the Hon. Dean Brown refers to the then leader of the opposition he is referring to the now Premier. So I am glad that the member for Colton interjects that the Labor Party has such a proud history in relation to this matter, because, if you had listened to some of the public debate and some of the

hypocrisy that has been floating around this place over this issue in the last two or three years, you would have to wonder what is the history of the Labor Party in relation to radioactive issues other than mirage in the desert comments that come back to haunt it. In 1994, Dean Brown went on to say:

As a result of this decision in April 1992 the then federal minister for primary industries and energy—

You wouldn't guess who the federal minister was: it was Mr Crean, their current federal leader. So, we have the current Premier and the current federal leader involved in orchestrating this process which we are still debating today—10 years later. Mr Crean wrote to the former premier, Mr Bannon. Not Mr Bannon! So, we have Mr Bannon, Mr Crean and Mr Rann—not a bad little Labor history involved in this. I wonder whether Mr Crean wrote to Mr Rann saying it was a mirage in the desert. Maybe that's where he got that from—I'm not sure. Anyway, we have Mr Crean, Mr Rann and Mr Bannon. Dean Brown tabled a copy of that letter. He said:

It [the letter] referred to the potential to use Olympic Dam as a disposal site for wastes arising from the medical, industrial and research use of radionuclides. Mr Crean stated: 'The commonwealth government strongly supports this investigation of the prospects of radioactive waste disposal at Olympic Dam and would welcome South Australia's support for the study.' The former South Australian Labor government gave that support, including the current leader of the opposition [now the Premier] as a minister in that cabinet.

Mr Brown goes on. I am sorry for having to repeat this to the house but, given the history lesson which the member for Colton requested, it seems important to bring him up to speed. Dean Brown continues:

In December 1992, the former South Australian minister of health (Mr Evans)—

For the record, that is Martyn Evans, not Iain Evans. We now have Martyn Evans, John Bannon, Simon Crean and Mike Rann. There is a bit of Labor history involved in bringing this issue before the South Australian public and radioactivity issues to the debate here. So, the South Australian minister for health, Mr Evans:

... presented a detailed summary to cabinet on all of the developments that I have so far mentioned and advised that a preliminary study had been completed on the proposal to use the Olympic Dam site for permanent disposal. This submission presented the pros and cons of continued South Australian cooperation in this matter. As a result of this cabinet submission, South Australia's cooperation under the former government continued. Again, the present leader of the opposition [now the Premier] was a direct party to that decision as a member of cabinet. Indeed, that cooperation continued right through until the 1993 state election. In September 1993, the former Premier (Mr Arnold)—

I can't believe this. We have Mr Crean, Mr Evans, Mr Bannon, Mr Rann and now Mr Arnold. If I am right—the member for Colton could help me here—I reckon that the Treasurer used to work for Mr Arnold as a senior adviser. So, I would suspect—

Mr Koutsantonis: Chief of staff.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for West Torrens confirms that he was the chief of staff. So, we now have involved the Premier and the Treasurer, the former chief-of-staff to Mr Arnold, who:

signed into cabinet a note which briefed cabinet on the latest developments. Again, cabinet, including the current leader of the opposition [now the Premier] did not oppose those developments.

This note also referred to the issue of a contemporary storage site. It stated: 'The commonwealth has a more immediate requirement to relocate radioactive waste removed from the CSIRO facility at Fisherman's Bend and presently stored at Lucas Heights.' The note

advised the former Labor cabinet, all of them, that the commonwealth's preferred option for temporary storage was the Rangehead site at Woomera. Accordingly, the former Labor government was apprised of all of the background, which has led to the current movement of low-level waste to that Rangehead site. At no stage did the former Labor government oppose either the moves to identify a permanent disposal site, including the detailed consideration of South Australian sites, or the commonwealth's proposal for a temporary storage site in South Australia. The information I have put before the house makes abundantly clear that my government inherited a set of decisions made by the federal Labor government and the former South Australian Labor government.

Mr Brown goes on to say:

There are three cabinet submissions which clearly indicate that the present leader of the opposition [now the Premier] gave his full support as a member of cabinet to those proposals developed here in South Australia, and the government records clearly establish that fact.

So, I think it is interesting that the member for Colton says that the Labor Party has a very proud history in relation to this issue, and I confirm that it does. We need to keep that in mind when we debate this bill, because I think there is some hypocrisy as to where Labor stands on it, where it stood on it in the past and how many times it has changed its mind in relation to this issue.

I remember receiving a public discussion document which related to radioactive waste and which was put out, I think, by Senator Nick Minchin, who had federal responsibility for this issue at one time. In the document he talks at some length about how the Labor Party opposes housing radioactive waste in South Australia and how that is a myth in this debate. For the sake of the member for Colton, who has a fascination with matters of history, I will refer to some of it because it is stated that in 1991 the Labor Deputy Premier of South Australia, Don Hopgood, agreed that there was a need for a central facility for radioactive waste.

Then, in 1992, there was a federal Labor government, and the federal primary industries minister, Simon Crean, decided that Australia needed a central repository for low-level waste. In 1994, the federal Labor government shortlisted the central north of South Australia as one of the possible sites for the repository. In 1994 the federal Labor government moved 2 000 cubic metres of low-level waste to Woomera without any public consultation. In 1995 the federal Labor government moved some 35 cubic metres of intermediate level waste to Woomera without public consultation.

Then, in August 1999, the parliamentary Public Works Committee—I think that might have been the federal parliamentary Public Works Committee, although the document is unclear—including Labor Party members, unanimously reported that a new research reactor should be built at Lucas Heights and further recommended:

Removal of all radioactive waste from Lucas Heights for disposal or storage at a national repository must be a high priority and is dependent on the timely provision of the repository and store.

So, the unanimous federal support for the new reactor to be built at Lucas Heights included Labor Party members. I think that is an important point to remember.

On 19 November 1999, federal Labor Party resources spokesman, Martyn Evans, was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

Opposition resources spokesman Martyn Evans said he agreed with dumping the medium level waste in [South Australia]. . .

Mrs Hall: Medium level.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Medium level, not just low level. This is Martyn Evans, who was the opposition resource spokesman and a former minister in the state Labor govern-

ment. He agreed with dumping the medium level waste in South Australia if it met geological and scientific requirements and the public were consulted. The article continues:

'It has to go somewhere, and just because it's in South Australia we can't have a "not in my back yard" view,' he said.

Compared to the ALP, Mr Evans having brought radioactive waste into South Australia with little consultation, I think the Howard government's open and consultative process has been a model compared to what the Labor Party provided in relation to the radioactive waste issue.

So, for the member for Colton's benefit, when he talks about the Labor Party having a proud history I understand what he means. I think he means—and he might correct me when he speaks—that it was the federal Labor government that moved some 2 000 cubic metres of low-level waste to Woomera in South Australia without any public consultation, without a referendum, or without any reference. It was just snuck in in the dead of night.

Ultimately, in 1995, the federal Labor government moved 35 cubic metres of intermediate level waste—not just low-level waste, but intermediate level waste—again to Woomera, without any public consultation. So, I can understand why the member for Colton would be running around doorknocking in his electorate saying, 'We have a proud history in regard to radioactive waste. We brought it to Woomera. There's no need to thank us for that.'

I am sure that he will put out thousands of newsletters advising his constituents that he is a member of the party that brought radioactive waste into South Australia, and which has a very proud history in matters radioactive. He might also mention those famous names: minister Evans, premier Bannon, premier Rann, premier Arnold, deputy premier Foley and federal leader Crean. It is not a bad mix of the leadership group that is floating around the Labor Party within South Australia at the moment, who were involved in this core issue about radioactive waste storage, and I think it is interesting to see how they handle it. For the information of the member for Colton, I will pass on the letter from Don Hopgood so that the member can put it in his party memoirs, in his history book. It is written to Simon Crean, his federal leader, and is signed by Don Hopgood, as the minister for health and deputy premier. I will pass that on to the member for Colton so that he has the opportunity to be updated in relation to the history of the Labor Party.

So the parliament is about to be subjected to a whole host of speeches—and I suspect more now, given these comments—saying how the Labor Party has fought this good fight to the death, and 'We have fought this for a decade.' They have been central to it, as is their responsibility within government. They have been central to this debate and they should just come clean and say they have been central to the debate, because it is an absolute nonsense—and everyone knows it is an absolute nonsense—for Labor Party members to come in and say that somehow their position has been consistent. Their position has been anything but consistent on this particular issue. They have had plenty of opportunities.

Where was their state conference in 1994, standing up and saying, 'This is outrageous, let's have a referendum'? Where was it in 1995, standing up and saying, 'This is outrageous. Let's have a referendum'? Where was the referendum on radioactive waste at the 1996 election? The personalities that now sit in the leadership positions in the Labor Party are the same personalities that sat in the leadership positions then. So if I seem a touch cynical on this issue, if I seem just a touch

spirited, if you do not think I believe you on this issue, you are dead set right, because I do not believe you on the issue. I think the myth that the Labor Party is running on this particular issue is a nonsense.

Then we can go into the Labor Party's bill which was brought before the last parliament. I will not go into that in great detail because I know that that was dealt with then. But the facts are that when the Labor Party brought its own bill before this house during the last parliament there was no clause on a referendum. So even when the Labor Party sought to gain some political advantage by introducing a bill there was no referendum then. It was only when the government introduced its own bill, when the government sought to clarify the issue, to strengthen the bill provided by the Labor Party, and indeed correct the mistakes in the Labor Party bill—it is in *Hansard* for those who want to read it—it is only at that point that the Labor Party knew it had to come up with another string to its bow.

It had to come up with another avenue of attack publicly because it could not go out and say that it had to bring in a bill to correct the mistakes, and to strengthen it, and put it in the proper context. It could not go out and say that. So, all of a sudden, in the dead of night, the answer was: 'Let's have a referendum. Now that we have 2000 cubic metres of low-level waste and 35 cubic metres of medium-level waste, now let's have a referendum.'

So I think it is a bit of a nonsense when the Labor Party now says: 'Even though we have debated this issue, let's have a referendum.' Even if you get the bill through the house you are going to give the minister a discretion as to whether to use the referendum or not. I think there will be some lively debate in relation to this issue, given the history of the Labor Party—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister made some comment about lively debate. When you brought in your own bill you even made the point to the house, and I quote:

Let me make it clear. This bill—

that is, the bill of the Labor Party when in opposition—

does not attempt to control what is known as low-level radioactive waste of which a considerable volume is currently stored above ground in drums at Woomera.

It does not seek to control what is known as low-level radioactive waste. So, again, there has been a change of position. This is a rolling debate by the Labor Party in regard to its position on this particular issue.

There will no doubt be some debate about the health issues in relation to this bill, and radioactive waste in general. It is interesting to deal with this matter in relation to whether South Australians benefit from the research reactor at Lucas Heights. I suspect that it was because so many South Australians and Australians generally benefit from the reactor at Lucas Heights that those Labor Party members federally supported the federal Public Works Committee's report that the Lucas Heights reactor should be rebuilt. That is why they supported it; because they recognise that it is saving hundreds of thousands of lives across Australia every year and provides solutions to medical problems that otherwise would cause a lot of fatalities and many families great harm and grievance. I think that is why the Labor Party federally voted for that issue.

Let us look at Lucas Heights and the research reactor. The research reactor provides a guaranteed supply of medical radioisotopes for diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. About 180 nuclear medicine centres in Australia perform

some 430 000 diagnostic tests and treatments annually for the detection and treatment of numerous illnesses and medical conditions. These include cancer and thyroid and heart diseases. In South Australia about 20 000 people benefit annually from radioisotopes, and almost 80 per cent of these are reactor based. On average, every Australian will require a medical radioisotope during his or her lifetime.

In the environment, radioisotopes are used for river and coastal zone erosion and sediment studies and for tracking pollutants in the marine environment. By using radioisotopes we can trace sewage from ocean outfalls or small leaks from complex systems such as power stations and heat exchanges. In South Australia, and particularly South Australian industry, radioisotopes are widely used in process controls in the metals, paper and chemical industries and for non-destructive testings. I suspect that, because so many South Australians receive medical treatment from this source and because so many industries rely on or create radioactive issues, that is why former Labor governments have supported the search for a central store for low-level radioactive waste. They recognise the fact that South Australia benefits greatly from, and contributes to, the waste stream and therefore needs to take a balanced approach to the waste stream. I sense that that is why previous Labor governments have taken the opportunity to support the processes which Messrs Crean, Foley, Rann, Bannon, Evans and Arnold all pursued on previous occasions.

One of the questions I asked the minister was where in South Australia radioactive waste is stored. I asked the minister through his officers, and I thank Wil Van Deur for his good work in coming back through the minister and providing the information. I assume (and the officers might confirm with the minister) that this is the information provided to the opposition in response to the question, because the sheet I got is undated and unsigned. I do not know who sent it to me or where it is from, but I assume it is from the officers, given that they are the only people whom I have asked for this information. I assume it has come back through the minister's office. I asked where in South Australia radioactive waste is stored, in what quantities and whether it is low or medium level, and I will quickly summarise this letter for the house. It states:

The most recent survey of radioactive waste stored in South Australia was conducted by the radiation section of the Environmental Health Branch of the Department of Human Services in October 2000. The survey included all government departments and private companies that owned radioactive sources registered under the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982. At that time there were 217 registered radioactive sources considered by their owners to be waste. Of these, 185 were in a category that may be suitable for disposal in the national low-level radioactive waste repository as proposed by the commonwealth (that is, low-level or short-lived intermediate level waste) and 32 were in the category not suitable for disposal in such a repository.

I am not sure what that '32' means, whether it means it has to be medium-level waste—which is what I sense it may mean—because the note does not make that clear. There may be 32 sites where medium-level waste is being created in South Australia which cannot be stored in the low-level facility being built by the commonwealth. It continues:

It should be noted that this information is not necessarily accurate today—

in other words, it was accurate only as of October 2000. It then states:

As you are aware, section 19—

and I am not sure I was aware of this, but I am now because I have read it—

of the Radiation Protection and Control Act (1982)—Secrecy states that—

An honourable member: This is extraordinary.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes. It continues:

A person who is engaged in any office or position connected with the administration of this act shall not, otherwise than in the performance of the duties or functions appertaining to that office or position, divulge or communicate any information obtained by virtue of that office or position.

I do not know the purpose of that provision. I think it means that they cannot say anything. The note continues:

The information derived from the survey is not on the public register. Consequently, detailed information on the location of radioactive waste in South Australia cannot be provided. The commonwealth government has, however, previously placed information on its web site showing the approximate locations of low-level and intermediate-level radioactive waste (copy attached).

The Hon. J.D. Hill: What do you think about moving that department to mine?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So you can keep it secret! It continues:

Many of these sites correspond to universities and hospitals such as in the Adelaide CBD, North Adelaide as well as regional locations such as Whyalla and Loxton.

There are a series of locations here: Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Loxton, Broken Hill, Woomera, Roxby Downs, Two Wells, Gawler, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully, Port Adelaide, Glenelg, Mitcham and Mount Barker.

Mrs Redmond: Mount Barker?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am not sure whether I have read them correctly, but I think I have. Of course, we all know waste is in the various universities and hospitals on North Terrace, because we have had various media reports in relation to that. The minister may need to obtain some advice from his officers regarding this question: is there any concern from the officers that there may be radioactive waste still described as active because it falls outside the act? If it is described as 'active', it is outside the act; if it is described as 'waste', it comes under the act and places certain requirements on them; and if they say it is active and still in use, then it does not necessarily meet the requirements.

So, not only do we have registered waste at these various locations but do we have active and in use waste outside of it that may need to be stored in other areas? When we talk about the sites for radioactive waste, we need to remember that that is, to the best of our knowledge, where the radioactive waste is stored.

Other information was provided from time to time and, if the house bears with me, I will try to find the appropriate piece of paper, but I may not have included it in my short contribution. It looks like I have not brought it with me. However, I think there are other locations in other briefing notes somewhere—and I will refer to them in committee—that detail not only locations but also the type and quantities of waste stored within South Australia.

I have found the paper. I know this is of interest because, as the minister points out, it has been kept secret because of the act. As I understand it, waste may be stored at Millicent, Whyalla, Mile End, Mawson Lakes, Olympic Dam, Adelaide, Frewville, Osborne, on North Terrace, at the Waite Institute, on South Terrace, at Bedford Park, Mile End, Norwood, Loxton, Osborne, Adelaide, Frewville—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Elder says that he does not see the point.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I might have said some of them twice, because they are on two lists. In regard to volumes, there are 30 sealed sources with a volume of less than ten cubic metres. This waste includes radium needles, formerly used in medical treatments; moisture meter probes used in agriculture and road making, and sealed radioactive sources and various measuring gauges. That is generally category S. We know that in category B waste there are 35 to 40 sources which are principally sealed radioactive sources with smaller amounts of radioactive material of short half life. The total volume is less than ten cubic metres, and sources include waste from old medical sources, various sources from radiation gauges used in industrial plants, and sources used in bore hole logging and moisture meter probes. In category A waste, there are about 20 organisations—that is, hospitals, universities and research laboratories—that use unsealed radioactive materials. Some of these users generate category A waste, principally light contaminated paper, cardboard, plastics, protective clothing and glassware.

With regard to the commonwealth waste—and I know this will interest the member for Colton, because he likes history—the stores at Woomera Rangehead area contain 10 000 205-litre steel drums. They contain soil contaminated by residues of uranium resulting from studies undertaken by the CSIRO, that is, low-level waste in categories A, B or C.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That was the commonwealth. That is at Woomera. For the member for Unley's information, there are 10 000 205-litre drums.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I move.

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I just mentioned that 10 000 steel 205-litre drums are stored at Woomera. Also, 150 drums and packages containing radioactive waste, including obsolete medical sources, radium based luminous powder and devices with luminous dials, contaminated laboratory equipment etc. are category S wastes. I put that on the record because I know that members may not have had access to all that information, given the provisions previously. I thought members would like that information for the sake of the completeness of the debate.

Also about 710 sealed radioactive sources are registered in South Australia. Members should think about that: 710 sealed radioactive sources are registered in South Australia. Nine hundred people are licensed to use or handle radioactive substances, and in some 200 registered premises unsealed radioactive substances are used and handled. Of course, the point there is that it is an everyday occurrence in South Australia. The fact is that we have to deal with this waste. I have provided that information on the quantities and volumes of waste for the benefit of the house, to the best of my knowledge. The easiest way to describe categories A, B and C waste is as follows: category A waste generally includes plastics, protective clothing, laboratory equipment, soil and industrial tools which have slight radioactive contamination, contained in steel drums.

Category B includes sealed radioactive sources used in industrial devices such as gauges and sources used in medical diagnoses and therapy. It admits higher levels of radiation than category A waste. Category C includes bulk waste materials arising from the processes of radioactive material sources that have been significantly contaminated or large items of contaminated equipment. That gives members an idea of the volumes and the type of waste, the everyday nature of it and where it is stored.

The question that raises for the member for Colton is: how does it get to Woomera, and how do you transport it? There must be a safe way of transporting waste. It is important that we recognise how we transport it because the bill deals with transportation of the waste. I refer to a document provided by Senator Minchin, the federal minister who had the responsibility at the time, which says that approximately 30 000 packages of radioactive materials are transported around Australia every year and there has never been an accident that has affected human health and the environment. Senator Minchin further says that the transport of waste is subject to a strict code of practice which ensures that transport is safe. Once the low level repository is established, waste will be transported there once or twice a year. Low-level waste is no more radioactive than shipments of yellow cake, which regularly pass through Port Augusta without any effect on health or environment.

Senator Minchin also says that the shipment of flammable and toxic material such as petrol and insecticides on the roads carries far more risks than the transport of radioactive waste. The transport of reprocessed spent fuel rods is also subject to strict international guidelines. The waste is returned to Australia encased in concrete or glass, then placed in containers which are designed to survive any foreseeable action without release of radiation.

It is important that we realise that there is a safe system of transport. I will be quizzing the minister during the course of the debate on the licensing requirements for transport, because I do have a vague recollection that the transport of radioactive waste requires a licence and specific training.

I know that the government and members of public will raise, quite rightly, concerns about South Australia's clean green image and what having a low level national facility would do to our clean green image. Let us say that we do not have a national facility in South Australia. What we have to accept is the fact that we have 200 businesses creating radioactive waste and 10 205 litre steel drums at Woomera. There are 2 000 cubic metres of low-level waste at Woomera. We have 35 cubic metres of medium level waste at Woomera. We also have 900 people licensed to use radioactive substances and 200 registered premises. It is a bit hard to argue that 10 205 litre drums of radioactive waste at Woomera have no effect on our clean green image. Clearly it might have an impact if that was an issue.

The best international example about storage of radioactive waste and a clean green image is the Champagne wine district in France—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That has a storage facility in the middle of Champagne in France. I know that occasionally we have drinks at Parliament House and that some champagne is consumed, and I have no doubt that, from time to time, some French champagne is also consumed. It certainly has not seemed to harm the reputation of French champagne world wide as one of the leading products of distinction.

Some balance needs to be brought into the debate in relation to low level storage within South Australia. The other—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No. The member for West Torrens may not be clear, but the now opposition went to the last election with a very clear understanding that we were happy to use the federal low-level waste repository for the storage of low-level waste. We know that what is not clear is what the Labor Party wants to do with the low level radioactive waste that is already in South Australia. What is the position?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order, the member for West Torrens!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We were happy to use the national low-level waste repository. I know that our clean green image will be the subject of debate, but some balance needs to be brought to that debate. In England and other areas of Europe, it is my understanding that there are low level storage facilities in farming country closer to population centres than Woomera. That is an issue for debate about our clean green image.

Mr Brindal: What if the EPA tells us to put it at Woomera? We will fight them, will we?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I take up the point raised by the member for Unley. We are now debating whether we should have a referendum.

Mr Caica interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, the member for Colton does not understand. There are two parts to your bill. The first part is about whether South Australia should accept low-level waste from other parts of Australia. I will be interested in the honourable member's contribution but the question is whether Australia's low-level waste should be stored in Australia's safest place. The Liberal Party thinks it should be. Your party will not commit to that. Your party will not commit to storing low level radioactive waste in Australia's safest place, and that is the key policy difference. We are quite prepared to state publicly that we are happy to store Australia's low level radioactive waste in Australia's safest place. The latest model of the Labor Party's policy, as best I can grasp it, is that every state is going to build their own low-level waste repository, and the member for Colton nods.

Mr Koutsantonis: You are just making it up as you go along.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Colton agrees.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That raises the question. What control does South Australia have over putting it in the Murray-Darling Basin, because we do not control Victoria and New South Wales? For all we know, New South Wales or Victoria could place their low-level waste repository in the Murray-Darling Basin. If the member for Colton has concerns about placing it at Woomera, which has been designated as Australia's safest place, one would have to ask the honourable member whether he would be concerned if the New South Wales or Victorian waste goes into the Murray-Darling Basin. That is a question for the member for Colton. The key policy difference in the first part of the bill is that we want it stored in Australia's safest place. Before the member for Colton got here, and I do not mean to pick on the honourable member, but he interjects occasionally—

Mr Caica interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: There's another one, and that gives me a chance to keep going. The last parliament, with the Labor Party's support, resolved that everyone should put smoke alarms in their house. Having a background in firefighting, or at least with the firefighters' union, the honourable member would know that the MFS supported that concept. Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on your view, the smoke alarms have some radioactive waste.

Mr Caica: They do not have to.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I accept that, and I did not say all of them. I accept what the member for Colton says that not all of them have radioactive waste.

Mr Caica: I said they do not have to.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Colton will grant me the point that some do.

Mr Caica interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, we have established the point that some do. Parliament said that people must put smoke alarms in their house, but we are not going to store the waste in Australia's safest place. That is the debate that we are having.

Mr Koutsantonis: Who says it is Australia's safest place?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am glad that the member for West Torrens chimed in.

Mr Brindal: Scientific experts from around the world.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It has been a 10-year search.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley! The member for Davenport has the floor and I ask other members to desist from constant interjection, particularly interjections that are neither witty nor amusing.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Mr Acting Speaker, you have to accept that the member for Unley is getting carried away with the quality of the debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I was referring more to members on your own side

Mr Brindal: So, was he. I am on his own side; haven't you noticed?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for West Torrens interjected and asked whether it was my interpretation that it was Australia's safest place. This has been a 10-year search by Australian scientists, who have decided, after an extensive process, that it comes down to three sites within South Australia for low-level waste.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for West Torrens was not here earlier, so I refer him to the earlier *Hansard*.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If he had been here for the whole speech, he would be aware that it was a process supported by Mr Rann, Mr Crean, Mr Foley, Mr Arnold, Mr Evans and Mr Bannon.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It is a process that has had good support from the Labor Party, and it has delivered the result that Woomera or near Woomera is Australia's safest place. We know what the Labor Party will do. This is obvious.

Mr Koutsantonis: Tell us!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am about to tell the honourable member what the Labor Party is about to do. The Labor Party will attempt to get this bill through. If it gets the bill through,

then ultimately it will not have the referendum because members opposite do not want to spend \$6 million that should go into health, education or sporting groups, or any other priority. They will not spend it on a referendum. They will try to get the political kudos by saying, 'We will have a referendum,' but never actually have it. At the same time, members opposite will say, 'We won't use the low-level repository because we opposed it; we have fought the good fight; we were in the trench having a go.'

Then, when the federal government builds three sites at Woomera, lo and behold, the EPA review will say, 'Why don't we put it at Woomera?' Do you know why they will put it at Woomera? Because it is Australia's safest place. Do you know why they will put it at Woomera? Because cabinet will not commit in forward estimates to build its own facility. The member for West Torrens went silent then.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: They will not commit in forward estimates to building a new facility. Do you know what else the government will not do? It will not go to Loxton, Waikerie, Millicent, Mount Barker, Bedford Park, Adelaide University, South Terrace, Frewville, Osborne, Woomera or Millicent. Members opposite will not go to all those places and say, 'Guess what we're going to do? We could store it in Australia's safest place, but we'll leave it in the suburbs.' Members might call me a cynic—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS:—but I suggest the Labor Party strategy on this is really transparent. Anyone with any political nous can see where members opposite are driving this truck.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, we are not. We are committed publicly to storing it in Australia's safest place. We are happy to store it in Australia's safest place. I think the strategy is exposed. There is no doubt about what the Labor Party is doing. It will run out there and say that it will stop it; it will have the EPA—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Ultimately, it will be stored in the federal facility at Australia's safest place. It will be interesting now because—the minister will know this—the commonwealth has said, in relation to the medium and low-level facilities, that each state will have to make its own decision on whether it uses the commonwealth facility. If the state intends to use the commonwealth facility, the government may have to pay a fee—and we will be quizzing the minister in relation to whether the government has a fee built into its forward estimates regarding the use of the storage facility for radioactive waste. I guess it raises the question that, if each state has its own radioactive storage facility, Mr Beattie, Mr Carr, Mr Bracks and Mr Gallup will now have to spend taxpayers' money for six facilities. Members should think about that possibility.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, and Claire Martin in the Northern Territory. It has taken the commonwealth from 1991 to go through an 11 year EIS process to establish one national facility, and it tells us that the safest place in Australia is Woomera. How long will it take for the five or six other states to go through five or six searches, all the EIS, all the site selections, all the public consultation, all the public debate we have had here for 10 years? Guess what the result will be in each state? They will say that the safest site for

low-level waste is Woomera. It could take another decade, but each of them will come back and say it is Woomera.

The farcical situation that the member for West Torrens would have us believe is that they will not use Woomera for low-level waste but will actually build their own. So, South Australia could end up with two storage facilities. I do not believe for one second that, if this government does not use the national facility, it will trot out there, having said that there is no room for cancer research centres and having announced a whole range of budget cuts to sporting groups, and announce, 'We could have put it in a purpose-built facility in Woomera. We could have put it in Australia's safest place but, no, we are going to build our own. Not only that, we are going to build it in the very spot that is not Australia's safest place.'

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order! The member for West Torrens will not interject out of his place.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do not need any help from members of the opposition. The member for West Torrens knows full well not to interject from out of his place, and particularly not to interject from the gallery.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: In fairness, I think the member for West Torrens has found his rightful spot.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, but I do not need any assistance.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So, does anyone honestly believe that the government will not use the federal facility? It will not build its own facility because it will not spend money on it. It will not go to the general public and say, 'We are going to leave it in your suburbs.' So the minister should confess that, when the EPA comes back with its review, the government will not use the federal facility. It is absolutely obvious to everyone. I have outlined the general background in respect of radioactive matters—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister interjects, so I will have to refer to more detailed notes. The opposition will be opposing the bill, particularly both the key principles. We will be moving some amendments, particularly in relation to the referendum and the referendum question. It is our view that, if a referendum is held, we will oppose it, because we see no need for one. As I said earlier in my contribution, it is nothing but a political stunt. It sets an unfortunate precedent of using taxpayer's money for political purposes, and that is not a good precedent to set. Clearly, it is not a referendum to find out what the South Australian public thinks. We all know what the South Australian public thinks about this issue. Whether they totally understand all the facts is another issue.

As I have said, I believe that the question in the bill is politicised and inflammatory and is designed to get the answer that the government seeks, although the cynic in me suggests that the government will not hold the referendum. Therefore, we have proposed some amendments and, in particular, two amendments which seek to add questions to the referendum. I will not go into it in great detail now; I will do that in committee. However, in fairness to those following the second reading debate, I will broadly outline the principle of those two questions.

The two questions that we seek to add are questions about the waste that is already here in South Australia. It is one thing to say that you do not want to take waste from other states and store it in South Australia. But if you are going to spend \$6 million, although I think it will be closer to

\$10 million on a referendum, there is an argument to say that we should ask the South Australian public what they want to do with the waste that is already here.

If you asked the people of Bedford Park—and I represent Bedford Park—or if you asked the people of Mount Barker—which is in the electorate of the member for Kavel—this question: do you want the low level radioactive waste currently stored in Mount Barker and Bedford Park taken away and stored at Australia's safest facility, licensed and operated by the commonwealth in Australia's safest place, I reckon they might say 'Yes'. That would save the minister from having his EPA review.

I also think we should ask the question about medium level waste. Do the people living in the suburbs of Adelaide that have medium level waste stored there want it taken out of their area and moved to the storage facility, wherever that might be—because the medium level storage facility has yet to come about. We will be attempting to add those referendum questions.

We will also be moving amendments to make the referendum voluntary. We are so offended by the political stunt nature of this referendum that we do not think the South Australian public should be forced to take part in a political stunt.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, Senator Minchin is a strong supporter of voluntary voting, except when it comes to his preselection, when he wants them all to vote for him! We do not think that the South Australian public should be forced to be involved in what will be seen as a political stunt. It will be a highly politicised environment. If you believe the word of the Premier and the minister, it will be the week before the next federal election, and that would be a highly politicised environment.

We do not think the South Australian public should be forced to go to the polls in a referendum. They should have the choice. For those who wish to express a view, let them go along and have a choice. But for those who do not want to express a view, they should have the choice to stay home and go about their normal business. We will also be moving amendments to get rid of the fine in relation to this referendum for those people who choose not to vote, even if it is a compulsory vote. Even if it is a political stunt in which you are forced to participate, we do not think you should be fined for not taking part in the charade and political stunt by the Premier and the minister in relation to this issue.

They are the key issues that the opposition will be raising during the course of the debate. I have probably 60 or 70 good questions for the minister which I will raise during the committee stage. There are only two or three clauses in the bill. The opposition is restricted in the number of questions and speeches it can make in relation to the bill, so we will be seeking some tolerance from the minister to flesh out some issues that are quite complex. We may need a few more than three questions on certain issues.

Just to recap, the opposition does not support the bill. We all know that it is a political stunt. We think it is unfortunate that it is the first bill that this government has brought before the new parliament. It could have been a bill of far higher priority. There is plenty of time for this bill to be introduced later. We know that these amendments were moved in the last parliament and defeated. We know that the government is not serious about having a referendum. It will say it will, but then it will not have it.

We know that the government is not serious about not storing its waste in the low level facility. We know that when the federal government builds the waste facility at Woomera, this government will no doubt use that facility. It will hide behind the charade of an EPA review. With due respect to those officers, it is not their fault. They will go about their proper duty. However, the fact is that it is a stalling mechanism to give the government time to let the federal government build their facility—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have sat in your seat. I do understand how the process works. Ultimately, the government will use the facility. The opposition will oppose the bill. We will be seeking the support of the Independents and other parties in relation to our stand. For the time being, I think that will be enough for my contribution to the second reading, although I can keep going if you want me to!

Mr CAICA (Colton): Exhausted as I am after that contribution, I will most certainly do my best in the next half hour. I am very pleased to rise in support of this bill, and I was hoping, before the previous contribution, that it would be a bill that would get support from both sides, but it is clear that it will not. That is nothing but a shame.

To begin on a sombre note, South Australia and its contribution to date in respect of nuclear matters has a fairly sad history. No state has paid a higher price. For 10 years, between 1953 and 1963, nuclear warhead development trials were carried out at Maralinga and Emu. Nine trials were conducted there. South Australia has shouldered its burden. Our lands, the traditional lands of the Aboriginal people, were contaminated and it was not until the mid-1980s that a proper attempt was made to clean up the contaminated area. I question how effective the clean-up has been because we will never be able to clean it up, and that is a fact. I am somewhat ashamed of the legacy that has been left to the people of South Australia through what were pointless and mindless tests at that stage. Perhaps I am being a little unfair, because at that time we were at the height of a cold war, and I am sure that today we would not do that again.

Mr Brindal: What about all the medical research that has come out of it?

Mr CAICA: I will get to that. What is mindless, in my view, is building a national dump, such as has been envisaged by the federal government, in South Australia. It is mindless because it is at odds with the views of the South Australian people. It seems that the federal government has a leaning towards dumping certain problems in the outback of South Australia. The difference between the refugee crisis and what is being proposed here is that there is no Pacific solution: the Pacific, like South Australia, has already paid its price with respect to nuclear matters in this world.

Despite what was said earlier, this bill is about democracy, and that is why we are here. Yesterday, I was showing schoolchildren from Mount Carmel College around and talking about the responsibility that we have as elected members. The talk I gave them focused on their responsibility to know, regardless of whom they vote for, what they are voting for. This is what our bill proposes: it proposes to allow the people of South Australia to consider something which I believe, and which my party believes, is very important to their future, and that is the disposal of nuclear waste. I will get to those other matters as I proceed.

This bill prevents a national waste dump. It prevents the construction and operation of such a facility. It prevents the

disposal of certain types of nuclear waste generated outside this state, and that is the point that I want to reinforce. It prevents the storage of nuclear waste generated outside this state. It prevents the transportation of such material into this state and prohibits the importation of high level—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Joe, I am always very quiet when you speak, so pay me the same courtesy. It prohibits the importation of high level waste. It guarantees the community—the community that we represent, the community that the member for Unley represents—the opportunity of having a say in this matter. It is a democratic process, and it is quite appropriate that we undertake this process. The federal counterparts of my colleagues opposite have decided that South Australia is the spot. If we accept this position, that that is the spot for a national dump—and I do not—isn't it the logical extension that that then is the best place for medium to high level waste? Is that what my friends on the other side actually want? Because that is what we will get.

I make this point, and I make it in the following context—and I did appreciate the history lesson provided to me by the member for Davenport. It was very good; in fact I would say that he is visionary. I quite enjoyed the Fidel Castro type presentation provided today, except that it was not really as good as anything I have read from Fidel. But the member for Davenport—

Mr Brindal: Did you say Fidel Castro?

Mr CAICA: Yes—with respect to length. The member for Davenport, who was the environment minister at the time of the second reading of the storage bill in May 2000, informed the house that the commonwealth is also exploring potential sites for a national storage facility to house 500 cubic metres of long-lived intermediate level waste. For the benefit of the house, that is the spent fuel rods from Lucas Heights. Then the minister went on to say that this is an entirely different matter. He went on to say, in relation to the bill being debated at the time:

It clearly defines the nuclear waste that South Australia does not want.

I say that the bill being debated this evening gives the people of South Australia, the people that we represent, an opportunity to decide, and that is a fair thing. I suspect that our people want no waste whatsoever and no dump in this state. However, we produce waste, and this bill recognises our responsibility to dispose of that waste. There is no argument from this side of the house that we have a responsibility to effectively dispose of, in the safest manner, the waste that we produce, and the people of South Australia will have the opportunity to decide that. I think I know the answer that will be given through a referendum, but I want to hear it. I hope that we do not have the need to run a referendum, but it is there in case we do.

Earlier, the member for Davenport talked about Lucas Heights and its benefits to medical research, and members on this side of the house, like everyone, understand the benefits that arise from nuclear medical research. But I question why we have Lucas Heights. I question the decision that was made to recommission it. I understand that the majority of our needs with respect to our medical and industrial use of radioactive materials can be imported, and that we do not really need Lucas Heights. Why was that decision made? I am not one who usually subscribes to conspiracy theories, and I will not necessarily do that on this occasion, but if our needs can be met without having a reactor at Lucas Heights,

and we can import the majority of the stuff that we need—and we all agree, as indeed does the member for Davenport, that it is fundamental to the way in which we live now with respect to the medical advances it provides—why do we not simply import it? Why do we have it? Why was a decision made to recommission Lucas Heights? It was not necessary. Further, we would not be having this debate today if it were not for the fact that a decision to recommission Lucas Heights was dependent upon there being a national storage facility.

Mr Brindal: So, we can import it from somewhere else and they can take the risk, that's fine; we've got no moral obligation—

Mr CAICA: We would still be responsible for the disposal of that material, just as I said earlier.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order!

Mr CAICA: It does not matter what I think with respect to Lucas Heights. In fact, it does not seem to matter whether the opinions of the people living around Lucas Heights were taken into account either—because they were not. I look at some of the documentation that has been distributed, such as a message from Ken McDonell, Mayor of the Sutherland Shire Council. He distributed facts about which he believed people should know—facts, it seems, that some members in this house might like to hide from. The documentation argues about the decision to re-commission the reactor and, at that stage, Mr McDonell said:

It is not too late; final decisions will be made in June 2000.

There is a whole host of information about how much a reactor would cost. The information asks: 'Do we need a nuclear reactor for jobs? Is the reactor needed for medicine? Where will the nuclear waste go?' In fact, research done at that time by Greenpeace asked many questions, namely: 'Do you think the federal government should pass legislation to ban the import of foreign nuclear waste into Australia?' People said yes; 85 per cent of the people said yes. Another question asked was: 'Do you support the federal government's proposal to send all of Australia's nuclear waste to South Australia for disposal?'

In reply to that question, 55 per cent of people said no; 86 per cent of South Australians said no. For the life of me, I cannot understand this. I am sure that the member for Davenport (because, from his contribution, I understand that he knows an enormous amount) will be able to give me a lesson in that, too, later. However, this government believes that what South Australians think is paramount. That is the difference between this government and members opposite: we take into account what the people of South Australia think. This bill helps the government. In fact, it tells the government what our electors think and want.

Mr Brindal: This is a representative democracy, not—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CAICA: I urge all elected members in this house to support this bill because it is the right thing to do, and members know it. Members know that it is right to give the people of South Australia a say in how our nuclear waste is managed. When I say 'our nuclear waste', I mean the nuclear waste produced in South Australia, and that is appropriate. I refer briefly to these summaries of results that were produced at the time of the Lucas Heights situation. I believe—and the people of Australia generally believe—that we do not need the federal government locating a dump in South Australia. We do not want it, the people of South Australia do not want it; and this bill is aimed purely at

making sure that we can gauge that opinion. For that reason, the bill ought to be supported by every member in this house.

I will conclude with those remarks because I do not believe that I need to be long-winded in any way. I do not believe that we need to go on about it because, as the member for Davenport rightly said, this issue has been debated previously. I am very proud that the government's first bill to be brought before this house is one that highlights an issue as important as this. The member for Davenport talked about history. I enjoyed his jaundiced view of history, and that is what it was. Today, this house will be on the cusp of making a very historic decision that will send a message to everyone in Australia that those states that produce nuclear waste will be responsible for the safe storage of their waste. I am not quite sure about the connection with France, and I will ask the member for Davenport questions about that later because, as I said, there is no—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAICA: I will ask the member for Davenport in private (over one of the champagnes that he enjoys from time to time) questions about the French situation and the fact that there appears to be no impact on the quality of wines in that country, because it would seem to me that there are then alternatives to having a centralised dump for low-level and medium waste. I will not be an apologist for things that my party has done in the past, just like members opposite should not be apologists for some of the dreadful things that their party may have done from time to time.

I am saying that this government—the government of which I am now a member—is looking at ways in which it will do things better. One of the things we will do better, among the many things we will do better, is to look at the ways by which we can look after the nuclear waste we produce—not anyone else's waste but ours. We do not have a responsibility for anyone else's waste: we have a responsibility for what we produce, just as other states have a responsibility for the effective and safe disposal and storage of the stuff they produce. I was a firefighter and enjoyed that occupation, and I would like to think that from time to time I got more laughs around the mess room table than I get here, but that is not really the case as I find that a lot of funny things are said in this place.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAICA: And I can see that you must have worn a helmet from time to time, too.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CAICA: As a new fellow in this place I appreciate your guidance and protection, sir, as these people opposite are out of order.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Yes, ratbags. I will reinforce the point made by the member for Unley. We are not being flippant here, and in a longwinded way I am trying to make the point that the debate has been completed and the member for Davenport is right. The problem with the debate that occurred earlier was that it was not quite right and really did not go far enough. This turns it into a far better bill than ever existed before, and for that we should be proud. We are on the cusp of an historical moment, and I am glad that I am part of a government that will be reflected upon quite well by the people of Australia and South Australia for this defining moment in Australia's history with respect to the manner by which nuclear waste is disposed of and stored in this country. For that reason we should all be proud.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: I note the interjection of the member for Kavel: it is not a waste. I trust that we do not have to do it, and I trust that the federal government will look at what the people of South Australia want and that the money will not have to be spent. For the benefit of the member for Kavel, if it needs to be spent it will not be wasted because it will deliver a definitive answer in respect of what the people of South Australia want. We are here to represent the needs of all the people of South Australia. If the member who spoke previously can speak for an unlimited time, I can at least use my 20 minutes. Just as we had to put up with what some might call a longwinded presentation, 20 minutes by comparison is very short. If it means that I have to put you through three more minutes, I intend to do so.

I look at the legacy that has been left to the people of outback South Australia, particularly the traditional land-owners, and how it took an enormous number of years before they could get back on to their lands.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAICA: The point is that it occurred. We have a certain responsibility to those people, in fact all people in South Australia, to make sure that we do not make a bad situation any worse by placing a national storage dump in outback South Australia. I will conclude by urging the opposition to reflect on its position on this matter and to take on board some of the wise words of the member for Davenport. I urge members opposite to make this long debate shorter by looking at those things that are sensible about this bill and ultimately supporting it.

Debate adjourned.

**AGRICULTURAL AND VETERINARY
CHEMICALS (SOUTH
AUSTRALIA)(ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY
(PROHIBITION) (REFERENDUM) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Debate resumed.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise to contribute to this debate having very carefully listened to the eminent contribution, one of the best contributions I have ever heard, from the member for Davenport: considered, weighty and erudite. I have also listened to my newer colleague the member for Colton and considered carefully his argument. I weighed up all the matters of fact in about 30 seconds and found that he is not necessarily consistent in his argument.

I will briefly explain to this house why the member for Colton, in particular, is wrong and the member for Davenport should be carefully listened to. For the member for Kavel's benefit, John Donne wrote:

No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If but one shore or clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less. . . and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

We have heard a lot in this house in the context of this bill about the right of the people of South Australia to have a say. No-one in this house would deny people the right to have a say, but I point out to the minister that the opportunity for

referendum is often given in this house. The Hon. Mr Xenophon from another place at another time proposed a referendum on ETSA, which the then opposition did not think was a good idea. So, it appears that every day in this place governments and oppositions will vary on what could and should be put to the people.

In particular, in this case, what we have is an issue where the people of South Australia have a similar idea, a consistent idea, and that idea is well known. I put to members sitting in this house, because I know some of their opinions, that probably roughly the same percentage of South Australians believe in capital punishment. Does that mean that we should have a referendum on capital punishment and, because the people of South Australia, say by a 60 to 70 per cent majority, want a reinstatement of capital punishment, we should do it? That is the line of argument that the member for Colton is pursuing.

If between 60 and 70 per cent of people do not want nuclear waste in South Australia—86 per cent, he tells me, do not want that—then we should have no nuclear waste dump. If 60 to 70 per cent of people want hanging, is the member for Colton going to vote for it? The member for Unley is not, and I am sure that there are members on that side of the house who will not vote for it.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: You will vote for capital punishment? Is the minister telling me he will vote for capital punishment just because it is popular?

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Certainly not.

Mr BRINDAL: Therefore, if we have a referendum on capital punishment, no matter what the result, this parliament, I bet by majority, will not bring it into this house, and that is a fact. But just because 86 per cent of people happen to have an opinion on this, we should put it in. We should not, because we are a representative democracy. We are put here and paid money with a responsibility to think and act in the best interests of the people of South Australia. It is assumed—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No. It is assumed that we will do our job diligently enough on most issues hopefully to understand those issues a little more than the general public of South Australia does and, therefore, on their behalf our decisions will be more informed than theirs. That is not unreasonable: you cannot expect people living ordinary lives with a thousand obligations to be experts on everything. We are paid to come in here, to study the legislation, to work hard and to use every office at our disposal, including the huge offices of the government, to come up with informed and intelligent decisions. That is why sometimes—and I hope most times—in a representative democracy this chamber is capable, on behalf of the people, of making more informed decisions than we can expect the people themselves to make. That is the very reason—and I hope the member for Colton is listening—why a referendum for its own sake is not necessarily a good idea.

More particularly (and the member for Davenport said this in a number of different ways), it is a question of leadership and whether we should have some responsibility in a nuclear world for nuclear waste. The member for Colton said—and I hope before he leaves I get him correctly—that we do have a responsibility to dispose of most safely the waste that we produce. He does say—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Precisely. Well, if we have a responsibility, let me take, first, the words 'most safely'. I heard the member for Davenport say that after 11 years we found that the safest place in Australia to dispose of nuclear waste (and we are talking about low-level nuclear waste) was—

Ms Bedford: Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: No. That is the point. The honourable member interjects 'Unley'. No, it is not. I do not want the member for Colton's firefighters fighting a fire in a building that is going up helter-skelter where low-level radioactive waste is stored in the lift well and they are, therefore, likely to be incinerated simply because we have made no decision—

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, I meant you in the sense of being a union official. I apologise.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: An ex-union official. I am referring to our state's firefighters—simply because we cannot decide where the safest place in South Australia is. I do not think the member for Davenport is brave in this case, because there was 11 years work—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, I'm not. He said that there is 11 years work which clearly establishes that the safest place in Australia—not just in South Australia—for nuclear waste is Woomera. I agree with the member for Davenport, because I have read some stuff which says that, geologically, there is no safer platform on the face of the earth than the particular geological structure around the area of Woomera and Roxby Downs. It is absolutely solid and there is limited groundwater below it. That groundwater is highly saline (two or three times the salinity of the sea) and non-moving. So, there is no danger of groundwater contamination and there is little danger of earthquake seismic shock or any other natural catastrophe. So, it is a logical place to dispose of nuclear waste.

Now, interposed always is our waste. I was disappointed with the member for Colton because he said that we do not need a reinvigoration of Lucas Heights because, after all, we can buy this stuff overseas and import it. Then, of course, we have a responsibility for disposing of the waste. He acknowledges that: it is our waste, we will dispose of it. But what about the ethical argument that it is not good enough for us to commission a nuclear reactor to produce the radioisotopes that we need for medical processes and scientific research? We should not produce them because there is some inherent danger in the waste that is the by-product of that production that needs to be disposed of—and we do not want to do that.

So, let them produce the radioisotopes in Korea, China, Thailand or Burma, because they will then have to dispose of the waste. We can grab the medical products and use them, and then we will be behaving ethically. We will actually take responsibility for the disposal of the stuff when we have finished with it, but of course we have conned them because they have copped the higher level nuclear waste in producing it for us. I do not understand how even a good old lefty such as the member for Colton can argue that that is ethical or moral. But we can go one step further. Will the minister include as part of the referendum that we should in fact close Roxby Downs?

Mr Caica: That is the Democrat preference.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, that is the Democrat preference. They are always away with the pixies—the Democracies, as one of my colleagues calls them. Often the Labor Party at least has more commonsense than the Democrats. I have

never known them to be that far over from commonsense. Roxby Downs produces an enormous revenue stream for this state. It is one of the biggest copper mines in the world and it is also a major producer of uranium. So, is the member for Colton saying, 'It is good enough for this state to produce the raw material from which high level and medium level stuff comes but we really should take no responsibility for any waste except our own'? I say to the member for Colton that I am a South Australian, I am proud to represent this state and to sit in this chamber—as I know every member opposite is—but I have an allegiance that transcends the allegiance to this state, and it is an allegiance to this country. I am first and foremost an Australian and proud to be an Australian, and I am not ashamed to say that if we can find the safest place in Australia for low-level waste, wherever that place is, we owe it to all Australians to put the waste there. Why should we—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I would be very careful, because I suspect—in fact I know—that the Speaker will be listening very carefully to this. The Speaker may have a casting vote, and I suggest that you read some of his intelligent contributions in past parliaments, because you might find yourself in trouble. I am not, sir, pre-empting what you think.

The SPEAKER: I didn't hear anything.

Mr BRINDAL: Good. Thank you, sir. The fact is that there is some moral responsibility. As Australians we owe it. Why should New South Wales, in having to dispose of its own level nuclear waste, dispose of it in any place that is less safe than the safest place in this nation? Likewise, why should Victoria, Tasmania or the ACT do that? If they dispose of it anywhere other than in the safest place in the nation they, by definition, put the rest of us in this nation at some measure of risk.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: But you don't want intermediate level waste stored in South Australia.

Mr BRINDAL: We are discussing a matter of principle and it is not—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: That's exactly right, but we are now discussing low-level waste. If we can—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No. If you want to produce a bill on medium and high level waste I am sure my colleague will discuss it, but we are discussing—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: We have. You didn't, we did.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: We are talking here about low-level waste. The member for Colton and the Labor Party made a lot about transportation, a very important issue—none more important. Why does the minister not come here and discuss the issue of the additive to petrol that is taken on almost a weekly basis from Birkenhead—because it can't be off-loaded anywhere else—down to the oil refinery, and by different routes every week because it is so dangerous? It is transported through our city streets, and has been ever since there has been an oil refinery. Why is that not a matter under discussion?

The Hon. J.D. Hill: This is the matter under discussion.

Mr BRINDAL: Exactly right, this is the matter under discussion. We need to discuss the matter of transportation because the commonwealth has the power, despite what we might do, to bring it in by air. If it is going to come here anyway, I would rather see it carefully transported by road than flying over the top of us, with catastrophic results if

there should be a plane accident or some sort of air disaster.
I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Monday, 3 June at
2 p.m.