

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 8 July 2002

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

SUPPLY BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the bill.

CONSTITUTION (PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Minister for Health (Hon. L. Stevens)—

Secretary of Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing, letter dated 28 June 2002 to Chief Executive of Department of Human Services.

HEWITT, Mr L.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I move:

That this house congratulates Lleyton Hewitt on his outstanding victory in the men's singles title at Wimbledon 2002.

Looking around the chamber, it looks like many members were up very late last night. I would like to pay tribute to the wonderful Wimbledon win of Lleyton Hewitt overnight. I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, and the rest of the house will agree that this remarkable South Australian has done our state proud. Since winning his first title on his home court at Memorial Drive in 1998, Lleyton has risen to become world No. 1. That initial win in Adelaide at the age of 16 years and 10 months made him the youngest player to win a title on the men's tour since Michael Chang in 1988.

In 1999 he helped Australia to win its first Davis Cup title for 13 years and last year Lleyton won the US Open by defeating Pete Sampras in the final. He finished the year as the world No. 1 at the age of 20 years and 10 months, the youngest player and the first Australian to do so since the ATP ranking system was introduced back in 1973. This year did not start so well for Lleyton when his campaign was interrupted by chickenpox and he was beaten in the first round of the Australian Open. Since then, though, he has fought his way back to health, fitness and top form culminating in his fantastic victory overnight when he became the first South Australian to win the Wimbledon singles crown.

Of course, South Australia has a proud history of fighting above our weight on the national and international sporting arenas. The Adelaide 36ers again won the National Basketball League Championship this year, the Crows won the AFL flags in 1997 and 1998, and Port Adelaide currently sits on top of the AFL ladder. Our Olympic and world champion women's hockey team, world champion netball team and Olympic women's basketball team have had a good representation of South Australians and have beaten the best in the world in recent years.

We have produced many great champions, and Lleyton Hewitt will go down as one of our finest competitors. He is proof to the kids of our state that you can grow up in South Australia and climb to the top of the world. He had a dream when he was about five or six, and that dream was to go on to win Wimbledon. He has shown all of our kids what they can achieve if they have a dream and, most importantly, work to make it come true.

Another South Australian who is currently doing battle against the world's best is Stuart O'Grady, our Tour Down Under hero who has won two stages and worn the yellow jersey in the greatest bike race in the world, the Tour de France. In 1998, He became the second Australian to wear the leader's yellow jersey in the Tour de France. He wore it again last year and had the green jersey, indicating that he was the top sprinter in the field, right up until the final stage in Paris.

I spoke with Stuart on Saturday night just before he set out on this year's Tour de France. He was in Luxembourg. On behalf of all South Australians I wished him luck for another epic ride. He told me that he had had major surgery on his leg a few months ago and was feeling as fit as ever and that, in fact, his leg was better than ever.

Of course, he was there for the prologue of the tour and was very happy when I was able to tell him that Port Power was on top of the AFL ladder. Of course, Stuart is Port Adelaide's number one ticket holder. He is a fine ambassador for that team and for the state right around the world. Let us hope that, over the next few weeks, Stuart can repeat his feats of earlier years and, like Lleyton again, give our state something more to cheer about. It is important, I think, for all of us—both as members of parliament (government and opposition) but all South Australians—to give Lleyton Hewitt a hero's welcome when he comes back later in the year.

However, that will not be for some time. Lleyton must again compete in the US Open. He will then return to Adelaide in early September in preparation for the Davis Cup that will be played in Adelaide. We would like to honour him. The Protocol Office (our office) has been in touch with the Lord Mayor's office. We want to make sure that the maximum number of South Australians—kids and also members of the public—can come to Adelaide for a real street party to honour South Australia's first Wimbledon single's winner. What we are talking about at the moment is, perhaps, a major street celebration and also, of course, an honouring of Lleyton Hewitt's Wimbledon win in Victoria Square. We will be talking to Lleyton, his team and his family to make sure that he gets the very best of welcomes. In completing my remarks I would like, on behalf of all South Australians, to pay tribute to Lleyton Hewitt for an outstanding Wimbledon win. This young man has a massive future ahead of him. It is blue skies from now.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): It gives me much pleasure to support the remarks of the Premier. There is no doubt that all South Australians are very proud of the effort that Lleyton has put up over the past two weeks. It was a very tough two weeks. We saw other top seeds go out early, but Lleyton is just so focused that he just kept on. It was absolutely fantastic. I, like many others, sat up last night and was very pleased to see the way in which Lleyton achieved his win. It has been a great 12 months. Apart from experiencing illness in the middle of that 12 months, to have reached number one in the world at the age of 20 was a top effort. The US Open win last year and his win in the Masters really put a stamp of authority on Lleyton and

where he is going in world tennis. It was unfortunate that he had illness earlier this year, but to come back like he has and to pick up his 16th title at Wimbledon really speaks wonderfully well of this young man.

He is the third youngest to ever win Wimbledon. Normally when that happens it is somewhat of a fluke. To have started the tournament as number one seed and number one in the world and to win at 21 shows that this is no fluke. This guy is going to be around for a long time. Just to set the record straight, the Premier was slightly biased towards Port Adelaide. I would point out that Lleyton is a great Crows fan. It is a real love of his and he tries to coincide his visits back to Adelaide with Crows games.

My mind goes back to seeing Lleyton in his first couple of years at the AAPT tournaments at Memorial Drive. As a 16 year old he pulled off a surprise win and really had the stands buzzing with talk about how far this kid could go. A lot of people said that his temper would get the better of him. Lleyton would go into a slight tantrum occasionally, and normally when players lose their cool they start losing strokes, but when Lleyton did lose his temper he would normally win that game and go on. It just shows the focus that this guy has. He is focused on one thing in life, and that is to be the best tennis player in the world, and he is certainly achieving that. There is no doubt that he has a great future.

One aspect that should be well and truly mentioned is the great support he has received from a lot of people: his parents, Glynn and Cherilyn, sister Jaslyn and girlfriend Kim Clijsters have been a terrific support, as have Max and Dawn Hewitt his grandparents. On the tennis side of things, Peter Smith coached him for a long time, Darren Cahill took him through the formative years, and Jason Stoltenberg has taken over and is doing a great job with him. Lleyton would be the first to acknowledge also the support of his fellow players, not only the players in the Davis Cup team but also the support people: initially John Newcombe and Tony Roach and subsequently John Fitzgerald. I know that Pat Rafter has been an enormous influence, as has Scotty Draper. They have looked after Lleyton all the way through and, without their support, for one so young Lleyton would have found it extremely difficult to get to number one. I certainly join with the Premier in congratulating Lleyton. All South Australians are very proud of him, and we look forward to him representing us very well in the future, both at the Davis Cup and on the professional circuit.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I would also like to acknowledge what the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have said. Lleyton Hewitt becomes the twelfth Australian to be a Wimbledon singles championship winner. He now ranks alongside the names of Ashley Cooper, Neale Fraser, Frank Sedgman, Rod Laver, John Newcombe, Roy Emerson and, of course, Pat Cash, who was the last Australian men's winner, in 1987.

To win Wimbledon you need to win seven matches over two weeks—every one of those matches being best of five sets—so this is a real test of stamina and skill. It would be fair to say that Lleyton Hewitt has not only won with what I guess could be described as relative ease, but has really dominated this tournament from round one. I think he had one match in his quarter final against Schalken, in which he was taken to five sets, but apart from that it was a relatively easy victory.

This of course comes on top of his victory last year in the US Open when he defeated the great Pete Sampras, who has won 13 Grand Slam tournaments and, later in that year, 2001, he became the youngest ever No. 1 ranked tennis player in the world. He also has an impeccable Davis Cup record, and he is one of those tennis athletes who always represents his country in Davis Cup—I think he has missed only one tie because of illness. He has a record of 17 Davis Cup singles victories, and has been one of the instrumental players in three consecutive Davis Cup finals dating back to 1999 when Australia defeated France and became the winner.

We should acknowledge the coaches involved in his career, going back as far as Pete Smith, in more recent times Darren Cahill and, of course, his coach at the moment, Jason Stoltenberg. It was Jason Stoltenberg whom Lleyton defeated when he won his first ATP tour title here in Adelaide that has already been referred to. He defeated Stoltenberg in the final and Agassi in the semi-final. So, we have already seen an outstanding record that has been achieved by such a young man. He is simply the most outstanding international tennis player on the professional circuit, and let us hope that he can maintain that ranking for many years to come.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I would like to add my congratulations to Lleyton and to support this motion. It is very encouraging for all young people to be able to see a role model such as Lleyton, who started very early in his career and who had the courage and the determination to move so quickly into this sport that he has taken up with such great gusto and professionalism. I trust that in the years to come Lleyton will be able to hold that No. 1 position. It is not an easy task for young people, particularly in the area of sport, when it comes to injuries and other illness that can affect them, such as happened to Lleyton, but it shows the tremendous courage that this young man has in being able to hold his own among the greatest in the world.

I certainly congratulate him, not only for being No. 1 but in taking out the Wimbledon crown as the world singles champion, particularly as he is not only a South Australian but he is the only Australian in some 15 years since Pat Cash took out that title in 1987. I think that what makes it even more special is the fact that this is something that no-one else has been able to do in this country, although we have had some very good athletes represent us in many different aspects of international sport. This is a Grand Slam event, and I also know that Lleyton will look to the US Open. Again, I congratulate him on this win and I wish him every success in the future in making those Grand Slam wins happen and adding to his own record.

It is extremely important in this country of ours that we do have role models. It is also important that not only communities but local and state governments look to supporting the means by which our young people can develop. I trust this is something that here in this chamber we take on board as well. As we move toward the coming budget I just hope that this will also mean that we are looking towards the support of young people to develop, go forward and to achieve as Lleyton has achieved.

Motion carried.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

A petition signed by 184 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.

WIND FARMS

A petition signed by 1 091 residents of South Australia, requesting that the house direct the government to reject the wind farm proposal for the Southern Mount Lofty Ranges at Sellicks-Myponga was presented by the Hon. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

COBBLER CREEK RESERVE

A petition signed by 866 electors of South Australia, requesting that the house act to prevent the land subdivision in the eastern section of the Cobbler Creek Reserve, Golden Grove was presented by the Hon. D.C. Kotz.

Petition received.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 248 electors of South Australia, requesting that the house not support any bill which may seek to extend shop trading hours in any way was presented by the Hon. D.C. Kotz.

Petition received.

INSURANCE, PUBLIC LIABILITY

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Members on both sides of the house will be acutely aware of the problems facing the community with respect to public liability insurance. The government has received representations from a host of small businesses and not-for-profit community groups about the availability and cost of insurance. Premiums for some groups in the community have risen severalfold and some organisations have been refused insurance altogether. I have maintained consistently that the government should not put taxpayers' funds at risk by re-entering insurance markets. As a result this government has received some criticism. This is understandable. The effects of the problem have been deeply felt by many people.

But early on this government decided that it needed to develop a response that would provide a long-term remedy, not just a band-aid solution. Because of the national scale of the problem, the government had to ensure that it worked cooperatively with other governments to find a sustainable solution that would enable small businesses and community groups to obtain adequate and affordable insurance cover. To this end I am releasing for widespread public comment a comprehensive and far-reaching package of reforms.

The government's draft legislative package consists of three bills dealing with the law relating to personal injury. Although the issue has arisen acutely in the context of public liability claims, is not confined to that field and a broader solution is required. Therefore, the package I am releasing is designed to ensure that bodily injury damages claims are treated in similar manner, irrespective of whether they were sustained in a motor vehicle, a shopping centre, an equestrian centre or on a sportsfield.

The package proposed by the government contains a number of elements. The government will be introducing a

system of caps based on the existing motor vehicle accident scheme. This will have the effect of placing caps on damages for bodily injury. Damages for non-economic loss will be related to the severity of the injuries sustained. The government also intends to allow people who engage in activities involving a certain amount of risk to sign waivers with the provision of those activities.

The draft package also contains proposals designed to ensure that volunteers, good samaritans and occupiers of land are protected from public liability claims, and that the influence of alcohol and drugs are taken into account when courts are awarding bodily injury damages. The government will also be moving to ensure that there is no liability for damages where a person is engaging in criminal activity, subject to certain protections.

The proposals I am putting forward today are designed to make insurance against bodily injury damages more affordable and accessible. They are also intended to provide a mechanism whereby people can take responsibility for their own choices. The government has received some advice from the Insurance Council of Australia that the government's proposed reforms will assist in reducing claims costs. This is a necessary ingredient to bring insurance premiums down from their current levels. Perhaps more importantly, the government also expects that the reforms will bring about greater certainty for insurers, leading to more competition in insurance markets.

The commonwealth government has recently appointed a task force of eminent persons to review the law of negligence and make recommendations for possible further reform. The final report of the task force is expected by September 2002 and will be considered by all states and territories at that point. It may lead to further measures beyond those contained in this draft legislative package.

In view of the urgency of the problem, the government has chosen to act now rather than wait any longer than is absolutely necessary. I hope that South Australians will take the opportunity to consider the proposals put forward today and to offer constructive comment to the government. After considering public input, the government will introduce legislation into the house. In an effort to ensure that the government's proposed reforms are debated and passed, parliament will sit for an extra week in August.

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: A matter of importance has been brought to my attention relating to the selection processes for the proposed Port Adelaide waterfront redevelopment. Indeed, I made a statement to this effect on Friday and I wish to advise the house in connection with this matter. The multi-million dollar redevelopment is being handled by the government's Land Management Corporation.

It appears that some days ago a bidder for the project was delivered confidential documents that they should not have received. The documents included a competitor's bid for the project plus papers assessing the competing bids, including their own. These documents were returned by the bidder to the Land Management Corporation late on Wednesday of last week. It is not known whether this incident occurred as a result of negligence, innocent inadvertence or misconduct of some kind. It is not appropriate for me to comment further on

the incident itself, but what I will do now is outline what we are doing about this matter.

On 24 June 2002 the Land Management Corporation made its decision on the preferred bidder for the Port Adelaide waterfront redevelopment project. The process began in June 2001 when the Land Management Corporation issued a request for registrations of interest to redevelop under-utilised Port Adelaide waterfront land for commercial, residential, industrial, recreational and tourism usages. The recommendation for the preferred bidder was due to be noted by cabinet this Monday, 8 July 2002. It is normal practice for the Land Management Corporation to advise cabinet of the decision before advising the bidders.

I was informed on Thursday that this incident occurred after the decision on a preferred bidder had been made, but before the decision was notified to cabinet or to the bidders. The Premier was first notified of this incident just after 11 a.m. on Thursday by his senior economic adviser, who was informed by officers from the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The Premier called a meeting at about 11.45 a.m. consisting of the Minister for Government Enterprises, who is responsible for the Land Management Corporation, the Minister for Planning, the CEO of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, senior advisers and me. The limited amount of information available to the government at that time was discussed, and a further meeting was called for 2.15 p.m. on that day.

That meeting was chaired by the Premier and included the Minister for Government Enterprises, the Attorney-General, the Minister for Planning, the Crown Solicitor, the deputy Auditor-General, the probity auditor for the project, senior advisers and me. As these documents are important to the integrity of the selection process used to identify the preferred bidder, the meeting resolved that the Minister for Government Enterprises would write to me as Treasurer requesting that the Auditor-General be asked to inquire into this incident.

I have therefore requested the Auditor-General to undertake an inquiry regarding this matter as part of his audit responsibilities with the Land Management Corporation. The Auditor-General informed me that he would begin this inquiry immediately and cut short a business trip to Perth and return to Adelaide on Friday to do so. In addition, the Attorney-General instructed the Crown Solicitor to investigate the matter and to pass on to the Auditor-General all information obtained. Minister Conlon and I will await the outcomes of these inquiries before taking any further action in relation to the Port Adelaide waterfront redevelopment project.

It is the government's responsibility to ensure that the bidders and the public have total confidence in the selection process, and that it has not been compromised—and that is why we have taken the course of action we have. We also believe that it is important to keep the public informed as much as we can of this incident, and we will continue to do so as part of our commitment to openness and accountability in government. Be assured that if there has been any misconduct in this matter we will act swiftly and decisively to deal with it.

TEACHERS' ENTERPRISE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a third, and final, ministerial statement for today.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The teachers' enterprise bargaining negotiations have now concluded, and I am able to inform the house of the revised offer that has been accepted by the teachers. This agreement includes:

- Salary increases of 4.5 per cent in this financial year, 4 per cent in 2003-04, and 3.5 per cent in the 2004-05 financial year.
- A number of non-salary initiatives which include:
 - a new scheme of country initiatives;
 - an increase from two weeks to six weeks in the amount of available paid maternity and adoption leave; and
 - additional school services officer resources for primary schools.
- Continuation of the 'no worse off guarantee'; and
- Indexation of the flexible initiatives resource program.

The total cost of the three-year agreement is \$354 million. The previous government held a contingency of \$205 million that has proven to be insufficient. On top of this contingency, I was advised by Treasury to include an allocation of just over \$130 million in the government's 14 March 2002 budget update to meet the likely cost of the teachers' enterprise bargaining agreement. A further \$19 million was committed during the final stages of negotiations to secure the deal with the teachers.

The value of the teachers' enterprise bargaining agreement over four years is \$539.5 million. When including the existing flexible initiatives resourcing program, which was already funded on an ongoing basis by the former government since the 1997 teachers' enterprise bargaining agreement, and indexed in this agreement, the total cost is \$633.8 million.

As I stated in my 14 March 2002 budget update in parliament on 8 May 2002—and repeatedly since—the former government's contingency to fund the teachers' enterprise bargaining agreement was inadequate. The former treasurer was advised that the contingency for the likely cost of the teachers' enterprise bargaining agreement was insufficient.

Of course, had this amount and other unavoidable cost pressures been included in the former government's mid-year budget review, as advised by Treasury, substantial budget deficits would have been revealed during the state election campaign.

Finally, I wish to table a separate document that contains a concise breakdown of each component of the final offer. It is purely of a statistical nature.

The SPEAKER: Do you seek leave of the house to have the table incorporated into *Hansard*?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do, sir.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: I have accepted the assurance of the Treasurer that it was a purely statistical table. It being in company with the statement, I myself was able to determine that.

Final Cost of the Teachers Enterprise Bargaining Agreement

Cost	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06 ⁽¹⁾	Total
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
Salary Increase (4.5% July 2002, 4% July 2003, 3.5% October 2004)	48.70	94.90	131.50	138.30	413.40
Flexible Initiative Resourcing (additional cost over base)	1.00	2.00	2.80	2.90	8.70
'No-worse off' Guarantee Continuation	0.00	9.60	23.90	24.10	57.60
Non-Salary Initiatives	4.40	14.30	20.50	20.60	59.80
Total Cost	54.10	120.80	178.70	185.90	539.50

HOSPITALS, INDEMNITY INSURANCE

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I wish to inform the house of recent developments relating to the availability and cost of medical malpractice indemnity insurance for private hospitals in South Australia. On Saturday 22 June 2002, six South Australian private hospitals were given just eight days' notice by their insurance company that medical malpractice indemnity insurance policies due to expire at the end of June 2002 would not be renewed. While this period of notice was then extended by 14 days, this decision created a major crisis for these hospitals. They faced closure if they were unable to obtain alternative cover, and this could have meant the closure of up to 350 hospital beds, including two obstetric units.

A meeting between representatives of the private hospitals and senior government officials from the Department of Human Services and Treasury was held on Monday 24 June 2002 to develop strategies to pursue alternative insurance arrangements for the private hospitals and contingency plans to meet additional workloads in public hospitals in the event that any private hospital was forced to reduce activity or close. My office also contacted the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority to inform them of the action taken by the insurance company.

I contacted the federal Minister for Health (Hon. Kay Patterson), asking her to intervene by taking up this issue with the Australian Insurance Council. Finally, on 27 June 2002, the Department of Human Services was advised by the insurance brokers acting for the six private hospitals that they had been successful in obtaining offers of alternative insurance cover, although these offers were at much higher premiums than previously paid. This foreshadows significant changes in the availability and cost of indemnity insurance for many private hospitals with indemnity insurance policies due to roll over in the future.

On 26 June 2002, I met with representatives of the Private Hospitals Association and the AMA and was advised of their concerns that the access to indemnity insurance was being compounded by rising premiums. Both organisations expressed a view that, even if some smaller hospitals are able to obtain renewals in the future, they may not be able to afford the new premium. My department will be working with the Australian Private Hospitals association and the AMA to address ongoing issues.

It is apparent that insurance cover for private hospitals deemed to be a higher risk for reasons of (small) size or complexity of procedures will be more difficult and more expensive to obtain. This is a national issue and, given the multi-billion dollar subsidies for private health insurance by the federal government, it is a matter that needs a national

solution. I will be pursuing these initiatives with the federal Minister for Health at the next meeting of state and federal health ministers, to be held on 19 July 2002, and I will keep honourable members informed on this issue.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have not got to questions with or without notice at this point.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to question No. 1 on the Notice Paper be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MEMBER FOR TAYLOR

The SPEAKER: On behalf of all honourable members, there is a project upon which I feel compelled to report to the house before we go to question time. I understand that it has been delivered on time, but whether under budget or not is beyond me to determine. The Minister for Education has proudly become the mother of a second son, and I am sure, from the remarks that have been made to me in the last few hours, that all members join in congratulating her and wishing her and her son well.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I do that in order to enable me to point out that questions which would otherwise have been directed to the Minister for Education will be taken by the Minister for Environment and Conservation.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

The SPEAKER: Whilst I am on my feet, another matter of equal importance, but nowhere near as happy perhaps, is the way in which members enter and leave the chamber and otherwise conduct themselves around the chamber. I briefly point out that when members enter the chamber or leave it they should acknowledge the chair, and when members cross the chamber to speak to another member they should acknowledge the authority of the chair, recognising in so doing that they do not seek to perpetrate a mischief in crossing the chamber.

Likewise, when members move about the chamber, should their passage result in their interrupting the direct line of sight between any member who is on their feet speaking and the chair, they should acknowledge both the member and the chair by bowing their head so as to indicate that they do not wish to interfere in the communication between that member and the chair. Finally, if members choose to leave the chamber through either of the access doors to the gallery, the appropriate place from which to acknowledge the chair is at

the bar at the entrance to the chamber at the other end or, if they are simply passing the chair, they should acknowledge the chair by the table of the house.

I would thank all honourable members for giving their consideration to such conduct, bearing in mind that we are here to do our duty on behalf of our constituents, that we are not here as individuals in our own right, and that we acknowledge the role and function of the chair in securing for the people whom we represent orderly conduct in the chamber.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CAICA (Colton): I bring up the 177th report of the Public Works Committee, on mini-hydro facilities at terminal storage, Anstey Hill and Mount Bold dam.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): With your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations and that of the opposition to the Minister for Education on her happy event. My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Given that the minister has held ministerial responsibility for the Land Management Corporation and the Port Adelaide waterfront redevelopment since 5 March, did he obtain specific advice about the probity procedures for the handling of this bid and, if so, did he satisfy himself that the probity procedures were appropriate?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): Before I answer the question, I urge the Leader of the Opposition not to jump to any conclusions about this matter and not to assume that anything—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And I'm prepared to answer the question. I also urge him not to attribute any blame before a proper inquiry is conducted. What I will say to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will address the very different approach of this government to the former government in a moment. The first that any member of the government was aware of the issues to which the Treasurer alluded in his ministerial statement was, I think, Thursday last week, just after 11 a.m.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If the honourable member waits a moment he will get the answer.

The Hon. Dean Brown: This is the answer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: As a matter of urgency, people were brought together, including the probity auditor, and it was made very plain—and I will answer the honourable member's question in this way—that no question was ever raised with me prior to that time of any difficulty with probity, and I would urge members not to believe that there was. I say to members that we were advised by the probity auditor on that occasion that, prior to this time—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Okay, let me make it absolutely plain: on no other occasion.

The SPEAKER: Do not go there.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On no other occasion has any issue ever been raised. I urge the opposition not to damage

the state interest in assuming that something is wrong when it is not. We made it very plain—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will address the difference in approach in a moment—just be patient. The probity auditor made it very plain on that occasion that, to the best of his knowledge, absolutely nothing was wrong with the process. It may well be that nothing continues to be wrong with the process and the decision that was made because the documents were misdelivered, for whatever reason, a long time after the decision was made. Let me refer to the difference in approach of this government and the previous opposition. Once being alerted to the existence of the issue we addressed it and we addressed it on the spot.

We asked for a full inquiry by the Auditor-General and the Crown Solicitor right there on the spot. The Treasurer then told the public. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to compare that to the actions of the previous government on issues such as Motorola, its water contract and its sleazy deal after sleazy deal. We identified an issue, we addressed it, we brought it out to the public and we will bring an answer to the public because that is what a good government does.

NATIONAL WINE CENTRE

Mr CAICA (Colton): Will the Deputy Premier inform the house of developments in the operations of the National Wine Centre.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I would like to make some brief comments about the National Wine Centre. People would be aware that we have made some announcements about it but, given the interest of the house with respect to the National Wine Centre, I thought that I should make a few comments. The National Winemakers Federation will establish a business entity 100 per cent owned and controlled by the Winemakers Federation of Australia Incorporated to manage the National Wine Centre. The government will lease the centre to the Winemakers Federation entity for \$1 per annum. That will transfer effective control of the business to the Winemakers Federation entity from July 2002 as an interim arrangement pending changes to the act and formal lease documentation.

The government is providing a contribution towards transitional funding. We will retain responsibility for major structural and mechanical maintenance. The Winemakers Federation entity is responsible for all other outgoings. The government will allocate \$250 000 per year to cover major structural and mechanical maintenance of the centre. We will allocate working capital support to the Winemakers Federation entity in the form of a grant of \$500 000 in 2002-03 and an interest-free loan of \$250 000 in 2003-04.

We will approve the transfer of funds available as surplus to the Botanic Wine and Rose Development capital budget of up to \$270 000 in 2002-03 on items of capital expenditure in the centre's facilities specifically approved by the Treasurer. Amendments will be required to the National Wine Centre Act 1997, which will be introduced into this parliament as soon as possible to effect the terms of this arrangement. I have had initial discussions with the deputy leader and I hope that, with the support of the opposition, we will be able to move that piece of legislation through this house this week once I am able to have it approved by my caucus and a copy is given to the Leader of the Opposition whom, I understand, we have briefed.

I want to thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because on the day that I contacted and briefed him prior to the announcement, as I thought was the appropriate thing for the government to do for the opposition—a refreshing change I might add—I was pleased when I heard the deputy leader say, in a very generous comment on the radio regarding the deal that the government had done:

What it shows is that this can be properly structured and run on a long-term basis without ongoing commitment from the state government.

That is the sort of proposal which was originally planned and which I am glad to see has now been achieved. I was pleased that the Deputy Leader the Opposition was able to indicate his pleasure and support for what the government did. But then at 8.30 the next morning, guess what? The whingeing, whining Rob Lucas, shadow treasurer, had to get on the radio to knock. He said on radio, in part:

... I'm glad Kevin Foley wasn't negotiating all the deals for the government in the past. ... I'm glad he hasn't been negotiating all the deals in the past. Certainly on the surface, the way you've put it [it] seems to be a pretty favourable deal. ... and good luck to the wine industry. They've done the deal and they've negotiated hard with Kevin Foley, obviously, and they've come out on top.

So, all of a sudden, there is a total difference of opinion between the shadow treasurer and the deputy leader. Then it only got better—and this is no criticism of you, Dean: this is simply highlighting the whingeing, whining Rob Lucas. David Bevan asked the question:

Rob Lucas, you think you could have screwed a better deal out of the wine industry?

This was the response from the whingeing, whining Rob Lucas:

Well, as I said, you've only got to look at the record of the former government under Dean Brown and John Olsen and Rob Kerin and look at their record of being able to successfully negotiate privatisation deals or contracting deals, and certainly they'll be much more favourable for the taxpayer and for the government than this particular one.

Can you believe the gall of the shadow treasurer—the man who gave us electricity price increases of between 20 and 80 per cent for business in July last year, the same treasurer who was part of the cabinet that gave us the water deal and the fiasco that surrounded that, that gave us the original National Wine Centre deal, and also the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium—the greatest white elephant of all time. But let us not forget one of the better ones—the TAB—the one that is going to cost us (what is it Michael—\$10 million, \$15 million?)—a negative sale. Only that government could have sold an asset that was a negative sale.

Rob Lucas has the cheek and the gall to highlight the track record of the former government when it comes to negotiating deals. What this government has been able to do, confronted with a problem, is act decisively. We had taken the liability and the risk associated with the National Wine Centre off our balance sheet and given it over to the Wine-makers Federation, and on advice provided to me from Treasury the net saving to taxpayers over the next five years or more is millions and millions of dollars.

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Can the minister rule out any taxpayer exposure as the result of the government's mishandling of the Port Adelaide waterfront redevelopment tender process?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): Let me go over this again and make it as clear as possible. I will speak more slowly, if it will help. The best advice we have so far is that it is unlikely to make any difference to the bid process, and that is because the misdirection of documents occurred after the process was concluded.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is a good question, and that is the thing we set out to find out as soon as it was brought to our attention. It may be that the process for handling documents set up by the previous government was not very good. That may be the outcome, so I just urge you to wait. It may be that the document handling processes set up under the previous government were no good, so why don't you wait and find out?

It has not been indicated to us at all, or suggested to us in any way, that the process has been spoiled, but we are, out of an abundance of caution, asking the Auditor-General to look at that. We are asking Crown Law to investigate it fully. We were open when we first found out: we will continue to be open, and I can tell you that it has not been suggested to us that we are liable.

HOSPITALS, AFTER HOURS GP SERVICES

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Can the Minister for Health verify the claim made by the member for Finniss that the previous government had secured \$5 million over two years to fund after-hours GP services at the QEH and the Women's and Children's Hospital? On 29 May 2002, the former minister for human services claimed:

Early this year the Liberal government secured \$5 million over the next two years from the commonwealth government to fund the service.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I would be delighted to answer and I thank the honourable member for the question, because the claim made by the member for Finniss has been proven to be wrong.

Mr Koutsantonis: Are you going to apologise, Dean?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Good question. After the statement by the former minister suggesting that I had diverted a \$5 million federal grant away from continuing the after-hours GP trials at the Queen Elizabeth and Women's and Children's hospitals, my department advised me that they had no knowledge of any such funding. I then asked my department to write to the chief executive of the commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing to check the claim made by the former minister. We received a letter in answer, dated 28 June, as follows:

Dear Mr Birch,
I refer to your letter of 12 June 2002 in relation to the pre-election announcement made by the then South Australian minister for human services, the Hon. Dean Brown.

She went on to say:

This department does not have any record of any commitment of funding and no funds have been appropriated to this department specifically for this purpose.

It is signed Jane Halton, Secretary. Mr Speaker, there was no \$5 million—

The Hon. Dean Brown: Yes, there was!

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Well then, you prove it. You get the documentation. There was no \$5 million grant from the commonwealth department. Nobody should believe the statements of the member for Finniss, and I must say it is disappointing that, on a continuing basis the member for

Finniss goes around misinforming the public of South Australia about issues in relation to health, continuing to undermine the public health system in this state.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the minister, in answering her question, appeared to be quoting from a piece of government correspondence. I ask whether, in light of your previous rulings, you will ask that the minister table the complete letter.

The SPEAKER: Is the minister quoting from a departmental document?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I quoted from a letter that I received from the secretary to the commonwealth department of health.

The SPEAKER: Are you willing to table that document?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Certainly, sir, with pleasure.

KANGAROO ISLAND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health explain why there are major cuts to crucial health services this year compared to last year? In recent years the Kangaroo Island Health Service has established a domestic violence service to protect women and children from domestic violence. Last financial year (2001-02), the Kangaroo Island health service received \$118 000 to provide this domestic violence service. However, last week the Kangaroo Island Health Service was informed that in 2002-03, the current year, it would receive only \$75 000, which represents a 36 per cent or \$43 000 cut in funds for domestic violence. This cut means there is no funding for emergency housing, no funding to support women in court in Adelaide, and no money for the workers to handle domestic violence issues for men or for children, those most at risk.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Social Justice.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Yes, I am answering this question, because this comes under my area of responsibility in the social justice portfolio. I am very disturbed to hear what the member for Finniss has said about alleged cuts to domestic violence services in Kangaroo Island, and I will investigate this matter and provide him with an answer.

WIND FARMS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. I am aware of reports that the minister has received an application for establishment of a wind farm on the ridge line between Sellicks Beach and Myponga. Given the wide public interest in the proposal, could he advise of the current status of the planning and environmental assessment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): The house would be aware that the proposed Sellicks-Myponga wind farm has attracted quite a deal of community interest. The house would be aware also that this government strongly supports alternate energy supplies as a contribution to environmental responsibility. Concern about greenhouse gases means that all governments should be looking at options to promote renewable energy sources, and for this reason this govern-

ment supports the concept of wind farms, provided that they are established in suitable locations.

The house may be aware that development approval has been granted for a number of wind farms in South Australia, including on the West Coast, in the South-East and more recently on a site near Cape Jervis. The Sellicks-Myponga proposal is attracting quite a deal of community interest, because obviously it is a more prominent site, located as it is in the metropolitan area. A development application for the Sellicks-Myponga wind farm was lodged with the Development Assessment Commission on 14 June this year, and I propose for the benefit of the house to set out the statutory processes that are now available to me.

I begin by saying that these are obviously discretions that reside in me as the minister, and I am anxious to assure the house that I have not made any final decisions about any of the matters I will have to consider. Just so that the house is aware, the application was lodged by the Department of Industry and Trade under the crown development public infrastructure provisions of section 49 of the Development Act. The DIT sponsorship as public infrastructure is clearly appropriate because of its contribution to state electricity infrastructure.

However, the endorsement itself does not prejudice the planning and environmental merits of the project. Under section 49 the commission is required to give public notice and consult relevant agencies such as the Environmental Protection Authority. The commission would then report to me so I could make a planning judgment. However, given the nature of this project, I am also considering whether I should declare this project a major development. A declaration will then mean that the application must be assessed through a more comprehensive major developments process, including a referral to the major developments panel, to set the level of assessment for the ultimate decision by the Governor.

Should I make a declaration, the Governor also has the option of issuing an early 'No,' and this option can be looked at in circumstances where there was a view that the assessment should not continue and unnecessary costs and delay could be avoided by making that clear at an early stage. I expect to be in a position soon to determine whether a major project declaration is appropriate, and I have assembled the information to make that assessment.

It ordinarily assists in making judgments about these matters to have the views of the local member, and the local member in this regard is the member for Finniss. However, I must say I am having some difficulty in defining the position of the member for Finniss, because in the proponent's documentation it is suggested that he supports the proposal.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Supports it? I thought he opposed it!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In fact, he goes a little further and says, 'If you run into any impediments, I'll see what I can do to support the proposal.' So, the proponents—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It would assist me, because in yesterday's *Sunday Mail* the member for Finniss is reported as saying that the proposal would be a 'planning disaster'.

The Hon. Dean Brown: Exactly.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The honourable member apparently said that to a group of residents yesterday, so I have to divine from the member for Finniss whether it is true what he told the group of residents or apparently what

he told the developer. I am trying to divine what the member for Finniss—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, apparently, they are of the view that you support the proposition. Perhaps you could assist me in my deliberations by telling me what you really think.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I will certainly cover that elsewhere.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, only last Friday they asked if they could come to see me. It was not until Friday they asked to see me. I will release the correspondence.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop has the call.

MEMBER FOR HAMMOND

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Attorney-General confirm that the government has reimbursed the member for Hammond \$11 170 for legal costs incurred by him, as well as paying \$9 642.50 to law firm Lynch Meyer in respect of the same member's unpaid legal fees?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I assume I should take it because the Attorney-General has not been dealing with this matter and does not have responsibility to the house for it. I will set out what I understand has occurred. The Public Works Committee, of which there are Labor and Liberal members, made a decision some time ago—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: A bipartisan decision.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: A bipartisan decision, that is right.

Mr Brindal: On incorrect information.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will come to that point in a moment. Mr Speaker, the Public Works Committee made a decision that the former chair—your good self—of the Public Works Committee in the previous government should be indemnified for action he brought to protect the laws of the state. That was the basis of their decision.

I am assured that the decision was taken without opposition in the Public Works Committee. In fact, as I understand it, one Liberal member abstained; the other, a former minister of the Crown, voted in favour of it. As I understand it, the former minister of the Crown, who used to exercise great responsibility on behalf of the state, has indicated he really did not mean it because he did not know what he was doing. We all suspected that was going on when we were in opposition and we are very grateful to have it confirmed.

Be that as it may, despite his reverse line on the road to Damascus, or whatever it was that occurred to his mind—I suspect it was more along the lines that he saw the merits when he got to the committee but when he got to his party room he had different merits explained to him there—he did manage to change his mind. What happened from there is that it was communicated to me as leader of government business in the house precisely what I should do about it. It was put to me that the resolution of the committee was in fact to indemnify, to pay the legal costs of the former presiding officer.

I do not have a budget to do that so I took advice from the head of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, who suggested there was an appropriate budget within parliament; that the ordinary thing to do would be in fact to send it to the

Speaker. What ordinarily happens, as I understand it, with parliamentary committees where they seek some expense—and I know we have done it in the past with the Economic and Finance Committee—is that it goes to the Speaker to okay the expense. That would have been inappropriate on this occasion so, taking the advice of that officer, I addressed it to the Acting Clerk of the House, who offered his advice to the Deputy Speaker.

It was the decision of the Deputy Speaker—and I understand he is quite happy to answer your question, if you like, in that regard—upon advice from the Acting Clerk, to pay the legal fees. I cannot for the life of me understand what is so difficult to understand or what is particularly wrong with that course of action. It certainly did not seem wrong to the former minister of the Crown. And I would hold it up in stark contrast with another matter.

I note that the opposition wants to refer the matter to the Auditor-General. Opposition members never used to like the Auditor-General while they were in government because he said awkward things—in fact, he was roundly abused on several occasions by some of them, but apparently he is going to protect us now. I note that they did not refer to the Auditor-General the indemnity granted by the former cabinet to the former Minister for Minerals and Energy. Contrary to legal advice and perhaps contrary to two sets of Crown Law advice, it does appear that, just as the former minister was in two minds in the Public Works Committee, they have two approaches when it comes to indemnity. They are happy to keep secret the fact that they are prepared to give an indemnity contrary to legal advice, but when we do something openly and according to proper advice it is not right. I think simply running through it demonstrates again the difference between this government and the former government, the current opposition—which so richly deserves to be in opposition; I hope it is there for a very long time—that is, whenever faced with a difficult issue, we deal with it openly, and we are not frightened to tell people what we do.

HOSPITALS, FINANCE

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Can the Minister for Health detail to the house the increased capital budget for the redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide, Lyell McEwin and Queen Elizabeth hospitals that was announced yesterday by the Premier?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for this question, because, again, a claim made by the former minister in today's media that Labor's funding for the redevelopment of our three major hospitals is less than last year's budget is wrong. Yesterday, the Premier announced new funding totalling \$119 million for upgrades of the Royal Adelaide, Lyell McEwin and Queen Elizabeth hospitals. The former minister claimed that this amount paled when compared to the \$142.5 million he budgeted for hospital redevelopments. The real comparison is that the budget for these works will increase from the \$142 million provided by the previous government to \$207 million in 2004-05 and then—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: You said something over two, and it was over three. I will just repeat that. The real comparison is that the budget for these works will increase from \$142 million provided by the previous government to \$207 million in 2004-05 and then increase again to \$261 million by 2005-06. This is \$119 million of new money for the

works that the previous government did not fund. The member for Finnis is wrong again.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Finniss): My question is directed to the Minister for Health, on this very subject. Will the minister confirm that the extra \$130 million over four years for the redevelopment of major hospitals, which was announced yesterday in the press release, has been allocated for spending in the financial years 2004-05 and 2005-06?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Clearly, the former minister was not listening to the answer that I have just given. I would like to say a few more words in relation to the capital works budget that was announced yesterday. The most outstanding aspect of the previous government's capital works program was that it was not completely funded.

An honourable member: It was virtual—virtual capital works.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: It was a virtual capital works program. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was only half funded. The announcement that we made yesterday completes the redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Under the previous government, we would have had 200 new beds and that is it; that was its legacy. With respect to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, in my electorate, year after year it was announced and reannounced by the previous government, and then only one of its stages was funded. The former government left a legacy of capital works not completed. Yesterday's announcement of \$119 million completes the redevelopment of those three major hospitals that should have been done years ago.

CREDIT CARDS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Is the Minister for Consumer Affairs concerned about rising levels of credit card debt in South Australia and, if so, what action does he propose to take?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I am concerned at rising levels of credit card debt among Australians. I am also concerned that credit providers do not all require complete statements of current financial commitments initially and, when offering an increased limit, do not request updated information about financial commitments and current incomes. Next month's meeting of the Ministerial Council of Consumer Affairs will be considering a range of changes to the current system. One of the regulations being considered is that credit card providers issue consumer health warnings of the consequence of making only the minimum monthly payments on credit card debts. One way of reining in credit card debts would be allowing credit card issuers to increase the credit card limits of their customers only as a result of a specific request by the customer. Another regulation being considered is that credit providers do not give applicants more credit than they can afford to repay, and that increases in limits receive the same scrutiny for capacity to repay as initial applications.

MEMBER FOR HAMMOND

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney or any other representative of the government have any discussions with the member for Hammond prior to the parliament reimbursing that member for legal costs incurred by him?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I will answer a couple of things. Plainly, the message did not get across last time. First, the Attorney had nothing whatever to do with it. That is what I just told members. Secondly, with respect to the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Isn't it amazing that it causes him so much distress now, when he voted for it! It really is rather bizarre. But, as I said, it is not new to this house that the member operates with a rather confused state of mind.

Mr Brindal: I don't like being cheated; I don't like being conned. That's why it upsets me.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He does not like being cheated; does not like being conned. That would be an interesting allegation to make outside the house. As I understand it, if we want to tell the truth, I am told that you indicated to one of our people that you were happy to vote for it as long as you did not get found out, but you got found out. As I said, I think the rather bipolar conflict we have going here is between his conscience and his party room. The answer is this: I had absolutely no discussions with the member for Hammond. I had discussions with the presiding officer of the committee, with Warren McCann, and that was the full extent of any discussions I had on it. Again, how it was done is a matter for public record, which is a vast improvement on the money you flung around when in government for miscreant ministers.

PASTORAL LANDS

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What advantages will the 10 new public access routes across pastoral lands bring to the people of outback South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): On Saturday, I travelled to Balcanoona with a number of people from Adelaide to make a public announcement about 10 new public access routes across the pastoral lands of South Australia. This recent announcement brings to 18 the number of public access routes which are available for visitors to South Australia to access the pastoral lands. As members would know—certainly the member for Stuart would know—there is—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: It would've been nice if you'd told me.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I do apologise to the member for Stuart for his not being informed. When I got there, I asked where the member for Stuart was.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: So, I do apologise to the honourable member. This arrangement has been reached with the Pastoral Board and the landholders—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, if members on the other side start talking about breaches of protocol and not being informed about ministers visiting their electorate, I will go through my records and point out a number of significant breaches when I was the opposition spokesman. Nonetheless—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have apologised to the member. I will continue. There have been continuing problems with access to pastoral lands by visitors from interstate, Adelaide and other parts of South Australia. Pastoralists were concerned as were visitors, because it was often difficult to

access those lands because of the bureaucratic processes they had to go through. There were liability issues which needed to be resolved and, as a result of some very good work conducted by the Pastoral Board negotiating between various sites, we now have 18 pathways which allow visitors from interstate to access the key parts of the state.

The locations which can now be accessed include: Mount Hack in the Northern Flinders Ranges, the Gawler Ranges National Park, Cooper Creek (now accessible from the Birdsville Track), Halligan's Bay on Lake Eyre (now accessible from the Oodnadatta Track near William Creek), and the Simpson Desert. This brings to about 650 kilometres the gazetted public access routes in South Australia. We now have a system in place where visitors from interstate can get into the outback areas, have a look at our attractions, spend their money—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: And local visitors.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: And local visitors too, as the shadow minister says. They will be able to access those areas, spend their money, enjoy the sites to be seen, and hopefully get out without causing any problems to the pastoralists, because, as it was pointed out to me many times on Saturday when I was there, this is their backyard, they want to have it looked after, and they do not want people coming in wandering around the place and interfering with what they do on their land.

BUILDING INDEMNITY FUNDS

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Will he now admit that the problems being experienced by the building industry as a result of the building indemnity insurance crisis are far greater than either he or the Treasurer have publicly admitted, and will he confirm that apart from special cases no exemption for housing has been granted under the scheme he has implemented?

In May, the government announced details of a scheme to exempt builders from the requirement to have building indemnity insurance in an attempt to address this growing crisis in the building industry. The opposition has been contacted by many builders who argue that the scheme is unworkable and has not helped the majority of small builders to get back to work. The first 80 respondents in a recent survey of builders showed that 78 per cent were unable to carry on work as they had done in the past, 41 per cent had been told to significantly reduce the amount of building work that they did, and 62 per cent had no indemnity insurance at all.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): My department and I have been handling the applications for exemption from building indemnity insurance as swiftly as we are able. Many of them have come over my desk and only two builders have been refused exemption while a series of them have been granted exemption. So, it is working for a range of builders. I am sorry that the member is so lacking in connection with builders that he does not know that a number of builders have been granted exemption under the scheme. So, it is working for them.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The government has responded swiftly and rationally to the problem that has presented itself. The reason that MBA builders have not been able to get building indemnity insurance is because an

overseas reinsurer pulled out in April, as I recall. The government has responded quickly by putting in place an exemption scheme. The Housing Industry Association claims that its insurance through Royal & Sun Alliance can handle all the applications from builders. There is conflict between the HIA and the MBA about whether that is so, but we are not relying on the HIA's assurances. We have set up an exemption system, and we have gone further and drafted regulations to ensure that there is exemption for high-rise developments. They can no longer obtain building indemnity insurance, so we are changing the law so that it does not apply in that area.

We are also moving (in cooperation with other states) to introduce a \$10 million cap on total liability arising out of any one event. We have also moved to ensure that those builders who are working for the South Australian Housing Trust do not require building indemnity insurance unless the trust insists on that. So, we have proceeded in a swift and rational manner—it is entirely under control.

DRUGS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Premier support the continuation of the Drugs Court? During the recent South Australian Drugs Summit we were advised of the positive contribution of this pilot program in dealing more effectively with drug offenders. The Chief Magistrate, Mr Alan Moss, also advised us that this pilot program has now come to a conclusion. As of today, there are no funds to continue this successful initiative, yet we have heard nothing from the government regarding the future of the Drugs Court itself.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am very pleased to answer this question. A few years ago I went to Sydney, and I went out to Parramatta to sit in on the Drugs Court there. At that stage, it was a new innovation. Under the New South Wales proposal, which is a little different from what happens here in South Australia, when the courts see a pattern of offending which is clearly linked to drug addiction—for instance, if they see a variety of break and enter offences with the same people being recycled—they basically give a superior court judge (the equivalent of a district court judge) the power to wrap those offences into one and to offer the person who is convicted a choice: either go to jail or go on a detoxification and rehabilitation course that lasts for about a year.

It was interesting sitting in on the court—and I will directly address what the deputy leader is talking about in a moment—because we saw that each of those who entered into the program were not suddenly allowed to go their own way after detoxification; they were required to come back to the court on a regular basis (at the start, I think about once a week), they were given a urine test, and there was a medical report and a report by the various officers required to manage their case (including a probation officer equivalent). If they were still doing well on the course, the judge acknowledged that fact, congratulated them on the way they were going, and then perhaps would say, 'Okay, you've done very well over the first six weeks; we appreciate that this has been difficult for you; you might want to come back in two weeks' time and we'll see how you're going.'

However, this was not just the soft edge of the law, because I did also see on that particular day someone who was on the drug program being brought back into the court.

This person had been found illegally on premises obviously with some intent to break and enter. Drugs were found in the urine and the judge's demeanour was quite different. She said, 'You played up. You've been given this unique opportunity. I'm going to send you to gaol.' Of course, then, after some bargaining, the judge worked out a way of trying to punish them but then to bring them back into the program. The former government, under the former Attorney-General (The Hon. Trevor Griffin), established a Drugs Court. In a sense, it was a bit different because, as I understand it, the Drugs Court in South Australia was conducted by the magistrate's (in this case the Chief Magistrate, Alan Moss) applying the provisions of the Bail Act in dealing with persistent drug-related offences. So, rather than being set up by a separate statute, or a separate law, to empower the Drugs Court to continue, the Bail Act and the provisions under the Bail Act have been liberally used in order, basically, to conduct a similar enterprise.

Alan Moss addressed the Drugs Summit (indeed, after speeches made by me and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition) and reported on how the court had been going. I think he said that there had been a very strong success rate. It was not more than 50 per cent but we are dealing with people with addictions. Certainly, a significant percentage of people going through the Drugs Court, albeit using the provisions of the Bail Act, have completed the courses quite effectively. So, in—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, I know that, but there was not separate Drugs Court legislation; and one of the points made by Alan Moss in his speech to the Drugs Summit was that essentially this was a pilot scheme in which the courts used the provisions of the Bail Act in order to deal with offenders in a way that was likely to result, hopefully, in their rehabilitation. Of course, that does not apply in the Youth Court area and, I think, that was one of the things he mentioned. From memory, Alan Moss also said that this pilot program had been completed and that he was providing a report on its success to the government. I am certainly delighted to inform the house that, under my government, the Drugs Court will continue.

RECREATION AND SPORT GRANTS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the house what this government is doing to ensure that funds spent on recreation and sport are being targeted effectively? In the lead-up to the recent state election a commitment was given to review all aspects of the various grants available through the Office of Recreation and Sport.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): Members on both sides of the house recognise that delivering recreation and sporting opportunities via grant money is unique and, of course, very important for those organisations that are providing a service in the community. Most of these funds are, of course, made available to not-for-profit organisations and, in many cases, the assistance that we are able to give them is assistance that makes the difference between delivering and not delivering a service. In the lead-up to the last election we said that we would look at the major sources of grant funding and, of course, I am talking about the Active Club Program. I am also talking about community recreation and sports facilities.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is the area which received a bit of publicity last week and about which the shadow minister was just interjecting. Of course, the other area is the Management and Development Program. We said that in the lead-up to the last election because we think it is critical that the criteria in place for those three major grants do hit the target and that those criteria meet the expectations of those people in the community, whether it be the major stakeholders, the sporting and community clubs or those people who are so active and participating at that level. I have raised concerns about the distribution of funds through these programs. What will take place now will be an assessment of those criteria.

Also, of course, I have highlighted my concerns about how money was previously allocated for specialist sports schools. I am advised that last year some 81.25 per cent of that funding went to two particular schools. With respect to the task force we have established to look at the criteria for those three areas of grant funding, we have announced that Barrie Robran will head that task force. In addition—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Have you given Barrie his riding instructions?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Why are you so rude? The former shadow minister interjects and asks whether Barrie Robran has been given his riding instructions. The simple answer is no. The longer answer is: what an insult that is to Barrie Robran who needs no riding instructions either from this or the former government. Perhaps the former government used to give him riding instructions—who is to know how that government behaved when it was in government. I would have thought that it is an absolute insult that the shadow minister would speak about riding instructions to Barrie Robran. This particular task force will operate with the independence that it deserves.

Barrie Robran will be given no riding instructions. I would have thought that the shadow minister would have known far better than that. Other organisations participating in that task force will be Sport SA, Recreation SA, the Local Government Association, the private sector and also the Office of Recreation and Sport. This task force will provide a very valuable service in working with the major stakeholders and people at the community level in drawing together those resources to look at the criteria currently in existence with regard to those funding programs. That task force will formulate its particular recommendations with regard to the criteria.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The shadow minister seems very sensitive on this topic. I am not sure why he is leading with his jaw because when I was shadow minister and he was the minister in this chamber we agreed about some potential inadequacies with respect to the Active Club Program. This is a genuine way to try to find the best criteria that can match the demands and expectations of the local sporting community. The opposition is invited to assist to try to draw those resources together. We welcome the input of members opposite.

DRY ZONES

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Attorney-General assure the house that the government is committed to the implementation of the City of Adelaide dry zone? Recent police figures indicate that since the trial dry zone was implemented on 29 October (after a lot of work by us and others) assaults and public order offences have been halved

and assaults and other offences in the parklands have also been dramatically reduced. According to police, declaration of the dry zone has helped police manage public behaviour across the city—not just within Victoria Square—and improved conditions for everyone in the CBD.

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

AUSTRALIAN TOURISM EXCHANGE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Will the Minister for Tourism explain to the house the benefits generated for the tourism industry in South Australia from the Australian Tourism Exchange held in Brisbane from 25 May 2002 to 2 June 2002?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): The Australian Tourism Exchange is one of the world's premier tourism trade events and it is probably the most important event held in Australia. Members will recognise that for South Australia \$4.4 billion worth of income is generated by tourism. It accounts for 10 per cent of the state's growth and 36 000 full-time jobs. More than 650 Australian companies, including airlines, hotels and tourist attractions, met with 750 buyers from more than 50 countries to negotiate contracts to include good South Australian products in their overseas tourism programs. This forum enabled the Australian tourism industry to exhibit products and services to selected travel wholesalers and retailers around the world.

The ATE was an unprecedented opportunity for the South Australian Tourism Industry to showcase itself to the world. International tourism to Australia is expected to double by the year 2012. Currently only 8.2 per cent of international travellers come to South Australia and, of them, they account for only 4.5 per cent of international visitor nights in South Australia. So, as you can see, our visitors are a fair proportion of those coming to Australia but they stay for a lesser time than on the east coast. For the ATE, we found that 30 SA operators were prepared to market themselves to the world. We helped them by mentoring and supporting them in the run-up to the event, and we held networking and programming events to help them present the best face to the world in Brisbane.

This year, there were two key tourism areas. Those were: Aboriginal tourism and indigenous events, and food and wine tourism. Of course, these two areas are ones where our state figures predominantly and can produce the best product in Australia. The South Australian Tourism Commission helped to have an indigenous tourism stand and was particularly active at the ATE. Those people coming also did familiarisation tours for the Outback and in Adelaide, and were overwhelmed by the product they saw.

This government's commitment to the ATE confirmed our commitment to our state's dynamic tourism industry. We worked with international tourism operators—the largest wholesale operators in the world—and the AT Commission, and worked with major airlines to work out ways that we could increase jobs and generate wealth for South Australia. It was figured a great success and we expect the response to be generated over the next years.

AQUATIC FACILITIES

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. During the election campaign the government promised to develop a plan with Swim SA to address the needs for both

current and future aquatic facilities. Will the minister advise the house—I can tell you, this was your plan, sir—where this plan is? A document released by the Labor Party on 6 February, prior to this year's election, as a plan for recreation and sport issues, identified 33 commitments in the recreation and sport area. One of those commitments stated that they would develop:

a plan, in conjunction with Swim SA, local government and user groups, in relation to South Australia's current and future aquatic facilities.

Four months later there still appears to be no plan. A letter from the State's 10 major swimming associations, sent to the minister just recently, outlines as follows the potentially disastrous ramifications of continued inaction by the government:

Unless the council and the South Australian government can reach an agreement in this matter aquatic sports in this state will be decimated or, in some cases, face extinction.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): What the government has been doing during this period—of course a lot of this could have and should have been sorted out before this government came into office—with the problem that we were left with by the former government is that I have been meeting with the user groups. I have met with Swim SA and I have met with the Adelaide City Council, and during that process the Office of Rec and Sport has also been meeting with those particular different groups that the shadow minister refers to. As part of that negotiation, the figures that were first put on the table by the Adelaide City Council to the user groups, which I think were in excess of \$500 000—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: \$600 000

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The shadow minister says over \$600 000. I think we have now come down to a figure of around \$200 000, although I do not have the exact detail in front of me. I have said, in discussions with the Adelaide City Council, that I think, as regards fees being placed upon user groups which are largely not in a position to be able to organise a lot of finance for themselves—they are not sports of a nature that can command a lot of sponsorship or have a very large fund-raising capacity—the council needs to be very mindful of what is taking place here.

We have also spoken to the user groups with respect to their going back and having a look at their programs and timetables as well, because they may be able to identify different aspects of their bookings which could, to a degree, help reduce the gap between the user groups, Swim SA (to which the shadow minister refers) and the Adelaide City Council.

I have also told the Adelaide City Council that I am prepared to sit down and, on behalf of the government, have a look at the indenture agreement, which as the shadow minister would be well aware is something that used to be in existence—I think up until about 1995-96—but which no longer exists, and we may be able to negotiate in that respect and potentially look at organising a new indenture agreement. I would hope that, through that process of talking this through with the user groups, sitting down with people like Swim SA as well as the Adelaide City Council and bringing those groups together in an effort to bring about a commonsense approach with regard to the fees to be charged, the Adelaide City Council will look favourably upon the government being prepared to negotiate a new indenture agreement—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is correct. The shadow minister correctly says that there is a meeting tonight of the Adelaide City Council. When the Adelaide City Council knows what the government is prepared to put on the table with respect to our contribution on behalf of taxpayers, I want to see—

Mr Brindal: It's a measly little subsidy.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, it is a lot more than your subsidy was. The former minister says it is a measly little subsidy. We are prepared to put on the table an indenture agreement that has not been on the table since 1996, so it is a lot less measly than what members opposite were prepared to put on the table. This is the range of options open for negotiation. The Adelaide City Council, in its deliberations tonight, has to decide whether it wants to go into discussions and attempt to negotiate an indenture agreement with the government. If it is prepared to do that then it also has to look at what it is prepared to offer the user groups, such as Swim SA, with respect to how this issue can be moved forward.

KANGAROO ISLAND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I am pleased to be able to answer in more detail the question asked of me by the member for Finnis during question time about the continuation of the Kangaroo Island domestic violence service. As the member would know, the service was established in May 2000 with funding provided through the Commonwealth Domestic Violence Rural and Remote Initiative. The former minister for human services approved an amount of \$105 000 in recurrent funds to be allocated from this fund for the ongoing provision of the service on Kangaroo Island.

Apparently, the funding for the two-year pilot period ceased as of 30 June 2002. Following an evaluation report, it is obvious that there is a need for the domestic violence service for women and children on Kangaroo Island to continue. I am pleased to tell the member for Finnis that there has been an extension of the supported accommodation assistance program (SAAP) funding for a period of 12 months, to 30 June 2003. The total amount allocated will be \$75 000, with \$60 000 of these funds coming from current service underspending, and \$15 000 from SAAP one-off funding. I am sure the member for Finnis will be pleased to hear that, during the next 12 months, there will be ongoing discussions with the Southern Domestic Violence Services, including looking at its role on Kangaroo Island. I hope this answers the question asked by the honourable member.

WIND FARMS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation to the house on two matters.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The first matter is in relation to the Sellicks Hill wind farm which the Minister for

Planning raised, and he inferred that I was a supporter of this project.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Implied! You infer; he implies.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He implied that I was a supporter of this project. First, to my knowledge, I have never ever met Trust Power. In fact, to back that up, Trust Power sent me a letter only Friday afternoon asking for such a meeting. I have a copy of that letter here from a Mr Rodney Ahern, dated 5 July 2002, saying:

I look forward to making an opportunity to discuss the project.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Have you spoken to them over the phone?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have not spoken to them over the phone. In fact, if you have a look at my statements on *Stateline* as of April this year, I came out very, very strongly opposed to this project. I have been opposed to this project. Furthermore, also on Friday afternoon I received a fax from Chris Rann of Rann Communications. This was received in my electorate office at about 1.20 p.m., because I was there and had just spoken to Chris Rann who rang me when he heard I was going to this meeting. The fax reads:

Dean,

Can you organise a meeting with Rodney Ahern next week?
Cheers, Chris.

There are three public statements I have made on this. One is to the *Victor Harbor Times*, which is my local paper; another is to *Stateline*; and another is to various media outlets over the weekend, that I have been opposed to this project, and I remain opposed to this project because these 100 metre turbines sit immediately above the hills face zone.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Personal explanations may not be debated, and the member is now straying into the substance of the wind farm issue.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I think the member has explained where, by inference or by implication, he may have been misrepresented.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was simply giving the reasons why I was opposed to it which I—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will not debate my ruling.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I won't disagree with your ruling, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: You're right, you won't!

HOSPITALS, AFTER HOURS GP SERVICES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a further personal explanation in terms of after hours GP funding from the federal government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Earlier this afternoon the Minister for Health made certain statements and read one sentence of a letter from the commonwealth department which said:

This department does not have a record of any commitment of funding, and no funds have been appropriated to this department specifically for this purpose.

What she did not read out was the following sentence:

However, the commonwealth has committed \$43.4 million over four years—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

—to a funding program to provide quality—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. Personal explanations are a means provided in standing orders for members to point out where they may have been misrepresented. It is highly disorderly at any time to interject or barrack. I hold the view that it is even more serious during the course of a personal explanation to do so. The opposition in this instance needs to remember that it is one of their members who has been misrepresented, and to behave in the manner in which they just have undoes all that they may have achieved during the course of the previous two hours of sitting. I urge all members to respect the standing orders and the rights we each provide to any one of us who may be on our feet at any time, especially when making personal explanations.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will read this paragraph and explain then as to the commitment given to me by the federal minister. This letter from the federal department says:

However, the commonwealth has committed \$43.4 million over four years to a funding program to provide quality after hours primary medical care in areas of need. South Australia has been the recipient of three seeding grants as a result of this program to date, and there is a further round of grant applications under consideration at this time, including from South Australia, relating to after hours service development.

Mr Speaker, in the last week of January, through the Premier, we went to the Prime Minister's office and asked specifically for funding for after hours GP clinics, and I got a specific commitment back from the federal Minister for Health, after a number of exchanges, for \$2.5 million for each of two years, which amounts to \$5 million over the two year period.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was specifically for the program of after hours GP clinics that I had announced. The minister personally rang me and gave me that commitment of \$5 million. So, Mr Speaker, what I said publicly was correct, that I have in fact received a commitment from the federal minister for \$5 million, \$2.5 million over each of the next two financial years, so we could maintain the after hours GP clinics—

The SPEAKER: Order! Giving reasons is debating the matter. Stating facts is what personal explanations allow. If the member has no other facts in explanation, then the explanation has concluded.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, the federal minister, in speaking to me, said that the \$2.5 million for each of the next two years was specifically for the after hours GP clinics at both the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

STATE LIBRARY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to bring to the attention of the house some of the great facilities and the field of excellence of the State Library. Members would be aware that the State Library is undergoing redevelopment of over \$40 million which should conclude in June 2003. This follows the excellent work that has been done in North

Terrace under the previous government with regards to the Art Gallery and the Museum.

On 8 October last year I accepted the offer by the Director of the State Library, Bronwyn Halliday, to visit the library. I am aware that many other members did so as well. I learnt that the State Library of South Australia has a strong reputation as a national and international centre of excellence for the preservation of microfilming. I would like to highlight that today. I have used the facilities of the library, specifically the Mortlock Library, with which I was very impressed. I went to the Mortlock Library to look at a sketch of the Bay of Naples by Colonel William Light in 1830 but which was partly damaged by the fire in 1838.

You can imagine the amazement when I tell people from Campania, where I was born, that Colonel William Light actually sketched the Bay of Naples. That aside, the excellence in preservation and microfilming has been achieved through a highly skilled and experienced microfilming staff; a proven track record of creating high quality microfilm products which conforms to rigorous international standards; state-of-the-art microfilming facilities which have been purpose built on the lower ground floor of the Jervis Wing; active participation in national cooperative microfilming projects; partnerships with key South Australian organisations such as Flinders University, Artlab, the Anglican Archives and public libraries to film priority titles; initiating and participating in a course advisory panel which developed a national course in preservation microfilming (TAFE certificate level 4); networking with national and international microfilming specialists; hosting the international email discussion list Microlink which has over 200 users, including participants from Argentina, Botswana, Estonia and South Africa; and commissioning by the National Library to write training materials on preservation microfilming which can be distributed throughout the Asian region.

Why microfilm? Preservation microfilm has a life expectancy of up to 500 years if it is stored correctly. Microfilm is the internationally accepted medium for preserving printed information in the long term. It is one of the key ways in which the knowledge and heritage of the past can be linked to the future. Digital information changes rapidly. By comparison an average CD rom has a life expectancy of about 10 years. It is possible to digitise from microfilm copies. In this case microfilm provides the preservation platform while the digital copy gives wider access via the internet.

What is being microfilmed? Members might be interested to know that it includes priority materials of South Australian heritage such as newspapers, current and old, and archival material such as diaries, manuscripts, church records and so on. There is a large backlog of South Australian newspapers which need to be filmed before the papers deteriorate and our heritage is lost forever.

I think this is excellent work that the State Library is taking on, and it has achieved excellence not only Australia-wide but also internationally. The work and the facilities provided by the libraries in South Australia in general, including the Norwood, Payneham & St Peters libraries and, indeed, Campbelltown and Burnside in my electorate, provide us with up-to-date information which is very important for this age.

NAIDOC WEEK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): This week as we gather on Kurna land, I acknowledge the traditional owners and advise the house that it is NAIDOC Week where we celebrate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture and achievements. This year, the 10th anniversary of the High Court's historic Mabo decision, focuses on three themes—recognition, rights and reform. I would like to tell the house a little about the NAIDOC Committee here in Adelaide which is chaired by Christine Abdulla. They have organised an action packed week of activities.

Before I outline the program, I pass on gratitude, also, to the various sponsors involved, amongst whom are the Kumangka, the Otherway Centre, Nunkuwarrin Yunti, the Adelaide City Council, and apparently a whole list which was too great to put on the back of the brochure. So, to all those involved, we acknowledge their obvious financial commitment to the activities of this week.

Yesterday (Sunday) we saw a service and a breakfast at St Martin's Anglican Church at Gilles Street, Hillcrest, which was conducted by the Reverend Syd Graham. Also, yesterday at a service attended by the Attorney-General and myself at the Otherway Catholic Centre, we were privileged to be part of a mass and luncheon. The mass was led by Emeritus Archbishop Leonard Faulkner and Father Tony Pearson from the Otherway Centre. Both these wonderful men have demonstrated a great commitment to indigenous people over a great many years, and they are to be commended for their service to indigenous people in this state. Also, I must mention the enormous role played by Mrs Shirley Peisley at the centre and the Aboriginal Catholic Advisory Council, and all the workers and volunteers at the centre.

I wish to digress a little to mention that the Otherway Centre has a proud tradition of helping everyone who goes there for assistance and, along with addressing the very great needs of Adelaide's indigenous community, it now finds itself addressing the needs of the Afghani community, as we see community attitudes here in South Australia and indeed all around the country, towards refugee asylum seekers move between compassion, on one hand, and absolute contempt on the other. Hundreds of Afghans have been desperately in need of all sorts of assistance, and they have mercifully had those needs met, albeit only in part on some occasions, by the Otherway Centre. I might add also that Archbishop Faulkner presented awards to many people involved with the centre's activities, and it was evident how much of a role respect plays in the day-to-day activities of all those involved or have contact with the Otherway Centre.

Today there was a flag raising at the Adelaide Town Hall and a traditional Kurna welcome. I might note here that we are proudly flying the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags from our building on the North Terrace side, and I am hoping that at some stage we will be able to fly them permanently, albeit not from the North Terrace side, but in the manner the Adelaide City Council has adopted by flying the flag in Victoria Square; we may do so here on a permanent basis. There will be cultural performances at the Parakeelya Cultural Centre, Torrens Road, Kilkenny, on Monday and Wednesday; and tomorrow night (Tuesday) Premier Mike Rann will be hosting a reception at the Nunkuwarrin Yunti Centre. He will also be announcing his Premier's Award for the year 2002.

There will be an Elders Luncheon at Nunkuwarrin Yunti on Wednesday; and there will be a launch of Arts in Health

at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Health Service on Wednesday. Tauondi College will be participating in that. Thursday will see the youth disco at the Otherway Centre. On Friday there will be a march which starts at 10.30 a.m. in Victoria Square and in which some of us may be able to take part on the way back here to Parliament House. It is the place to be at 10.30 a.m. if we can be. The NAIDOC Ball will be held in the evening at St Paul's Reception Centre, where people will be presented to a panel of respected Adelaide personalities and awards will be announced.

During the week, all prisons will be having activities. As we know, Aboriginal people are disproportionately represented in gaols throughout the state and there will be a family day at Mobilong on Friday 12 July. I urge all members to take part in whatever is happening in their local electorate—I am sure they will be right up to date with all the things going on in their own electorate—and to take part on Friday at the march, if they can, and to engage in whatever way they can during the rest of the year in recognising the rights of indigenous people.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BOARD

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise today to bring to the attention of the house a matter which may seem of small import, but which has arisen in my electorate and which appears, most worryingly, to be both bureaucracy initiated and bureaucracy driven. It concerns two small localities in my electorate—one known as Greenhill which is the area predominantly known around Yarrabee Road, off Greenhill Road as you go from Burnside towards Summertown and another locality known as Green Hills, which geographically is located essentially in the middle of a triangle encompassed by Macclesfield, Meadows and Echunga.

For no apparent reason, the Geographical Names Board has decided it wants to get rid of the locality known as Green Hills. The locality is steeped in history and it has been in existence for a long time, and the many residents around the area want the name to stay. One might ask why the Geographical Names Board would initiate of its own motion, apparently, a move to get rid of the name Green Hills. They assert, it seems, that that name is too easily confused with the name 'Greenhill' and could lead to all sorts of problems. That might have some sort of basis in commonsense were it not for all the other matters about which I propose to speak, which do not align correctly with this. For instance, we have Stirling and Stirling North in this state, but no-one is taking the attitude that we need to remove either Stirling North or Stirling from the map simply because of a possible confusion. Indeed, if we look at things that happen in our area, I remember just in the last couple of weeks reading a report in the press about a lady who collapsed on Granite Island. A person using a mobile phone called the emergency number only to find that the person on the other end of the phone had no idea where the call was coming from: 'Where is Granite Island? Where is Victor Harbor?' The call was clearly being taken at a call centre interstate.

Of course, if we are to follow that line of reasoning, we will find that we have to go right through the country and remove all the inconsistent names. For instance, I know that there is a Stirling both here and in Western Australia; there is a Macclesfield in New South Wales; there are Mount Barkers all over the place. There are literally hundreds of instances where such confusion could arise.

We know that rapid numbers have been developed in the rural areas to overcome this specific problem. Indeed, in the case of the area of Green Hills, the local Meadows CFS—which is the response unit (combined with Echunga) to that area—has made it very clear in its written communication that it has no concerns whatever and does not wish the name to be changed. Indeed, 300 residents have submitted a petition which indicates that they do not want the name changed. The Mount Barker council has said that it does not want the name changed. The SES, the ambulance service and the Metropolitan Fire Service have all indicated that they have no difficulty with the name remaining as it is.

Most telling of all is this remarkable attitude of the Geographical Names Board that it wishes to change the name for the sake of avoiding confusion when, in fact, this very same board in the last couple of years, would you believe, named another place in this state Prospect Hill. Just beyond Meadows is a township called Prospect Hill. It is a wonderful little place, if members ever get the chance to go there; there is a wonderful museum. There is already a Prospect Hill but, within the last couple of years, the Geographical Names Board took it upon itself to name another place on Kangaroo Island Prospect Hill. For this board to say that it wants to obviate any possible confusion between Greenhill and Green Hills—about which none of the residents, the emergency services, the councillors or the council have any confusion—having turned around in the last couple of years and named a place Prospect Hill when one already existed in this state, strikes me as the ultimate in idiocy. Furthermore, it seems to be a bureaucracy driven agenda. It has nothing to do with any request from the public or from any emergency services. It is simply the Geographic Names Board apparently taking it upon itself to pick on the residents of Green Hills. I believe it is time that we came to our senses and stopped these bureaucracies having that level of power.

ONKAPARINGA COMMUNITY PLAYGROUND

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Sir, I am sure you will be pleased to hear that my comments today are about the Onkaparinga community playground—and I know that you are, as am I, a great supporter of that playground. I think members would have heard a fair bit of publicity lately about the community playground and seen it transformed from a few very large poles in the ground into what we saw in this morning's paper, where we saw children enjoying a fairytale castle that now exists on Saltfleet Street next to the Onkaparinga River at Port Noarlunga.

The story about the playground is not just about the fixtures; it is about a community deciding that it needed something and that community coming together to ensure that it was delivered. The idea for the playground arose out of the Living Neighbourhood project, which was based in Christies Beach. A survey of community members indicated that the highest need in that area was for somewhere for children to play, so they set about developing a really special playground. They had heard about the magic playgrounds in Victoria, and Councillor Bill Rowland went to have a look at them and see what people were talking about. He came back with photographs which convinced the members of the Living Neighbourhood team that this would, indeed, be a marvellous asset for the south, both in terms of providing recreation for the young people and as a possible tourist attraction—because I am sure that people from all over Adelaide will want to come and play in that wonderful

playground. The people involved had to work out where this playground might go. They then discovered that they would have to raise about \$200 000, and they had to work out how to do that.

A group of people formed a committee and set out to deliver to their community the wonderful playground that we have seen. They were led by Councillor Bill Rowland (who was supported very much by his family) and Anne Ellis from the Living Neighbourhood Committee. They received the support of the council about this time last year. As I am sure you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, wherever about 20 people were assembled together at any community event in the Onkaparinga area, there were Bill and some of the other people involved, with a table of pamphlets and lovely photographs, telling us what was possible and asking for our support. They were successful in obtaining grants from the Department of Recreation and Sport and the council, and they fundraised from a number of community organisations, including Mobil, which contributed quite a bit to the playground.

They then had to find people to erect the playground, because the whole concept was that this was something that the community would do for itself. They had volunteer coordinators who went out and about and attended just about every event in the neighbourhood where more than 20 people or so were gathered together. They raised the enthusiasm of what ended up being about 1 800 volunteers who came together to do their little bit of work. My small contribution was doing a lot of sanding on a Saturday afternoon, and I know that the member for Kingston, David Cox, was involved with a group of Kiwanis in assembling one of the towers. The project captured the imagination of the Minister for Tourism, who visited it very early in the piece. The Minister for the Southern Suburbs went along to do his little bit of sandpapering, or whatever, but at that stage they were waiting on some machinery to move towers into place, so he ended up just having a really interesting tour.

I would like to name some of the organisations that got behind this project and really worked on it. The schools in the surrounding areas were absolutely magnificent. The involvement of the many high school students from Willunga, Christies Beach, Morphett Vale and Seaford 6-12 means that those young people will have a stake in protecting it. Primary schools—Christies Beach, Port Noarlunga, St Johns at Christies and All Saints at Seaford—also were involved. I think at Seaford every child was involved in some way, and I saw many of them getting ready to put soap on the approximately 100 000 screws that were involved in the project. The Professionals from Christies Beach was very much involved. Blue Light Discos, the firefighters—CFS, MFS—police and the Christie Downs Community House were among the many people who wanted to make this community's dream a reality, and I congratulate them on doing so.

Time expired.

INSURANCE, PUBLIC LIABILITY

Mr MEIER (Goyder): As members would be aware, it has been some four weeks since we last sat, and in that time a lot has happened. What disturbs me most as to what has happened in that time is the issue of public liability insurance. Members will recall that the opposition offered the government the chance to sit an extra week to specifically consider the public liability issue, because we recognised that it was looming as a major crisis—in fact, it was already a crisis

when we last sat. The government declined that offer to sit, and we are now seeing the real results of the public liability insurance issue. I know that, in my own electorate, several builders are not building any more.

Today the opposition asked the Attorney-General (as the Minister for Consumer Affairs) a question specifically about house building. You will recall, Mr Deputy Speaker, that he went on about a high rise building and similar large enterprises. He skirted around the issue of house builders. These are the people who are the bread and butter small businesses in regional areas, and they are being hurt very hard. It is all very well for the Treasurer and the government to say that they are bringing in legislation shortly; it should have already been done, and I hope that when it does come in it will be tough enough to address these spiralling costs. What are some of these spiralling costs? I will identify a few from my own electorate. Recently a motor dealer contacted me to say that his public liability insurance had increased from \$7 000 to \$17 000—a huge increase. He said, ‘I’ll be able to pay it, but I don’t know that I’ll be able to give all my employees the employment that they have had in the immediate past.’ The chance of this increase being passed on to you and me, the customers, is almost a certainty.

Another business in my electorate indicated that its premium had increased from \$28 000 to in excess of \$50 000—I think the figure was about \$56 000. They said, ‘If we cut out some of the benefits, we can reduce it to just below \$50 000.’ So, that increased from \$28 000 to \$49 000—again, a huge increase in premium.

Dr McFetridge: A shame.

Mr MEIER: It’s a great shame, as the member for Morphett interjects, and it worries me that it will start to lead to staff cuts in some of these businesses. Last weekend, we heard the announcement that the Pichi Richi Railway would not be able to continue. It then got a reprieve. I thought for a moment that that was because the insurance premium had gone down, but it was because the community had got behind it to raise the money. The Minister for Transport will recall that I asked a question in relation to Yorke Peninsula Rail five or six weeks ago. The key question from Yorke Peninsula Rail was whether it could have insurance that would give it only \$10 million worth of cover rather than \$20 million. I am still awaiting an answer, but I believe from an article in the Yorke Peninsula *Country Times* on Yorke Peninsula Rail this week that offer may have now been withdrawn even if the minister does say yes, that its cover can go down from \$20 million to \$10 million. I urge the minister to do everything in his power to implement this change in policy—personally, I believe that a \$10 million claim against a tourist railway would be ample for the immediate future—because these railways will have to close.

Last year, Yorke Peninsula Rail had 4 000 passengers. Basically, that is 4 000 tourists going to the Yorke Peninsula. If the Yorke Peninsula Rail closed, it would be an absolute tragedy. I hope that cover can be found, but I am still awaiting an answer. I realise that governments can do only so much, but the key thing that they have to do now is to get legislation passed. What should that legislation address? Certainly, amongst other things, it should put in place a realistic cap. Members will recall that the Liberal government imposed caps in two areas: first, third party insurance; and, secondly, WorkCover.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I would also like to address a few remarks to this issue of insurance which has been exercising

a lot of people’s minds over the last few months. I congratulate the Treasurer for bringing to the parliament in draft form some very intelligent changes to the law which will hopefully have the effect of ameliorating some of the difficulties. It is my understanding that the draft legislation is now going out for consultation and that people who are involved in industry who have a relevant contribution to make—and, of course, very importantly members of the opposition—will be invited to have something to say about it. I have not had a long time to look at it, but I must say that, in its scope, the idea of a graduated scale being applied not just to motor vehicle accidents but across the board has much commonsense to recommend it. Whilst I still need to understand fully the detail of the legislation—because, as I have said I have not had a chance to look at it for any length of time—I think that, in concept, the Treasurer is to be congratulated on bringing forward these changes which are reasonable and measured.

What I would like to turn to now is why we are in this particular predicament. I have raised this issue before in this parliament and I raise it again. Why is it that, all of a sudden, in 2002 the wheels are falling off every single cart in the insurance industry? Has it not struck anyone that this is a bit odd? I would like to know what has happened. One explanation is that there has been an epidemic of injury. As I understand it, that is unknown in history. You can have an epidemic of, say, influenza but injury does not tend to manifest itself in epidemics. As I understand it there is no evidence whatsoever of an epidemic of injury in the field of public liability, hospitals or any other field that we are hearing so much about. So, that cannot possibly be the answer.

The second possibility is that Australia is suddenly filling up with greedy paraplegics or other people who are seizing the bank accounts of insurance companies. We all know that that is rubbish. Anyone who looks at any of the awards of damages, as I have said in the parliament before, would appreciate that, overwhelmingly, the moneys that are awarded in large claims are awarded for future care; not for pain and suffering and loss of income—for future care. Why is that? That is because the state no longer provides that care and, if it is not to fall on the families of these individuals who have probably got more than enough suffering to deal with, someone has to pick up the tab. Again, that has been the law forever. Governments at state and federal level have been withdrawing themselves progressively from all forms of support for people with disabilities for the last 30 years. So, nothing has changed there either.

That leaves us still scratching our heads wondering why it is that this calamity has befallen the Australian public, all of a sudden, in the year 2002. What has happened? If we really want to get to the bottom of this, I hope that, aside from passing laws that make things more difficult for plaintiffs which is perhaps a necessary although unwarranted response, there might be a decent inquiry into the insurance industry in this country and around the world. We might ask ourselves what sort of prudential management have these insurers had in place to ensure that, for example, the premiums that they have been charging for the last 20 years have been relevant to the risks that they have been accepting. We might ask ourselves what sort of investments these insurance companies have been making with all the money they have been getting from premiums for the last 20 or 30 years and what activities accountants and some of the auditors who have been responsible for looking after the public interest in relation to these companies have been getting up to.

I would like to see a proper national inquiry across the board so that we can find out what is wrong with the insurance industry and make sure that we fix it so that this does not happen again. Unless we do something about it, it will happen again and we will be confronted in another five or 10 years with another epidemic of injury and another load of well-managed media presentations about the RSL parade that cannot go ahead, and so forth, and we will be expected to change the law again.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 June. Page 593.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise to speak against this bill which seeks to amend two main elements of the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act of 2000. First, it seeks to redefine the definition of 'nuclear waste' in the act so that it will now include matter known as category A, category B and category C radioactive waste which is defined in the code of practice for near surface disposal of radioactive waste in Australia. This includes low-level waste.

Secondly, the new bill adds three new sections, which enables the minister to direct that a referendum be held on this question: 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 South Australia? In passing, although I would anticipate that 'the minister' referred to in this new section would be the Minister for Environment and Conservation, I can find no definition in either the original act or the proposed amending legislation that confirms this to be the case. In order to understand the proposal fully it is first necessary to understand the current position.

In the year 2000 the Liberal government introduced the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility Prohibition Act to prohibit the establishment of certain nuclear waste storage facilities in this state. The 2000 act, in essence, said that no-one could construct or operate a nuclear waste storage facility in South Australia and no-one could bring nuclear waste into the state or transport it within the state (except that the act did not apply to South Australia's own legal nuclear waste). The nuclear waste referred to was defined as material containing a radioactive substance that was derived from either the operations or decommissioning of a nuclear reactor, a nuclear weapons facility, radioisotope production facility, uranium enrichment plant, or the testing, use or decommissioning of nuclear weapons or the conditioning or reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. Clearly, most, if not all, of these things did not occur in South Australia.

The point of the legislation was to prevent the waste product created by these activities then being brought here to South Australia for storage. The 2000 act specifically did not include, that is, did not apply, to prevent the creation of a storage facility for category A, B or C waste. Category A includes plastics, protective clothing, laboratory equipment, soil and industrial tools that have slight radioactive contamination contained in steel drums. Category B includes sealed radioactive sources used in industrial devices, gauges and sources used in medical diagnosis and therapy and emits higher levels of radiation than category A waste. Category C includes bulk waste materials arising from processing

radioactive materials, soils that have been significantly contaminated or large items of contaminated equipment.

The effect of the proposed change is that these materials will now be defined as nuclear waste and thus specifically become banned from having a purpose-built storage facility established in this state. Frankly, it does not make sense that a government would wish to expose its citizens to more risk of exposure to radiation (as could become the case if the present government line is followed) than would be the case by allowing the waste to be safely transported and stored in a purpose-built licensed and monitored facility.

I reiterate what has been noted previously by a number of opposition members: that the term 'dump' is not accurate. It is emotive and designed to deflect from sensible and proper debate. If one looks at the criteria used by the National Health and Medical Research Council when it developed the code of practice 10 years ago, it is clear that the social and technical themes (as they are called in its document) are designed to take into account all relevant factors to enable scientists (not politicians but scientists) to determine the absolute safest place on the Australian continent to store the waste.

They take into account the following: geology, that is, the volcanism or recent volcanic rocks (what is best, obviously, is non-volcanic and extremely old volcanic rocks); the regolith, or weathered surface material, which is used to indicate whether the present landscape is erosional or depositional and thus infer whether a site may be subject to regional flooding; earthquake risk; the faults—the area must be more than 2½ kilometres from any major fault; the relief and land form—areas of low relief with little likelihood of landslides or needing complex engineering to ensure stability; creeks, streams and lakes—obviously, there is a need to avoid major drainage systems.

Also included are cities and towns—the site must be greater than 1½ kilometres from the nearest existing permanent residence at the time of site selection (this largely relates not to safety but to the need to monitor and ensure security); transport routes—it must be less than 25 kilometres from an all-weather road; heritage—this is used to identify areas of special environmental, cultural or historical significance that should be avoided; location of rare or threatened plants—obviously to avoid having any in the area that is chosen as a site; and land use—to help define the areas with current adjacent and likely future land use that would not be compatible.

In other words, the National Health and Medical Research Council took into account every contemplated factor and then referred the selection process to a panel of scientific experts from a range of organisations, including the CSIRO, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, the Department of Human Services (Victoria), the Department of Health (Queensland), Adelaide University, Geoscience Australia and the International Atomic Energy Agency. But the Labor government thinks that it would prefer to ignore all those findings and expertise to attempt to block the way to construction within this state for a facility to store low level waste.

Let us make no mistake here: we do create nuclear waste in this state. In the public's mind, perhaps, the word 'nuclear' refers to nuclear power and nuclear weapons, but we all know that there are many uses of radioactivity that benefit South Australians every day. Waste products, including laboratory equipment, syringes, protective clothing, etc., are currently

stored in a range of places and in a range of ways across this state. Individual waste producers currently have the responsibility of looking after their own radioactive waste and, as a consequence, it is often stored in facilities that were not designed for the long-term storage of material such as that and in circumstances that, although safe, are not ideal. In fact, because of the lack of a regulating regime we are not always certain of the storage situation.

The same situation applies in other states. Waste is not necessarily stored in the safest or best manner. The amendment proposed makes it an offence to create such a facility in the safest place in the country. The effect of it is, potentially, to prefer the storage of such waste in all manner of ways and places that could prove much more hazardous for the people of this state.

The second aspect of the proposed amending legislation is even more objectionable: it seeks to give the government power to call a referendum if the commonwealth even looks as though it might seek a licence to create a facility to store in South Australia long-lived intermediate or high level waste generated outside South Australia.

Clearly, if the commonwealth government sought to do so on commonwealth land in South Australia there would be very little this government could do to prevent it. Clearly, also, there is no need for the government to hold a referendum to find out the answer to the question it proposes. The answer would be, as we all know, an overwhelming 'no'. But that is because, as I said earlier, public perceptions about which we are talking are generally a long way from the reality.

The facts are that all radioactive waste is classified into categories based on its physical and chemical form, the characteristics of the radiation that it emits and the length of time over which it will continue to emit radiation, hence we have: low level waste, which contains short lived beta and gamma emitting radionuclides and normally low levels of alpha emitting radionuclides. It includes such items as wrapping material, discarded protective clothing and laboratory plant and equipment. It includes categories A, B and C, which the government now seeks to include under the prohibition legislation.

We then have intermediate level waste. This contains significant levels of beta, gamma and possibly long lived alpha emitting radionuclides. Such waste in Australia consists of industrial gauges, mineral sands, concentrates from past activities, reactor components, waste from the processing of spent fuel and ion-exchange resins and filters. It sometimes requires special shielding during handling and transport. This category includes category S in the National Health and Medical Research Council Code.

Thirdly, we have high level radioactive waste. This contains high levels of beta and gamma radiation emitters, significant levels of alpha emitters and generates significant amounts of heat.

No high level radioactive waste is generated in Australia. There is no need or responsibility to store or dispose of any such material in Australia. There is no likelihood that any Australian government of any persuasion would ever contemplate the disposal of such waste in Australia. What we are really looking at is the safe storage of intermediate level waste. What the previous Liberal government's act did was to say, 'We don't want it stored here in South Australia because we didn't create it here in South Australia.'

The proposed new bill states that any attempt to bring intermediate level waste here will (potentially at least) trigger

a referendum. It is not to find out what people think—because, as I said, we already know what the overwhelming response to the referendum would be—but to use it as a political stick. The proposed timing, which was made clear in government announcements, but in the act itself it is at the discretion of the minister, is to be one week before the next federal election.

I think it is important in addressing these issues to keep in mind a few salient points. Firstly, although we in South Australia do not create intermediate level waste, many South Australians—some 20 000 every year—do benefit from the production of radioisotopes at the Lucas Heights facility, the only radioisotope producing facility in the country. We are certainly South Australians, but we are, above all, Australians. That waste comes about because the provision of assistance to Australians throughout this country, including South Australians, and the resolution of how best to manage it should be seen as a question of national significance.

What needs to be assessed is: what is the safest way to deal with it and where is the safest place to do so? Accordingly, it should not be a matter of each state saying, 'Not here.' Indeed, it is my submission that any such attitude with respect to potential of waste from other states could in fact be much more harmful to South Australia than if we agreed that it should be stored in Australia's safest place, which happens to be in South Australia. Because if you follow that argument to its logical conclusion—each state having to store its own waste—what would stop Victoria, for instance, from selecting a part of Victoria, say in the Murray-Darling Basin, close to the South Australian border, and without all the elements or 'themes' which have been used to identify the safest site in Australia.

There are a number of comments made by the member for Colton in his address on this matter which I believe should be answered. Firstly, the member asserted that any proposition to put a national storage facility in South Australia—and the member actually used the word 'dump'—is 'mindless because it is at odds with the views of the South Australian people'. That proposition, in my view, flies in the face of reason. As I have earlier pointed out, the criteria or 'themes' for the site selection were carefully thought out and designed by people with a range of expertise to find the safest place in Australia. To say that the result of that process is mindless, because clearly a majority of people in the state would say no—but without having any understanding of the nature of the waste, where it comes from, what it arises from and how it would be stored—is simply not sensible.

Secondly, the member states: 'It prohibits the importation of high level waste.' To this I say two things: first, the existing act already does so and, secondly, there is no high level waste in Australia. The member for Colton then went on to say: 'If we accept this position that that is the spot for a national dump, isn't it the logical extension then that this is the best place for medium to high level waste?' I wish to make clear to the member for Colton that, no, one does not follow the other. Federally there are two separate projects: the National Repository Project, which is for the disposal of low level waste, and the National Store Project for the storage of intermediate level radioactive waste. Why are there two projects? It is because there are quite different requirements for the two levels of waste. They are dealt with in quite different ways; and I would like to remind the member for Colton again that there is no high level waste in this country, nor is it anticipated that there will be.

As to disposal of two types of waste, they are different. I quote from a report of the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training regarding safe storage of radioactive waste, published in April 2002, in which it stated:

There is clear evidence from the operation of purpose-built facilities around the world over the last 30 years that low level waste can be safely disposed of. Low level radioactive waste is suitable for near-surface underground disposal.

For intermediate level waste there is a broad international consensus that the materials should be stored in specially built above-ground facilities and then disposed of in geological repositories at depths of several hundred metres.

The member for Colton in his address then asserted:

The bill being debated this evening gives the people of South Australia . . . an opportunity to decide.

By this comment, I believe the member for Colton intended to indicate that the outcome of the proposed referendum would have some automatic effect on the outcome of whether in fact there will be a low level nuclear waste storage facility in this state. But the fact is that there is no trigger created by this bill as to what will happen, depending on the outcome of the referendum. The only trigger is the very blunt political stick which the Labor government is seeking to insert by providing that a referendum may be called in the event of any anticipated commonwealth action with respect to the establishment of a storage facility in this state.

The member then questioned why we have Lucas Heights. Well, for the member's information, we have Lucas Heights, amongst other things, to undertake research and to produce radioisotopes which are, of course, used for medical purposes throughout the country. Indeed, those radioisotopes benefit some 20 000 South Australians every year. That leads me to the last comment in the member for Colton's address (or perhaps it was the discussion following it). He said that he knows what the result of the referendum will be, that is, that an overwhelming majority will answer 'No'. But, as the member for Unley pointed out, that should not be the basis for our decision. If that were the case, a referendum tomorrow would almost certainly indicate that a majority of people would support a return to capital punishment. Does that mean that we as the elected representatives of this state should seek to reintroduce it? I think not.

The fact is our responsibility to the people of South Australia goes well beyond taking straw polls on issues and acting on the whim of that response. Clearly, most people are frightened by the words 'nuclear' and 'radioactive' without having any real appreciation of what they mean. It is also clear that the people of this state deserve to have politicians doing their best to protect them. Any referendum proposed by this legislation is not calculated to gauge the wishes of the people but to strike fear of the short-term political responses into the federal government. It is simply playing politics in the worst possible way. For these reasons I believe that this bill should be opposed.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I speak today on behalf of the people of my electorate of Giles where, should it eventuate, a waste dump is planned. I do not believe that the federal government is interested in the wishes of the people of this state, and certainly not the people in the electorate of Giles. Everywhere I go in my electorate, people tell me that they do not want a radioactive waste dump in their area. I would be interested to know whether members opposite, if the proposed waste dump site were to be in the middle of their

electorate—as it is in mine—would be so strongly in favour of siting a dump in South Australia.

Barry Wakelin, the federal member for Gray, is obviously not listening to people in our electorates. Incidentally, he has commented in the past that we need more scientific proof of the real dangers of radioactive waste. I think that is an interesting comment. If he were listening to the people in the electorate of Gray, he would certainly oppose a dump as strongly as I do. For a start, we can forget any opportunity of any real jobs coming out of a waste dump in our electorate, because there would be minimal employment opportunities. So why do he and the federal government persist in this action. I think it is time that the federal government started acting in the interests of the people of South Australia, particularly in my area—the rural, regional and remote parts of South Australia. Time would be far better spent creating employment opportunities and providing decent services for those people. These people have copped a disproportionate share of the cutbacks imposed by the federal government in the last few years. We want the federal government to stop dumping on regional South Australia. Certainly, residents of Coober Pedy, Woomera, Andamooka, Roxby Downs and Whyalla have all expressed opposition to the dump through petitions, phone calls and letters to me, through public comment and through many of their councils and they have expressed concerns about the dump being placed in that part of the state. I am sure that the proposed referendum will overwhelmingly affirm their feelings.

An extraordinary comment was made by the member for Heysen about how well the dump site was chosen and how much thought, preparation and scientific evaluation went into this site. I want to talk about not only how stupid the federal government is in not listening to the people of South Australia but also how stupid they are in their choice of the site for the repository. I have been listening for some time to murmurs coming out of Woomera about how inappropriate the site is. When I first heard the rumours I thought that it might be mischief-making by opponents of the dump, because it seemed too stupid a rumour for even the federal government to propose. However, the rumours got stronger and I found out that what people were saying was actually true.

This federal government has actually chosen a site right in the middle of a bomb-testing site. That is where it wants to place its radioactive dump. The chosen site is in the middle of a bomb-testing site. This leaves *The Simpsons* and *South Park* for dead in terms of stupidity. It is better than any science fiction movie I have seen, and I would like to know who actually chose this site: was it Homer Simpson? The federal government is putting a radioactive waste repository in the middle of a weapons-testing range.

I cannot believe that the media has not picked up on this. I have checked the map over and over again, with defence department people, with people in Woomera, and the site that has been chosen is definitely right where the bomb-testing range is. They test bombs and other weapons right there. The incredible thing about this is that one government department is not listening or taking notice of another government department. I know that the defence department has not publicly opposed the chosen site because, of course, it is not able to. But, I do know that behind the scenes great concern has been raised about this issue by the minister, by senior officers in the defence department and certainly by people in Woomera. I know that many potential customers interested

in using the range for weapons testing are amazed and very concerned at the proposal, and the potential to lose these customers is obvious and likely.

Many of the customers who have proposals to use the site are Japanese, and they are very concerned about the possibility of a bomb being dropped right in the middle of the radioactive waste dump. The proposal for the location of the national radioactive waste repository is in the Woomera Prohibited Area certainly, within the Woomera Instrumented Range. The Department of Industry, Science and Resources nominated a preferred site for this, and there is a lot of confusion about this particular site because it has been promoted as being part of a pastoral lease, the Wirraminna Station.

I had a number of discussions with the Minister for Environment, prior to his becoming the minister and since then, about this particular site. He believed that it involved a pastoral lease, as do most people in Australia—and it does. However, during a recent visit to Woomera I especially checked to make sure my facts were exactly right: this site is right on the bomb-testing range. It is part of the Wirraminna lease, but it is also right where the bombs are tested, because they test on the station. Wirraminna Station covers an area of the weapons-testing range, as do many other pastoral leases in the area, such as the Andamooka Station, I know for one, and a couple of others as well. They all cover that area: they are all part of the Woomera testing range.

DISR identified three potential sites: the chosen one was site 52A, and two alternative sites, site 45A and site 48. Those last two are outside the Woomera Prohibited Area, but the one they chose is right in the middle of it, or right on the edge of it where the testing actually occurs, and there has been great concern about this in Woomera. All three sites were the subject of an environmental impact statement and I have not been able to determine whether it has been completed, although I think it is very close.

Many concerns have been expressed about the impact of the proposal on the continued use of the Woomera Prohibited Area and the instrumented range for defence and also aerospace activity. The future protection and viability of the Woomera Prohibited Area must be given full consideration in any proposals to use the area for non-defence purposes. Maintaining the integrity of the range is vitally important, and site 52A is not a sensible or logical choice in this. The potential impact on activities is very concerning.

Woomera has received an incredible amount of negative publicity in recent times, and it has been publicity totally undeserved, as Woomera is a great little community. It has been a vital part of our state's history and the township of Woomera itself is a pleasant and attractive oasis in the desert. Certainly, the asylum seekers' camp has done dreadful things for Woomera's image, and the prospect of a waste repository that has the potential to prevent the legitimate use of the range for which it was built is absolutely ludicrous. Many projects are being developed for Woomera, and the range is in almost constant use despite what people may think. Many people think the range is obsolete, but it is not: it is being used constantly for testing purposes. Indeed, recently, while I was there, tests were going on with high-powered aircraft in the area. This week I know there will be the launch of a rocket, and I was invited to go to that but unfortunately it is on budget day, so I think my chances of being paired that day will be pretty slim.

I recently heard discussions on ABC radio about the tourist centre at Woomera and the number of tourists who pass through the area and visit the centre. It is an incredible little centre, because it tells so much of South Australia's history, particularly of when the range was first surveyed and of the work of Len Beadell, who is really a cult hero in South Australia for his work in this part of the state, where he surveyed so many of our roads and areas up north; and a large area of the museum is devoted to him.

The museum also maps out the history of the rocket and weapons testing programs in South Australia that have occurred there. Although it did not occur at Woomera—it was further over—the atomic bomb testing is a great lesson for us to learn, too. We know the devastation that that caused in parts of South Australia. We cleaned it up to some extent, but now we are talking about putting a waste area right in the middle of where either Australian or overseas bombs will be tested. It is just crazy.

I cannot believe that the government has not seen this, has not worked this out and that it is not planning to do anything about it. It is planning to put a pile of radioactive waste right where a bomb can be dropped in the middle of it. How do you think Japanese, Russian or overseas investors will feel about this possibility? This will can many of our projects, and they will go to other places overseas—projects that could be so important to our community in South Australia and projects that could continue to keep Woomera viable and keep both Woomera and South Australia on the map.

As I said before, I cannot understand why the media has not picked this up and realised that this is the case. It has been hidden under this covering of, 'This is a pastoral lease that we are talking about.' It is a pastoral lease, yes, but it is part of the Woomera testing range. It is right where they test the bombs. I do not care what assurances we are given by the federal government about medium-level waste dumps. I do not trust the logic after this, or the government's word that it has given us.

I strongly support this bill. As the local member, I would certainly like to see the bill go much further: I would like to see the whole waste dump totally banned. Certainly, in this case I think we need to let the people of South Australia, first, be told what is really being proposed and, secondly, have a say in the siting of the dump.

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I rise to support the comments made by a number of my colleagues on this bill. The referendum question proposed in my view should read, 'Do you want dangerous waste from radioactive material to continue to be stored in Adelaide?' That question is what this bill is about, but we know that that question would be far too rational for the nuclear politics of the Rann government.

What a defining moment it was when the Minister for the Environment introduced this bill. It enabled him to set up a referendum that would do nothing other than try to play a political game, and that game was based on emotional tactics and fear. We know, however, that this move proves two things about Labor's priorities: it will always put politics before the business of government and the welfare of the public; and it shows how fictitious is the Treasurer's claim that he has found a black hole in the budget, because now he is willing to spend somewhere between \$6 million and \$8 million on a useless referendum that cannot in reality have the slightest effect on the federal government's intention about the disposal of radiation waste.

The money is not likely to bother the Labor Party with its State Bank history, as we all know, and the repeated claims—false as they are—that the Premier and other Labor luminaries keep talking about in relation to the fact that the state government has, in their view, spent \$40 million on the wine centre. We are absolutely delighted that the wine centre now has a solution. However, we also know that—and it is not being said—it is an investment in our future, and that the reality is that \$40 million was not spent by the government. That indifference, though, to the bizarre financial management of Labor is a given for the party we now have in office. But the stupidity, in my view, of Labor's constitutional ploy of a referendum on nuclear waste should concern every person who cares about sensible government. If the commonwealth proceeds to build a waste facility on commonwealth land, what we do know is that it will obviously proceed in a constitutional manner, it will be legal and it will validate the actions which will be well beyond the reach of this parliament, and Labor knows it.

In dealing with this question, though, we have to understand that the Premier's ego—and I hope it is not the ego of the Minister for Environment and Conservation—is leading him down the same dangerous path that has led other eminent Labor luminaries, some former, to their demise. If this government thinks it can frighten, scare off or intimidate the Prime Minister, I think it is even sillier than I think now. The Premier should ask former prime minister Paul Keating and, indeed, Kim Beazley, about the dangers and perils of that process.

The fact is that the Prime Minister has seen off enough Labor top dogs to prove the point that he is not likely to be intimidated by the South Australian Premier or the Minister for Environment and Conservation, who has no constitutional standing on this matter, and who is in fact, as we know, in office because of the support of a member for parliament elected from a non-Labor electorate, and who consequently, whether you like it or not, leads a government that is based on a minority of votes from the 2002 election.

The passage of this bill may be precarious. I wonder, for example, what the member for Hammond will do. Clearly the house will divide on this issue, and I wonder whether the member for Hammond will support the government of his choice or whether he will support his views that he has espoused so vigorously, and I might say very colourfully, when he has in the past enthusiastically voted against the bill that was put up by a previous government. Some of the quotes of the member for Hammond are quite instructive some months later. In the previous debate, he said:

I do not support the proposition for a referendum. In fact, as I said in my second reading contribution, I do not even support the bill. It is all feel-good crap.

Now, I find that quite an extraordinary statement for the current Speaker, the member for Hammond, to remember. He also went on to talk about the definitions in the previous bill, and referred to them as 'dillberry stuff'. I actually had some difficulty when I was looking through the dictionary to find out what on earth 'dillberry stuff' is, but I am sure when he reads some of this material that he will no doubt inform us what 'dillberry stuff' is, although I suppose it is a better description than 'feel-good crap', which was one of his other descriptions.

The reality of this bill is that it does obscure the practical question of what we should do with our waste in South Australia. Right now, as we have heard on a number of previous occasions, it sits around in a number of various

locations in our city, our suburbs and several of our country centres. It is in wonderful places like the Royal Adelaide Hospital on North Terrace, the Waite Institute, Flinders University and the University of Adelaide, and in a range of suburbs, some of which are currently held by Labor members, ranging from Norwood to Osborne, and Frewville to Bedford Park, and in country centres such as Loxton, Whyalla and Millicent, to name just a few.

The continuing use of a number of sophisticated medical treatments depends on nuclear applications. We have just heard the member for Heysen remind us that more than 20 000 people in South Australia benefit from some of these medical treatments on an annual basis. Besides the medical treatments, there is a range of other uses, and one that I thought is worth drawing our attention to, because it is legal and in fact enforced by our laws, is appropriately outlined in a most informative brochure that refers to smoke detectors. It says:

One of the most common uses of radio isotopes is probably only a few metres away in the form of a smoke detector. These detectors contain a tiny amount of radioactive material, which makes the detector sensitive to smoke. Every home first-aid kit has its items sterilised by radiation. They include cotton wool, burn dressings and bandages.

If we cannot dispose of the waste from that type of use, do we stop the medical procedures or do we change our support and promotion of the lifesaving devices of smoke detectors? We cannot have it both ways. What will the South Australian government do about the reality of these issues and these problems? The stupidity of the current position is outlined, in my view, by a stupid and irrational question. Do we ask patients to take the nuclear residue from their treatment to their home for storage in homes where the smoke detectors must be removed? Let us get real about this: it is an impossible scene, but it clearly illustrates the irrational and extraordinary position that will develop if the government continues to play politics instead of developing a sensible way through this current impasse.

The safe storage of South Australian nuclear waste is very relevant at this time because the federal government will offer all the states suitable storage space in the commonwealth facility. Is this government going to accept the offer? Will it accept it and get our nuclear waste out of North Terrace and out of our suburbs, away into the safe storage facility in remote Australia or is it going to put Labor politics first and let the waste decay in our city? The truth is that ultimately there will be only one answer. Only the commonwealth is going to be able to overcome state rivalries and establish safe storage for nuclear waste in a manner that is properly regulated to maintain the safety and integrity of its sites. In those conditions, away from our social and work environments, it will pose no threat to our future, quite unlike the continued damage raw sewerage causes to our waterways and air pollution to our continuing health.

I oppose this bill because it is an absolute expensive nonsense. It is too smart and too shallow and I believe it will be recognised for exactly what it is. While this government continues to allow nuclear waste to accumulate in our city—in Adelaide—it turns its back on the possibility of any negotiations which could get it out of the city and stored in Australia's safest place in a purpose built facility near Woomera. By this device of promoting a political stunt referendum, the government is, in a quite mischievous, inappropriate and calculating manner, obscuring the interests of the South Australian public.

Another book, entitled *Safe Storage of Radioactive Waste*, is put out by the commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training. One of its quotes is particularly relevant, although I suggest Labor members ought to read the entire book. Point 8.3 on page 16 asks:

Will the national store affect the quality of the surface and ground water around the facility?

It goes on to talk about that. One point that I thought was particularly relevant was that 'only conditioned and packaged waste in solid form will be accepted by the facility.' This book goes on to talk about a whole range of questions that the public deserves to be informed about, but because of the fear tactics employed by the Labor Party with this political stunt, it probably means, sadly, that the political stick and public perceptions may take control. I repeat what I said at the beginning of this speech: the question that really should be put in a referendum is one that would invite an answer from every citizen of our state in their own interests and in the interests of their children and future generations. That question is: 'Do you want dangerous waste from radioactive materials to continue to be stored in Adelaide and its suburbs and in country centres?' I do not believe that this government has the courage to put this essential question, and I think it stands condemned for that. The politics of this government are clearly not going to allow that question to be put, and obviously it is not going to allow it to spoil the political game it is currently and predictably—and shamefully—playing.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I am shocked and stunned at the latest contributions by members opposite regarding this issue. I am stunned beyond disbelief. For the member for Morialta to say that we are playing political games, after the Liberal Party at the last general election put out leaflets stating, 'The Labor Party wants to leave nuclear waste in your suburbs because it does not want a centralised nuclear waste dump,' and to then say that we are playing political games, is the height of hypocrisy.

This opposition will wear this decision like a crown of thorns. The member for Davenport, who is leading the charge with his jaw on this issue, will wear this issue like a crown of thorns and it will ruin his leadership aspirations—and I will talk about that in a minute. If I was on that side of the house, if I was a Liberal Party member, I would be turning to the member for Davenport for help because right now members opposite are leaderless and rudderless. He is the only one who can give them any direction; he is the only one on that side of the house with any credibility.

But, back to the issue. This opposition is saying that John Howard in his wisdom has decided that Woomera is the safest site in South Australia, and the Liberal Party rolls over like a good little dog and gets tickled on the belly by the Prime Minister. It is not enough that we had Maralinga: now members opposite want the nation's nuclear waste and radioactive waste stored in South Australia. They do not have the courage to say that we are prepared to store South Australia's waste in a central location, but not New South Wales', not Victoria's, not Tasmania's, not Western Australia's, not the Northern Territory's and not the ACT's. They are representing interstate interests, not South Australia's. They refuse to put South Australia first.

They insist on putting their federal colleagues ahead of their own constituents, and I have nothing but contempt for members opposite. They are disgraceful; they are a rabble; they are rudderless and leaderless. I cannot believe that any

member opposite would advocate storing New South Wales' radioactive waste in South Australia. Why? Because John Howard says that the safest place is South Australia. Members opposite think South Australia is the nation's dumping ground. If they had their choice they would take off 'SA—the Festival State' and put on 'SA—the Dumping State'. That is what members opposite want for South Australia. Their vision for South Australia and the future is that we become the world's nuclear waste dump. Members opposite are saying, 'That's what we want.'

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I have been informed by our very good Minister for Tourism that members opposite are not only jeopardising the future of South Australian children by having the nuclear waste storage dump in South Australia but also damaging our exports. Worldwide we are considered cutting edge in agriculture and wine development. The solution of members opposite is to add to that a little rider, 'SA Great—wine production, agriculture, nuclear waste'. That is the message from members opposite; that is their vision for South Australia.

I can imagine members opposite going to school children throughout South Australia and saying, 'We want you to recycle, we want you to save our heritage, we want you to protect the Gammon Ranges; but we also want you to take on the responsibility of the nation and have nuclear waste from Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne, Hobart and Perth stored in our backyards.' That is their legacy—the legacy of contempt for South Australians and the future. They are attempting to impose their contempt on future generations, and I will not stand for it.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: If you think that we are not prepared to call a referendum on this issue, just try us. Nothing would please me more than to stand outside my local polling booth on the Saturday before the federal election and say, 'Vote no to the Liberal's nuclear waste dump.' Nothing would please me more, but the experts, the electoral geniuses opposite who are now in opposition, think it is madness. They think we would never do it, that we do not have the courage. We are happy to pull the trigger, no problem whatsoever. We will pull the trigger and it will be your colleagues in Canberra who will pay the price because you have run down this state long enough. It ends today.

This government will not stand by and watch members opposite ruin our future, ruin our heritage. They have done enough damage to our heritage by selling off the assets we owned. We are not going to let them destroy our image as a state. We are going to fight every chance we get to stop their federal government depositing their rubbish and waste in South Australia. It is absolutely absurd for members to say that we are playing politics, given the rubbish they put out during the election campaign that we want nuclear waste stored locally.

We are going to set up an independent EPA, unlike the EPA that those opposite had. Our EPA will do an audit on this waste, and we might set up a storage facility for ourselves, but we will not be storing anyone else's nuclear waste in those facilities. We will not do it. It will not become an industry that we will be proud of. Radioactive waste will not become our main export or import. Our exports will be cars, wine, aquaculture, our people and our lifestyles. It will not be nuclear waste.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose this legislation and I was very surprised to hear the member opposite be so intense in his contribution because I think South Australia is seeking to renege on its responsibilities if it does not accept any low level or medium level waste in this state. Let us be quite honest: the bill is principally twofold. First is the principle that the government wishes to amend the definition of waste to include low level waste; in other words, no nuclear waste at all is to come into South Australia. Second is the principle of whether there should be a referendum at the minister's discretion and at the minister's choosing on the question of whether South Australia wants a storage facility.

Without question, no-one ever wants a dump in their backyard. That is as obvious as any other truism. However, national studies have indicated that the safest place in Australia is a site in South Australia; yet the Labor Party is saying, 'We don't want it at the safest place. Go find a second or third safest place, but not the safest place, please.' That is the first thing, and the second thing is the sort of nuclear waste that we are talking about. We are talking about low level nuclear waste.

We could take it to the extent that, if the granite part of Parliament House were demolished, technically that should go to a low level nuclear waste site because the granite emits a greater amount of radiation than some of the low level waste that we are talking about. We all want the good things in life such as smoke detectors, and virtually every time there is a fire and someone is killed or a house burns down and a smoke alarm was not installed or the batteries had not been replaced we hear emergency services personnel say that everyone must have such an alarm.

We all know how they operate, which is through nuclear energy. They have a nuclear device, and it is clearly stated that they should not be thrown in the rubbish bin; they need to be disposed of safely. But I will bet that there would be hundreds—in fact, thousands—that are thrown in rubbish bins and are lying around. People probably live with them in their own room every night. They have that radioactive source right there; they are passing within millimetres of it.

That is the type of thing that we are talking about depositing in a low level nuclear waste dump in what is regarded as the safest place in Australia—in South Australia. People can live with it in their own bedroom but they are not prepared to live with it many hundreds of miles away from where we currently are. What hypocrites! The Labor Party obviously has not grown up at all. It still has the mentality that it had with that 'mirage in the desert', Roxby Downs. Some of us who are a little older remember their fetish in not wanting Roxby Downs under any circumstances. In fact, they were so strong that poor old Normie Foster was thrown out of the Labor Party and was ostracised for so many years. Yet he was the one who crossed the floor because he, of all people in the Labor Party, could see commonsense and he supported the Liberal government to allow Roxby Downs to go ahead. I do not hear criticism about that decision today.

In the same way, there is no doubt that the whole issue of a so-called dump—and let us not call it a dump; let us call it a repository—needs to be addressed, because we have this stuff sitting in our hospitals, in businesses and all across Adelaide and in many country towns, and no-one is prepared to make the decision as to where it should go. The irony is that the previous federal Labor government and the previous state Labor government gave full support in all measures to seek an appropriate repository for this low level nuclear waste. In fact, even a well respected gentleman, the Hon. Don

Hopgood, indicated very clearly the need for appropriate disposal facilities, and fully backed the committee of inquiry at that stage. Now they have done an about-turn. And it is only for political point scoring, because the general public does not understand this situation. Anyone who mentions the word 'dump', of course, immediately has sympathy if they say, 'We will do everything we can to stop that dump from being established.'

Let us not kid ourselves. This is an effort to try to create some kudos for the government. The Premier is very good at that, and so are some of his ministers. But he is very lucky that he has taken over a state that has reached a pinnacle in development in Australia, and people are very happy and very confident in the future of this state. If the government starts concentrating on these sorts of issues and brings before us a bill that is, in many ways, wasting our time here, its priorities are wrong and I would say to the government, 'Get away from these wrong priorities.' If we consider the referendum alone, it is estimated that that will cost in excess of \$6 million.

That is \$6 million that could be spent on health, education or policing. The government is quite happy to have a nonsensical referendum for \$6 million but it does not understand the damage that that will do to its own citizens and businesses and also to the credibility of South Australia—and, I would say, to the credibility of Australia. Overseas countries would, quite rightly, look at us with concern and suspicion because we have huge waste areas yet we are not prepared to take other people's low-level waste products when, as I said, in so many cases we are sleeping right under them every night. Let us be realistic. I hope that the government rethinks this bill and agrees to either withdraw it or even oppose it in the end. I certainly oppose it.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to oppose this bill and I believe that, as Australians who are concerned about our environment, we should store nuclear waste at Australia's safest site. It has been well documented that the safest nuclear waste storage site in Australia for low-level waste—and I stress low-level waste—is Woomera. This is a highly emotive issue and it has been obvious during this debate that members have different views. I listened very carefully to the speeches of the member for Giles and others in relation to this matter. As I say, it is a highly emotive issue and one that can be played upon by the government accusing the commonwealth of trying to turn South Australia into Australia's dumping ground for nuclear waste.

There has been much emotional nonsense spoken and much hypocrisy in relation to this issue and I hope this house is able to settle down and consider what has happened. As you would know, sir, truck loads of radioactive waste are already stored at Woomera. And who put it there? It was put there by the federal government, but it was not the Howard Liberal government. Would you believe that it was the Keating Labor government that put it there! The current government in South Australia—a Labor government, I remind you (the Lewis-Rann Labor government)—is now castigating the current Howard Liberal government for wanting a low-level radioactive waste dump here in South Australia. I am a pretty basic sort of fellow and, to me, that is hypocritical, because the previous federal government already decided that South Australia—Woomera—is going to be the site for a low level radioactive dump. During the

debate, members opposite seemed to have chosen not to know that fact, to ignore that fact or to just fudge it completely.

I have just returned from the north—in fact, yesterday. Four MPs visited the north, and we saw a thousand sites that would be good for a low level radioactive waste dump. There are thousands of square kilometres where nobody is living—not even Aboriginal people. There are acres where you could safely put a nuclear waste depository. This is hypocrisy and, by this absolute nonsense that is dished up here by parliamentarians who ought to know better, we are running away from a few obvious facts. Fact one is that the material is already there at Woomera. And who put it there? A federal Labor government put it there. Let us build on that. Let us continue from that in this debate on this legislation and see what we will do next. We cannot run away from this sort of legislation or we will end up with nothing—a stalemate—and to do nothing, as we all know, is no option. Surely this issue will only rile the general public more and instil further fear into their hearts and minds about radioactive material and its harmful effects. Certainly, it is very easy to say, ‘Do you want a radioactive dump next to your home?’ Of course, none of us does. What sort of emotive question is that? What sort of emotive debate is that? Certainly, the old NIMBY principle is alive and well. But I am not critical of that because I would not want a radioactive deposit alongside my home, either. But at Woomera and even further than that, there is nobody living close.

There are many sites within Adelaide and North Adelaide—at hospitals, universities and other facilities—where low-level radioactive materials are currently stored. We all know that, and we see pictures of it in the *Advertiser*. There are closets under the stairs in the Royal Adelaide Hospital where there are containers of radioactive material. ‘We’re happy to leave it there, but don’t you take it to Woomera!’ That is how ridiculous this whole issue has become. Surely, storing radioactive materials in cupboards is an accident waiting to happen. I would feel far more comfortable knowing that such substances are stored in the Far North and remote parts of South Australia as opposed to being stored in buildings on North Terrace or in North Adelaide or anywhere else—not just in the metropolitan area, but anywhere where people live. That is commonsense, and I am amazed that we have not had more people taking a more commonsense point of view in this debate.

Having been to Woomera very recently, I can safely say that the environment there is one which sustains very little. It is a very dry, flat area with very little surface run-off. The groundwater is very deep and extremely saline, and no-one lives near there, so it is an ideal spot. I heard the impassioned debate of the member for Giles—I usually listen to her speeches—but I do not think she adequately addressed the material that is already there and the matter of who put it there. The member for Giles is an independent person who speaks her mind, and I appreciate that, because I do not think anyone should be tied down by their party dogma all the time. We are allowed to speak our mind, and I appreciate that she does also. However, I do not think this case has been adequately answered by the current government, particularly in relation to this bill.

I am very concerned about what the outcome of all this will be. The geological structure of the land surrounding Woomera and the limited amount of groundwater, as I have said, reduces the risk of earthquake and seismic shocks and the contamination of groundwater. The issue of contamina-

tion of groundwater is always being brought up. I do not think it will be any problem at all, because any repository will be lined and monitored with adequate sumps and everything else that goes with that sort of construction. Compare that with the potential accidents that could occur in an urbanised area where any contamination would seriously affect a highly populated location.

The greatest problem that has not been spoken of in this chamber is the risk in relation to the theft of this material in Adelaide. I am certain that not all of it is properly secured so that people cannot steal it and sabotage other areas of industry with it. This is an issue that we do not want to talk too much about because we do not want to put any silly ideas in people’s heads. I believe that this material is not only injurious to health but it is also a security risk if it gets into the hands of the lunatic fringe that I am afraid we have in our community. Just think what they could do with it.

The reality is that, in our society, radioactivity is part of our lives. It is in our homes, schools, hospitals and businesses. It is in such simple items as microwaves that we use daily—I do—and smoke detectors. These are prime examples. Most of us have been involved with this waste, because we have been to hospital and had these procedures. A lot of the material that we use is slightly radioactive. For medical treatment and procedures, radioisotopes are essential. They have helped many Australians through X-rays, radiology and radiotherapy. One of the most important contributions in radiation technology is its use in sterilising instruments in hospitals where it is highly effective. Radiation and radioisotopes are also beneficial in industry. They are being used in agriculture (as I know very well), horticulture and viticulture in, for example, the measurement of soil salinity and erosion rates.

Radioactive waste products from this technology must be deposited somewhere; we know they must go somewhere. I am confident that in not too many years the technology will exist so that this material can and will be reprocessed. In fact, that could be a very valuable resource. I heard the maiden speech of the member for Morphett, Dr McFetridge, and a lot of us would agree with what he said. We could become a national repository and it could become a very attractive business for this state in the long term. One can be wise in hindsight, and I am sure that in 10 years we will look back and say we did or did not do the right thing. I know it is a controversial issue and that the honourable member got some unwanted publicity from his maiden speech. I thought it was a courageous thing for him to say, but I know that a lot of people out there would agree with him.

I say again that nuclear waste products from this technology must be deposited somewhere. If we do not allow the building of low level radioactive waste storage facilities we cannot reap the benefits of radiation for our society and economic livelihood. We must be realistic and store the radioactive waste in the safest possible location, as we cannot escape the issue that the nuclear industry is here to stay, and this industry will continue to generate radioactive waste.

It is certainly in Australia’s best interest to have low level radioactive waste deposited in a centralised and safe location and to South Australia’s advantage to maintain this facility funded by the commonwealth government; whether it be the previous Keating government or the present Howard Liberal government, I do not believe it makes a jot of difference. I support the building of a low level radioactive waste storage facility in the safest location in South Australia. If it is not

Woomera, I will not die in a ditch over it; I am quite happy to listen to the debate and support a location other than Woomera. But I do not support a referendum with regard to the storage of nuclear waste that would cost our state of the order of \$6.4 million when these funds could be channelled to areas with greater priority. I believe a referendum would be a total and gross waste of money, because we all know what the result would be. The government knows what the result would be; it is purely a fudge.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 5.40 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr VENNING: This government has been in power for only a few months, and this is the weakest thing it has done. It is a disgrace when MPs cannot make a decision themselves and stand by it. We know that these sorts of decisions are hard to make. Of course we all know what the result of the referendum will be, but is that the right decision? Does every member of the government know it will be the right decision? Of course not. It is just like the recent Drugs Summit. I did not go to the Drugs Summit because I thought it would be just a talkfest.

I know what the problem is and we have read all about it after the Drugs Summit, and the problems and speakers were listed properly—but what will you do about it? We cannot decide on that, either. It is a roundabout, and it is a pretty spineless, gutless government that cannot make a decision like this—the right decision—and then make it stick. By going out to the people with an emotive issue like this, I know what the result will be, and so do they, so it is a waste of money. If you want to do that, just do it and do not hide behind this referendum. This is a political stunt, and one that will be used to undermine the federal government prior to the next election. Not only is it a weak stunt, it is also blackmail.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I ask the member who is interjecting whether she has been up there in recent times. Too many people in this house sit in judgment on matters and they do not even go there; they do not know the area.

The Hon. J. Hill interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I've been there since you, minister, but you were there not far in front of me. Go out there and have a look and speak to the people. I spoke to the member for Giles, kindly, and told her I was in her electorate. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, this is a stunt. It is blackmail to a federal government. This government is running away from a decision that, backed by the opposition, it ought to make.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The minister, by interjection, says no. What is his solution to this problem?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hanna): The honourable member will address his remarks through the chair.

Mr VENNING: Sir, I respect your decision, but I remind you that the minister was also out of order: he was interjecting and interjections are out of order. Certainly, I do respect the minister. He is one of two ministers I respect, and I mean it. If the government is going to say no, let us see the end result. The government says that we do not want the radioactive waste of other states here. I thought that we were all Australians. I do not believe that a state boundary should

matter a jot. I do not believe that material generated in New South Wales should be stored there. I think that is a gross put down of Australia. I believe that any material generated in Australia should be stored in Australia. I do not care whether it is stored in Victoria, Western Australia, Northern Territory, or where ever. I see myself as an Australian. The minister is saying that, because the borders are there, Victorian waste should be stored in Victoria. Is that what the minister is saying? This debate pales into insignificance. I deal only in basic commonsense where I come from. I do not go into this academic poppycock that some of our people go on with. I cannot see why we cannot store other state's material here.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Medium level waste?

Mr VENNING: Low level waste.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The minister interjects again; he is out of order. Will the minister tell me what material is currently stored in Woomera? Does he know what level it is? Does he really know what it is?

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Schubert would be better off not to respond to interjections that are, of course, out of order anyway. The member for Schubert will continue with relevant remarks.

Mr VENNING: Thank you, sir; I hope that you judged my previous remarks as relevant until the minister got me off the track. I think that it is not Australian to say, 'We want to store only South Australian waste in South Australia.' That is very un-Australian. We all own our Australian icons—own this one, as unpopular as it might be. I think that having a referendum on such an issue, when we all know what the answer will be, is bad, and to play the blackmail pawn makes it twice as bad. I only hope that, in this instance (and the way in which this parliament is structured), reason will prevail.

I know that some members opposite know and hope that the people who control the power in here—the members for Fisher and Hammond—will see the light and address this problem. Certainly, I oppose this motion because I do not believe that commonsense is prevailing here. I live in hope that we will come up with a rational debate. We must address this issue. The waste is already stored at Woomera; the waste is already stored in our city of Adelaide and in some of our regional towns. What is the government going to do about it—run away from it and hide behind a referendum? A referendum will say no, and where are you then? What will you do with your medium and high level waste? What are you going to do with those? The government has not addressed that issue. We must also have a repository somewhere for that. I certainly look forward to the minister's response to this debate. I do not support the legislation.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I give this bill my strong support and congratulate the Minister for the Environment on his efforts to get this bill before the house so quickly. This legislation was a commitment that the Labor Party gave to the South Australian public prior to the last state election. It addresses an issue of real concern to our community—a concern that the federal Liberal government has discounted and disregarded. They have got South Australia in their sights and their intention is quite clear. Well, this bill and this government are about letting them know it will not be a 'cake walk'. We know that the commonwealth could override our legislation, but unlike the opposition we will not sit by silently and let them run roughshod over our community and over our state.

The shadow minister, in his address to this house, claimed this bill was a political stunt designed to take up the time of the house. The problem is, the opposition think that listening to the people and responding to their needs and concerns is a stunt. They think that a government that is prepared to voice its view, voice the view of its community and stand up to those who want to run roughshod over us is somehow not acting appropriately.

Well, if the opposition thinks that listening to and responding to the people of this state is a stunt, we are guilty. If they think that standing up for our state, saying that we are not prepared to let them turn us into the nuclear dumping ground for Australia—and ultimately the rest of the world—is a stunt, then we are guilty. I have yet to hear any reasonable argument as to why South Australia should be the location for a national repository for nuclear waste.

In South Australia we produce waste. We acknowledge that. We acknowledge we have a responsibility to deal with that waste; and the minister has indicated a number of measures to be taken in this regard. We need to know where it is, how it is being stored and how best to store it. I do not, in any way, profess to be an expert in this area, but the proposal to bury low level and short-lived intermediate radioactive waste in drums, in the middle of the desert, seems to me to be fraught with danger and uncertainty and, let's be clear, when we are talking about low level and short-lived intermediate waste we are talking about waste that is hazardous for 30 years and radioactive for 300 years.

It is this level of waste that the federal Liberals want transported around the nation, through our ports, over our roads, through our suburbs and country towns—all of this with no consultation. How do they propose to safely transport this waste? By what means and what routes? All of this information is being held closely to their chest. Well, that is just not good enough, and it is just not on.

And what is the opposition concerned about? Not the dangers; not the lack of consultation; not the concerns of the community. They are concerned that the people of this state might actually get to have a say about it. And we know why that is—because their message would be loud and clear. Mr Howard and his cronies would get a very clear, strong and definite response from the South Australian community. They would be held accountable and that is just exactly what they do not want.

This bill is extremely important. It sends the message that we will not countenance radioactive waste from other

states being transported throughout our state, increasing the risk enormously to our residents. And if the federal Liberals attempt to establish a facility in this state to store or dispose of long-lived intermediate or high-level waste, this bill allows the voice of our community to be heard. The minister will have the power to call a referendum to allow that to happen.

In that case we are talking about radioactive waste which is hazardous for 10 000 years and radioactive for 250 000 years. I cannot believe what I have been hearing from the opposition. They are arguing for the residents of this state not to be able to have a say about the establishment of a nuclear dump here in our state. They seem to be supporting it. Can you believe it? Somehow they equate not allowing our state to be the dumping state with saying that we do not think people should have smoke alarms or that medical procedures would be affected. Their arguments have to be heard to be believed.

It is not going to be a dump, they are telling us. It is going to be repository. Well, let me tell you: if it looks like a dump and smells like a dump, the likelihood is that it is going to be a dump. I wonder if the leakage from a nuclear repository would be any different from that of the nuclear dump?

In his ministerial statement to this house several weeks ago, the Premier reminded us about the damage and costs inflicted on our state as a result of the atomic tests undertaken at Maralinga in the 1950s and 1960s. Our soldiers were exposed to radiation, our land was contaminated, and Aboriginal people lost their homes. What were we told at the time? Everything was fine. What did it cost to clean up? Somewhere in the vicinity of \$100 million, and we cannot put a cost on the lives lost and destroyed as a result of that testing.

This bill is about our children's future; it is about protecting our environment; and it is about protecting our image as a clean green state. The establishment of a national nuclear dump in South Australia has the potential to wreak havoc on our food and tourism industries. I am very pleased to give the bill my strong support.

The Hon. J.D. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.52 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 9 July at 2 p.m.