

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 December 2002

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

MITSUBISHI ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRIALS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates and commends the South Australian Tourism Commission, Australian Major Events and all others involved in organising the 2002 Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials;
- (b) thanks all volunteers, South Australia Police and Ambulance Service and other emergency services personnel involved; and
- (c) calls on the government to continue funding and other support in future years.

The Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials are another outstanding example of how Adelaide does it so well in regard to major events that attract tourism numbers and dollars to this state. This year, these horse trials were conducted from 7 to 10 November.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members wish to conduct conversations, they should sit beside each other in the benches. It is highly disorderly for members to turn their back on the chair and/or to continue conversations between a member speaking and the chair. The member for Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: It was a fabulous program in the parklands that involved on Wednesday the 6th some inspection and preparation; on the 7th, a galloping breakfast and course walk, as well as dressage; and, on the 8th, a series of events, including a course walk and horseland dressage, all held in the area of the Victoria Park Racecourse. In the evening, there was actually a horseland cinema among the stars and a series of competitive events. On Saturday 9 November, Adelaide City Council Cross Country Day, there were some fabulous races of all classes in the east parklands. It was a free day for a lot of the public. On Sunday 10 November, there was a Trot Up, with an inspection of horses and other serious racing and competitive events. And, of course, the R.M. Williams Show Jumping Day occurred on Sunday 10 November.

Those who attended (as I did) would have been thrilled with some outstanding international standard competition. Indeed, the way in which the event organisers and AME had set up the racecourse and the competitive track was really most interesting. The horses bounded into the lake and over obstacles in the lake and in the parklands—Mitsubishi vehicles were set up as obstacles over which the horses had to jump. The spectators could get right up close to the action. There was a whole range of stands and stalls for food, clothing and all sorts of things to be purchased. It was really quite a festive day. It was beautiful weather, too, I hasten to add. It was really just a fabulous day all around.

This international standard competitive event, which is a four star competition (that is Olympic standard), has been held here in Adelaide now for many years. There are only three other four star competitions held annually in the world. The Badminton event was cancelled last year due to foot and mouth disease, but I think it was held again this year. But there are other events held in Burgley in the UK and Lexing-

ton in Kentucky in the United States. So, it really is an international standard event, and one of only a few in the world that we have created here, and it gets better from year to year. The fact that it is an Olympic standard competition augurs well for Adelaide's and Australia's reputation in the international horse competitive community and, of course, provides an excellent focus for horse riding and for international horse competitors from around the globe as they attend to participate in the event.

The event has strong commercial sponsorship from Mitsubishi, in particular—and, interestingly, I understand that Mitsubishi also sponsors the badminton event. So, it is part of its global network, if you like, of promotion. The other sponsors include the Adelaide City Council and R.M. Williams, which were principal sponsors. There were, of course, other sponsors, such as Cooper's, Singapore Airlines, Channel 9, Horseland, ATCO Power, Bowden Printing, senet, Novotel, Clipsal, Winergy and MIX 102.3. Of course, without these sponsors, events such as this simply would not be possible. I want to make a point to those sponsors that the opposition—and, I am sure, the house—really appreciates their involvement in the event. Not only is it of benefit to them, but it is also of benefit to the event and to Adelaide as a whole. I hope that they continue and that new sponsors turn up to join the throng. It is interesting that you see the same old South Australian legends there, with Coopers, MIX 102.3, Clipsal, of course, and the other sponsors that I mentioned. They are there all the time ready to support South Australia.

The event, of course, involved leading international experts as part of the set-up and competitive arrangements. The event committee included the Chairman, Mr Zane Treloar, the Deputy Chairman, Bob Hennig, and a long list of committee members. Zane Treloar did an outstanding job as the event director and, of course, the involvement of Mike Etherington-Smith from the UK as a technical delegate, and other delegates from international points of origin, as part of the ground jury, made the event quite special indeed.

The television coverage was quite extensive. Not only was the event put to air here in South Australia but the television coverage found its way interstate and overseas, and will thus generate a very substantial benefit back to South Australia through that coverage. The sort of thing that people are seeing as they watch the International Horse Trials on TV are not only the parklands but the city as a whole, and shorts of South Australia in the lead-up to coverage of the event. It really provides a focus for tourism operators and others to leverage opportunities off the event, as occurs with all our major events.

There are some issues with this event, and one of the most important is whether or not the government will maintain its commitment to the event, which, because it has been run so successfully, is gaining in international stature. My understanding is that the economic and media impact of the International Horse Trials is around \$3.5 million per event and an annual contract has been entered into. The former government budgeted a figure of around \$650 000 for each of the next three years to fund the event. Other states have shown considerable interest in this event and, as is so often the case, and as we learnt so ruefully with the poaching of the Formula 1 Grand Prix by Melbourne, it is an event that needs to be looked after if it is to be retained.

It is important for South Australia to commit for a further five years if the event is to be kept as a principal icon in our tourism events calendar. The opposition calls on the govern-

ment to continue with that support and to make clear its position on the future of the event, because we see it as a very important part of the major events calendar. It is different from the other events, there is no question about that. It is not the Clipsal 500, it is not the tennis, it is not the Tour Down Under—it is a different type of event and it attracts a different type of audience. In our major events calendar, surely that is what we want: a balanced array of activities in which people can participate.

There are some issues apart from funding that are important if the event is to succeed. One of those issues is what the government has planned for Victoria Park racecourse. The event is run not only out of the parklands but out of the adjacent Victoria Park racecourse, and a lot of infrastructure in the racecourse is vital to the successful conduct of the event. There has been a bit of uncertainty about the future of Victoria Park racecourse, so perhaps the government will shortly clarify the position, not only for the International Horse Trials but for other stakeholders interested in that outcome. I note that the Minister for Tourism is in the chamber. If she chooses to respond to this motion on behalf of the government (and I note that she has responded to only one motion so far that I am aware of), perhaps she can sort out what is likely to happen in regard to the racecourse.

My understanding is that about 50 000 people attended the event this year. That is a stunning result, and perhaps in a statement to the house in the new year the minister can confirm that once the wrap-up of the event is complete. If it was 50 000, then it was certainly successful. It occurred on the same day as the Credit Union Christmas Pageant. A lot of people might have gone to the pageant in the morning and then taken the family to the horse trials in the afternoon and made it quite a family day. It was a good strategic fit with the Christmas Pageant. As I mentioned earlier, it was the sixth event at this four star level—which really is at the top—that has been held in Adelaide, and I understand it is the third that Mitsubishi has been involved in sponsoring.

There are also some issues in regard to quarantine. International competitors are having to bring in their horses from overseas, and because of quarantine arrangements that can take some time. That is another area which perhaps the government can help the horse competition industry resolve for future events, and maybe there are ways to trim that up.

Getting back to the issue of the budget, all the matters I have raised—the Victoria Park racecourse, the quarantine issue and the amount of government funding—impinge on the overall budget for the event which, I understand, is about \$1.2 million for the cost of running the whole thing. I hope the government is able to see its way through those challenges to guarantee a secure future for the event. There is also the opportunity to extend and diversify by getting future events out of Adelaide and into the regions a little more. Maybe there is an opportunity to run some build-up or wind-down events either side of the horse trial. These are all things the government might like to explore in the future as it looks at ways to add value to the event.

The police, emergency services and Adelaide City Council personnel involved in the event should give themselves one massive pat on the back. There were issues to do with traffic management, St John and emergency services; and certainly an enormous number of issues to do with coordination with the local Adelaide community had to be dealt with by the council as well as the police and others. All those were handled with aplomb under the guidance and tutelage of Australian Major Events—that outstanding organisation

within the Tourism Commission which does such a splendid job bringing these events to us and providing opportunities for tourist operators to hinge off them to bring people to the state; that fabulous organisation which the opposition feels is doing a marvellous job and which we feel is not dysfunctional but playing a very effective role in building and promoting tourism, unlike the minister, who seems to feel that it is dysfunctional. It is a credit to the organisers. I hope that we see many more successful international horse trials in the future and that the government continues its support.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): It is with much pleasure that I rise to support this motion. I personally have a long history of association with three-day and one-day events. I rode in the Gawler three-day event many years ago and, while I was never able to succeed in that event at the level of many of the current riders, particularly Gillian Rolton and Wendy Schaeffer, I certainly thoroughly enjoy watching these elite athletes who have brought so much pleasure to all South Australians.

I was absolutely shocked by the rumour that was going around the international horse trials a few weekends ago that the current Labor government would not continue funding for this event and that it would be scrapped. It is my understanding that this event is the second most popular event in the parklands after the V8 races, and we saw what wonderful accolades the V8 races got. The Adelaide International Horse Trials is one of only four four-star events in the world: it is the only four-star event in the southern hemisphere. To even consider not supporting an event such as this and so give someone such as the Victorians or the New South Wales people even a slight inkling that there may be an opportunity to steal the event away (in the same way that they stole the Grand Prix) is something about which we must be very careful.

Moving the international horse trials to Adelaide was a very positive move. Although the Gawler course was a fantastic course, not only for spectators but also for riders, unfortunately, it took a compass and a packed lunch to get around the cross-country course. Even though spectators will never be able to watch the horses on the roads and track section, the showjumping, the dressage, and particularly the cross-country course, are becoming more popular every year. I believe that 50 000 to 60 000 people watched the cross-country on the Saturday. It is a free event. It costs a lot, which is why we are looking for good sponsorship. Once again, as with many other things in this state such as the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and the Wine Centre, that is why we must not talk it down: we have to be positive. This event is something that will be recognised around the world. As I have previously said, it is one of only a few four-star equestrian three-day events in the world. It is something we have to be very careful to protect.

The level of expertise and professional input into this event is something which makes me proud to be a South Australian and to talk about it. The riders put in many hours and many thousands of dollars in preparing for this event. I personally know that to run one horse in events at a lower level is a very expensive enterprise. They do not call them 'hayburners' for nothing: they are certainly money burners as well. It costs thousands of dollars. It involves not only the cost of the horse but also the cost of the equipment, the truck to get them around the place, the cost of the grooms to help look after the horses and certainly the veterinary costs involved in maintaining them at their peak physical condition.

The vets on course who maintain these horses in peak physical condition and ensure that they are fit to continue should be congratulated. Many of my friends who are veterinarians participate on the day. They are all in close radio contact on the day. A horse that is even a little bit suspect will be eliminated from the event. Riders may not be aware sometimes of the way their horses are performing, but a professional eye will be able to assess the way in which the horse is performing. There are too many vets to mention on that course during the day. Nearly every jump has a vet next to it or close by. As well as the vets, there are many experienced stewards. My sister-in-law is one of the chief stewards. She has world wide experience in stewarding at these types of events, particularly at the Sydney Olympics.

The level of networking of the logistics that has been put in place to maintain this event as a world leader is something of which we have to be very proud. A small thing I did pick up while talking to some people at this event was that we had a South Australian first at this event as far as safety for the horses was concerned. When the horses jump obstacles, which are very substantial—and they have to be to ensure the horse does not go crashing through them—the object is to make the horse jump clearly, and, if it is a solid object, the horses tend to jump clearly. However, what we have in South Australia—it was the first time it was ever used in the world—is a special type of pin to hold the jumps together which will fracture at a critical spot if there is a slip or an accident, and so the horse will not be put in undue danger. Certainly, we are very confident that the spectacular flips that have been seen at past events will not occur in the future.

This event will continue to be held in South Australia only if the government backs both it and the infrastructure behind it. The South Australian Horse Academy, being promoted by Horse SA, is something the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing needs to get behind. Unfortunately, we hear statements that no money will be spent on sporting infrastructure. I remind the house that the horse industry is worth \$8 billion—I repeat, \$8 billion—to the Australian economy. I am not sure what the portion is in South Australia, but I think it ranks in the billions of dollars. Approximately 17 500 people work in the horse industry in South Australia and there are 3 500 full-time employees.

In this week's *Adelaidian*, there is the announcement of a new horse research centre being established at the Roseworthy campus of the University of Adelaide. The people who are establishing this new research institute recognise the input to the economy from the equine industries. It is very important that we allow an opportunity, such as the Adelaide International Horse Trials, to expose South Australia to international acclaim and to promote not lycra-clad tourists, about whom the minister was talking the other day, but,

rather, leather-clad tourists, with their expertise, enthusiasm and money. If the government handles things correctly, they will bring their horses as well.

The member for Waite was talking about quarantine problems. Horses from all over the world came to South Australia a number of years ago when they held the World Championships at Gawler. I was vetting at the Reynella Horse Trials, which were held before the Gawler event, and I spoke to many competitors. They were rapt that they could travel to Australia with their horses. The quarantine problems were not insurmountable. At Glenelg, at the Metropolitan Showjumping Club, which is right next to the Adelaide Airport, we have the ideal situation to bring in horses to South Australia and maintain them in a quarantine situation. We can bring them in, allow them to compete and fly them home again.

As a result of initiative and input from this government, we could establish an international quality facility at the Metropolitan Showjumping Club. The Olympic training squad was practising there recently. I spoke to the Olympic coach, who believes that the ground at Glenelg is one of the best grounds, if not the best showjumping ground, in Australia. It is similar to the Adelaide International Horse Trials cross-country course, and we should not be overlooking its facilities. It is very important that this house should be aware of the economic impact of the equine industries to South Australia—not just the fantastic spectacle we are seeing at the International Horse Trials in the parklands.

Showjumping and cross-country events are some of the most popular spectator sports on television overseas. That will happen here, if we get the sponsors. The sponsors will go there only if the government is seen to be supporting it. Certainly, the people of South Australia support the International Horse Trials, and I congratulate everyone associated with the event. I urge the minister and this government to ensure that they stay behind the equestrian industries and the International Horse Trials.

Mr SNELLING secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: During estimates earlier this year, I asked a question about expenditure in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. For reasons beyond my control, the answer has only now come into my possession. Without passing judgment on the statistical information, I seek leave to have the answer inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Appendix A

Summary of Expenditure per Person by Category

American Express Purchase Card (Credit Card) Expenditure: 1 June 1997—31 December 2001

Category	J.W. Olsen	V.F. Thomson	Total
Airlines	954.92	4 343.87	5 298.79
All Other	-	60.00	60.00
Auto Services	-	156.76	156.76
Car Rental	-	689.96	689.96
Department Stores	-	791.30	791.30
Lodging	90 085.81	59 941.00	150 026.81

Appendix A

Summary of Expenditure per Person by Category

American Express Purchase Card (Credit Card) Expenditure: 1 June 1997—31 December 2001

Category	J.W. Olsen	V.F. Thomson	Total
Mail Order	149.95	-	149.95
Other Services	37.32	518.14	555.46
Restaurants	3 413.75	26 282.42	29 696.17
Retail—Other	255.80	1 228.03	1 483.83
Travel Agents	-	50.00	50.00
<i>Not Classified</i> (mostly Overseas Lodging)	85 458.20	147 163.91	232 622.11
Total	\$180 355.75	\$241 225.39	\$421 581.14

<u>John Olsen—combined cards</u>			
<u>Card Use June 1997 to December 2001</u>			
Industry Definition: RETAIL—OTHER			
21/12/1999 HAIGH'S CHOCOLATES	\$255.80	06/01/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$357.25
Total RETAIL—OTHER	\$255.80	07/01/1998 REGENCY CLUB	\$773.22
Industry Definition: RESTAURANTS		08/01/1998 GRAND HYATT JAKARTA	\$1,333.15
21/10/1997 GEKKOS LANDING REST BAR	\$81.70	19/01/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$267.20
05/11/1997 ALPHUTTE RESTAURANT	\$168.10	01/02/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$572.00
31/12/1997 PARLAMENTO	\$50.00	03/02/1998 THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$1,012.15
09/01/1998 PARLAMENTO	\$45.00	11/02/1998 McLAREN VALE MOTEL	\$164.35
09/02/1998 WOODSTOCK COTERIE	\$28.00	13/02/1998 THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$1,311.15
12/02/1998 OTTOMAN CUISINE	\$115.00	08/03/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$1,392.78
14/02/1998 MARCELLINA RESTAURANT	\$29.80	13/03/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$878.55
03/03/1998 GEKKOS LANDING REST BAR	\$95.00	15/03/1998 THE HERITAGE	\$474.05
13/03/1998 THE COFFEE CLUB CAFE AT WEST END	\$97.40	17/03/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$288.00
24/05/1998 PAPAARAZZI	\$129.00	20/03/1998 HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$669.35
25/06/1998 YOTS CAFE RESTAURANT	\$147.35	27/03/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$273.82
17/07/1998 PAPAARAZZI	\$44.80	01/05/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$270.58
21/01/1999 THE LION HOTEL	\$62.00	06/05/1998 HOTEL IMPERIAL KUALA LUMPUR	\$1,151.98
22/01/1999 THE STAG HOTEL	\$77.80	10/06/1998 Ng-h Nbain negTc	\$2,645.06
04/02/1999 THE LION HOTEL	\$45.00	15/06/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$228.35
24/03/1999 STANLEYS SEAFOOD RESTAURANT	\$90.00	29/06/1998 CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$680.30
14/04/1999 THE OXFORD NTH ADELAIDE	\$201.50	02/07/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$270.00
29/06/1999 JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$122.00	03/07/1998 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$18.00
11/08/1999 JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$92.00	16/07/1998 HYATT REGENCY COOLUM	\$172.80
26/08/1999 STANLEYS SEAFOOD RESTAURANT	\$41.00	28/07/1998 PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$75.00
01/11/1999 WINDY POINT RESTAURANT	\$180.00	29/07/1998 PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$110.00
08/12/1999 STANLEYS SEAFOOD RESTAURANT	\$40.00	10/08/1998 HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$585.65
17/01/2000 PARLAMENTO	\$20.00	11/08/1998 LIMANI MOTEL	\$95.00
23/03/2000 RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$42.20	23/08/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$1,531.90
27/05/2000 ITALIAN VILLAGE REST/TAVERNE	\$34.00	25/08/1998 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$161.00
07/06/2000 GOUGER FISH CAFE	\$59.60	20/09/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$253.10
11/07/2000 PARLAMENTO	\$50.00	26/09/1998 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$306.00
17/08/2000 LA CASALINGA REST	\$395.10	07/10/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$28.90
17/08/2000 LA CASALINGA REST	\$10.00	07/10/1998 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$307.60
17/01/2001 THE HOUSE OF ROBERT TIMMS	\$11.10	20/10/1998 THE JOHN PIRIE MOTOR INN	\$96.10
21/02/2001 STANLEYS SEAFOOD RESTAURANT	\$97.50	13/11/1998 HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$981.85
07/04/2001 TRIBECCA	\$246.00	18/01/1999 SH PUDONG NEW AREA SHANGRI-LA HO	\$45.32
08/05/2001 FLOWERDRUM MARKET LANE P/L	\$183.90	21/01/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$416.10
18/06/2001 STANLEYS SEAFOOD RESTAURANT	\$31.00	31/01/1999 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$412.15
26/07/2001 RED OCHRE GRILL	\$250.70	25/02/1999 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$590.00
Total RESTAURANTS	\$3,413.75	26/02/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$588.75
Industry Definition: OTHER SERVICES		01/03/1999 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$406.40
14/07/2000 SINGAPORE TELECOM	\$1.01	06/03/1999 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$104.00
14/07/2000 SINGAPORE TELECOM	\$1.31	08/04/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$340.75
03/08/2001 MIRROR AUST TELEGRAPH PUBC	\$35.00	09/04/1999 HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$599.90
Total OTHER SERVICES	\$37.32	07/05/1999 GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$744.27
Industry Definition: MAIL ORDER		08/05/1999 GRAND HYATT TAIPEI	\$395.13
17/09/2001 CROWN CONTENT P/L-INFORMATION AU	\$149.95	22/05/1999 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$115.00
Total MAIL ORDER	\$149.95	27/05/1999 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$53.00
Industry Definition: LODGING		02/06/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$1,094.10
23/07/1997 MILLENNIUM HOTEL SYDNEY	\$328.40	13/06/1999 PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$536.95
19/08/1997 GEKKO RESTAURANT	\$161.25	02/07/1999 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$140.04
03/09/1997 GRAND HYATT BALI	\$509.68	04/07/1999 HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$996.75
31/10/1997 GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$859.90	05/07/1999 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$390.00
06/11/1997 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$299.25	11/07/1999 CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$675.35
07/11/1997 THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$656.25	24/07/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$23.50
18/11/1997 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$488.85	24/07/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$660.25
29/11/1997 GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$7,295.80	13/08/1999 HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$27.50
		24/08/1999 GRAND HYATT BALI	\$197.90
		29/08/1999 HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL	\$697.45
		09/09/1999 SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$404.35

25/09/1999	GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$382.40	10/10/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$930.36
30/09/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$370.00	22/10/2001	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$235.00
11/10/1999	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$469.23	06/11/2001	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	<u>\$510.31</u>
16/10/1999	GRAND HYATT SINGAPORE	\$1,023.06		Total LODGING	\$90,085.81
28/10/1999	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$242.15	Industry Definition: AIRLINES		
23/11/1999	GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$360.02	12/10/1999	GRAND HYATT SEOUL MIRAMAR CO.	\$954.92
02/12/1999	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$443.40	15/07/2001	ANSETT AUSTRALIA - DIRECT SALES	\$474.54
11/12/1999	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$236.75	15/07/2001	ANSETT AUSTRALIA - DIRECT SALES	-\$474.54
19/01/2000	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$685.00	15/07/2001	ANSETT AUSTRALIA - DIRECT SALES	-\$474.54
20/01/2000	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$9.00		Total AIRLINES	\$954.92
26/01/2000	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$628.85	Industry Definition:		
08/02/2000	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$317.15	07/09/1998	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M, PARIS	\$3,450.19
16/02/2000	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$92.00	09/09/1998	HOTEL VILLA MAGNA, MADRID	\$2,646.67
22/02/2000	LAKES RESORT—MT GAMBIER	\$226.80	15/09/1998	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$10,502.85
25/02/2000	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$298.35	16/09/1998	GRAND HYATT NEW YORK NEW YORK N	\$2,142.03
26/02/2000	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$30.00	19/09/1998	WALDORF ASTORIA NEW YORK, NY	\$2,416.97
13/03/2000	GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$549.09	12/10/1998	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTO	\$1,736.53
15/03/2000	HYATT REGENCY PERTH	\$897.35	14/10/1998	NORTH RALEIGH HILTON RALEIGH NC	\$323.71
16/04/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$871.92	14/10/1998	NORTH RALEIGH HILTON RALEIGH NC	\$460.50
29/04/2000	WGTN PARKROYAL HOTEL	\$808.32	16/10/1998	HOTEL INTER-CONTINENTAL CHICAGO IL	\$977.50
28/05/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$1,946.69	27/04/1999	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M. PARIS	\$3,236.08
28/05/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$24.75	29/04/1999	SALE E PEPPE, LONDON	\$235.28
30/05/2000	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$395.50	30/04/1999	CAFFE VENEZIA RISTORANTE, LONDON	\$326.16
31/05/2000	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$386.00	04/05/1999	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$17,810.55
16/06/2000	HYATT REGENCY SANCTUARY COVE	\$454.20	04/05/1999	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$10,084.69
23/06/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	-\$24.75	09/05/1999	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$2,428.96
27/06/2000	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$102.00	21/09/1999	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTON	\$900.76
30/06/2000	GRAND HYATT SINGAPORE	\$341.17	14/10/1999	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$1,343.41
09/07/2000	GRAND HYATT SINGAPORE	\$615.26	28/01/2000	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$2014.01
21/08/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$18.35	30/01/2000	ATHENAEUM INTER-CONTINENTAL HTL	\$957.13
21/08/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$1,187.70	01/02/2000	CYPRUS HILTON LTD NICOSIA	\$1,831.04
30/08/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$434.84	02/02/2000	RIST.MINA TORINO	\$120.76
02/09/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$405.80	03/02/2000	HOTEL LE MEREDIEN LINGOTT TORINO	\$1,561.20
09/09/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$418.60	02/07/2000	HILTON ITALIANA S.R.L., ROMA RM	\$1,672.66
12/09/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$11.00	30/07/2000	HYATT REGENCY NEWPORT LDG NEWP	\$4,363.25
12/09/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$428.16	01/08/2000	SHERATON VALLEY FORG KING OF PRUS	\$531.78
17/09/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$3,098.95	01/08/2000	SHERATON VALLEY FORG KING OF PRUS	\$1,171.77
21/09/2000	ALBURY MANOR HOUSE	\$1,106.75	04/08/2000	SHERATON VALLEY FORG KING OF PRUS	\$478.72
22/09/2000	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$555.08	04/08/2000	HYATT AT FISHERMAN S SAN FRANCISC	\$2,095.87
24/09/2000	ANA HOTEL SYDNEY	\$243.30	04/02/2001	CHICAGO BEACH HOTEL, DUBAI	\$8,284.55
28/09/2000	ALBURY MANOR HOUSE	\$232.00	05/02/2001	CHICAGO BEACH HOTEL, DUBAI	-\$8,308.99
30/09/2000	GRAND HYATT JAKARTA	\$1,647.17	05/02/2001	CHICAGO BEACH HOTEL, DUBAI	-\$8,308.99
21/10/2000	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$2,464.49	12/06/2001	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$4,863.49
23/10/2000	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$314.00	15/06/2001	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M, PARIS	<u>\$2,798.12</u>
04/11/2000	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$319.38		Total	\$85,458.20
01/12/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$660.30		Total Spend	\$180,355.75
02/12/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$24.71	<u>Vicki Thomson</u>		
10/12/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$948.50	<u>Card Use June 1997 to December 2001</u>		
13/12/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$129.00	Industry Definition: TRAVEL AGENTS		
01/01/2001	HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL	\$22.80	25/11/2000	ARKAROOOLA PTY LTD	<u>\$50.00</u>
04/01/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$29.50		Total TRAVEL AGENTS	\$50.00
04/01/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$3,144.38	Industry Definition: RETAIL—OTHER		
17/01/2001	STAMFORD GRAND	\$65.10	29/11/1997	ANGEL BEAUTY HOUSE	\$83.51
25/01/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$545.56	10/10/1998	DOWNTOWN DUTY FREE	#133.90
08/02/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$621.51	27/01/1999	SOUTHERN CROSS CELLARS	\$119.70
09/02/2001	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$492.90	17/09/1999	DOWNTOWN DUTY FREE	\$79.90
19/02/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$339.30	22/12/2000	HAIGH'S CHOCOLATES	\$197.40
19/02/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$382.60	08/08/2001	SCARPANTONI ESTATE WINES P/L	\$388.80
09/03/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$762.59	08/08/2001	MARIENBERG WINES LIMEBURNERS CEN	\$107.47
12/03/2001	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$1,936.65	18/10/2001	ABC SHOP ADELAIDE	\$117.35
27/03/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$1,211.75	19/10/2001	ROYAL OAK HOTEL BOTTLE SHOP	\$2,237.83
20/04/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$1,812.81	24/10/2001	ROYAL OAK HOTEL BOTTLE SHOP	<u>-\$2,237.83</u>
10/05/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$265.00		Total RETAIL—OTHER	\$1,228.03
10/05/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$2,027.65	Industry Definition: RESTAURANTS		
25/06/2001	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$351.95	07/07/1997	THE UNIVERSAL WINEBAR	\$54.40
27/06/2001	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$118.45	11/07/1997	AMOROSA RESTAURANT	\$27.50
14/07/2001	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$433.05	16/07/1997	CAFE ISABELLA	\$52.60
18/07/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$908.00	18/07/1997	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$57.20
25/07/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$1,012.64	21/07/1997	PARLAMENTO	\$39.00
03/08/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$62.70	25/07/1997	PARLAMENTO	\$29.30
03/08/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$633.21	28/07/1997	RED OCHRE GRILL	\$86.50
11/08/2001	GRAND HYATT BALI	\$367.72	11/08/1997	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$35.30
22/08/2001	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$170.00	20/08/1997	AMADORA RESTAURANT	\$41.00
04/09/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$874.78	28/08/1997	THE UNIVERSAL WINEBAR	\$380.80
20/09/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$918.82			
02/10/2001	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$78.50			

01/09/1997	BOTTICELLI BISTRO	\$55.60	21/12/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$38.00
03/09/1997	THE BOTANIC CAFE	\$97.00	18/01/1999	PESCATORE	\$30.60
04/09/1997	THE BOTANIC CAFE	\$43.00	20/01/1999	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$116.00
09/09/1997	GRAND TASMAN HOTEL	\$42.10	22/01/1999	AMARIN THAI RESTAURANT	\$70.40
11/09/1997	RED OCHRE GRILL	\$90.00	29/01/1999	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$85.20
15/09/1997	EVIDA CAFE BAR GRILL	\$68.30	03/02/1999	CAON'S RESTAURANT	\$44.00
19/09/1997	CAFE PARADISO	\$35.20	04/02/1999	THE GRANGE JETTY KIOSK	\$136.50
20/09/1997	FISHERMANS GROTTTO	\$104.95	11/02/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$46.50
22/09/1997	CHIANTI RESTAURANT PTY LTD	\$60.00	12/02/1999	ALPHUTTE RESTAURANT	\$83.50
27/09/1997	ZIO JOE ITALIAN RESTAURANT	\$158.70	16/02/1999	NEW SAIGON	\$64.00
15/10/1997	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$103.00	19/02/1999	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$55.00
17/10/1997	THE RIVER-SEAFOOD GRILL	\$74.50	23/02/1999	FLOWERDRUM MARKET LANE P/L	\$228.70
21/10/1997	THE OXFORD NTH ADELAIDE	\$95.60	16/03/1999	AMADORA RESTAURANT	\$80.30
23/10/1997	PARLAMENTO	\$55.80	31/03/1999	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$63.00
30/10/1997	THE STAG HOTEL	\$43.50	07/04/1999	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$68.70
05/11/1997	LENA'S	\$37.80	20/04/1999	ALPHUTTE RESTAURANT	\$157.60
13/11/1997	PARLAMENTO	\$19.40	20/05/1999	CAFFE PAESANO	\$34.00
17/11/1997	THE STAG HOTEL	\$64.70	27/05/1999	MARCELLINA RESTAURANT	\$38.80
20/11/1997	GEKKOS LANDING REST BAR	\$407.50	03/06/1999	THE LION HOTEL	\$1,717.80
29/11/1997	THE REGENT H K—LOBBY LOUNGE	\$77.87	04/06/1999	STAR OF SIAM	\$22.40
02/12/1997	PARLAMENTO	\$96.60	08/06/1999	BOTANIC GARDENS REST	\$198.80
12/12/1997	FISHCAF RESTAURANT	\$53.90	10/06/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$52.20
15/12/1997	GEKKOS LANDING REST BAR	\$99.60	18/06/1999	ROCOCO CAFE	\$31.30
14/01/1998	RED OCHRE GRILL	\$35.00	23/06/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$10.00
15/01/1998	THE UNIVERSAL WINEBAR	\$59.70	30/06/1999	ECCOLO RESTAURANT	\$114.50
16/01/1998	BACCHUS WINE BAR	\$84.50	02/07/1999	BLAKES	\$181.00
20/01/1998	THE BOTANIC CAFE	\$87.90	07/07/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$37.00
21/01/1998	KENZAN	\$180.00	07/07/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$38.10
02/02/1998	THE ATLANTIC	\$154.00	18/07/1999	CHAFF MILL RESTAURANT	\$301.80
02/02/1998	CASTLE CATERING SERVICES	\$25.20	22/07/1999	QUAY	\$534.00
04/02/1998	CAFE GREAT SPACE	\$21.00	30/07/1999	ALPHUTTE RESTAURANT	\$206.50
04/02/1998	BISTRO ONE	\$175.50	31/07/1999	DON'S TABLE RESTAURANT	\$202.50
05/02/1998	HISTORIAN HOTEL	\$51.60	04/08/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$30.50
06/02/1998	CAFE TAPAS	\$50.20	06/08/1999	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$123.00
12/02/1998	CASTLE CATERING SERVICES	\$19.00	07/08/1999	YOTS CAFE RESTAURANT	\$255.70
16/02/1998	MARCELLINA RESTAURANT	\$111.00	31/08/1999	STAR OF SIAM	\$72.90
26/02/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$25.40	07/09/1999	FRASERS RESTAURANT	\$372.60
02/03/1998	C K FOOD AT THE ART GALLERY	\$54.50	11/09/1999	BERTINI'S CAFE BAR & RESTAURANT	\$81.40
04/03/1998	GRIMALDI'S	\$35.60	27/09/1999	ROCOCO CAFE	\$35.20
14/03/1998	BRISBANE CONVENTION & EXHIBITION C	\$48.20	30/09/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$53.90
19/03/1998	SANTA LUCIA TRATTORIA	\$174.00	01/10/1999	SCHMITTY'S GARAGE	\$403.40
23/03/1998	AMADORA RESTAURANT	\$49.00	06/10/1999	PARLAMENTO	\$78.50
02/04/1998	BOTANIC GARDENS REST	\$78.60	08/10/1999	ULTIMATE OCCASIONS	\$85.00
08/04/1998	C K FOOD AT THE ART GALLERY	\$77.50	22/10/1999	C K FOOD AT THE ART GALLERY	\$89.50
09/04/1998	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$40.70	27/10/1999	CAFE PARADISO	\$37.00
14/04/1998	BIN 273	\$56.40	05/11/1999	SCHMITTY'S GARAGE	\$51.75
27/04/1998	BOTTICELLI BISTRO	\$41.80	22/11/1999	BUZZ CAFE	\$97.00
28/04/1998	CIBO RISTORANTE PASTICCERIA	\$39.30	22/11/1999	YOTS CAFE RESTAURANT	\$48.30
04/05/1998	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$39.70	23/11/1999	POSIEDON CAFE	\$103.10
08/05/1998	PETALUNA'S BRIDGEWATER MILL	\$351.00	23/11/1999	THE HANUMAN THAI RESTAURANT	\$103.00
15/05/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$42.40	13/12/1999	MANNA CAFE	\$38.10
01/06/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$16.00	14/12/1999	SCHMITTY'S GARAGE	\$81.50
19/06/1998	JOLLEY'S BOATHOUSE REST	\$111.50	17/12/1999	THE GRANGE JETTY KIOSK	\$130.50
29/06/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$33.90	21/12/1999	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$77.50
10/07/1998	LA TOMBOLA RESTAURANT	\$72.70	27/12/1999	IRODORI RESTAURANTS	\$139.40
21/07/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$35.00	29/12/1999	THE MAGILL ESTATE	\$307.40
29/07/1998	THE CORNER BISTROT	\$35.00	11/01/2000	THE GRANGE JETTY KIOSK	\$108.00
30/07/1998	THE CORNER BISTROT	\$46.10	18/01/2000	IRODORI RESTAURANTS	\$196.50
31/07/1998	THE STAG HOTEL	\$109.70	08/02/2000	THE RED HERRING	\$183.00
04/08/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$25.00	14/02/2000	ROCOCO CAFE	\$32.30
05/08/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$39.00	16/02/2000	PEE WEES AT THE POINT	\$178.70
11/08/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$74.20	18/02/2000	EUGENES FOOD & WINE	\$99.00
13/08/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$34.00	01/03/2000	EUGENES FOOD & WINE	\$79.00
13/08/1998	CAFE PARADISO	\$66.90	08/03/2000	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$104.50
28/09/1998	CHARLICK'S STORE	\$99.00	11/03/2000	MEAD'S FISH GALLERY	\$449.30
30/09/1998	CHARLICK'S STORE	\$131.50	17/03/2000	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$72.00
26/10/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$17.40	21/03/2000	THE STORE	\$18.60
29/10/1998	PARLAMENTO	\$35.00	22/03/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$33.00
06/11/1998	HENLEY ON SEA	\$39.30	31/03/2000	HENLEY ON SEA	\$39.40
10/11/1998	STRATOS CORK & CLEAVER REST	\$131.60	13/04/2000	FLOWERDRUM MARKET LANE P/L	\$202.40
10/11/1998	MARCELLINA RESTAURANT	\$16.90	20/04/2000	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$73.50
12/11/1998	ROBERTOS TRATTORIA	\$144.50	29/04/2000	MOLLY MALONES	\$4.70
26/11/1998	VIETNAMESE VILLAGE RESTAURANT	\$135.00	29/04/2000	MOLLY MALONES	\$4.70
02/12/1998	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$125.00	29/04/2000	MOLLY MALONES	\$298.82
16/12/1998	STRATOS CORK & CLEAVER REST	\$134.40	29/04/2000	MOLLY MALONES	\$298.82
17/12/1998	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$109.00	01/05/2000	MOLLY MALONES	-\$300.26

02/05/2000	SHED 5 LTD	\$32.80	24/08/2001	RED OCHRE GRILL	\$146.50
02/05/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$30.20	25/08/2001	SALOPIAN INN	\$134.25
03/05/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$16.30	06/09/2001	IRODORI RESTAURANTS	\$141.20
26/05/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$32.20	13/09/2001	THE CHAPEL CAFE	\$34.40
29/05/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$32.00	19/09/2001	JEAN PIERRE AT FRINGE BENEFITS	\$313.50
31/05/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$26.00	20/09/2001	LA CASSALINGA REST	\$93.40
01/06/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$87.70	08/10/2001	WINDY POINT RESTAURANT	\$270.25
10/06/2000	SALOPIAN INN	\$247.50	08/10/2001	WINDY POINT RESTAURANT	\$249.25
15/06/2000	IL CENTRO	\$149.70	08/10/2001	WINDY POINT RESTAURANT	\$270.25
17/06/2000	DAMARI PIZZA PASTA	\$95.20	16/10/2001	THE LION HOTEL	\$46.00
22/06/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$34.80		Total RESTAURANTS	\$26,282.42
23/06/2000	TANTINO	\$48.70		Industry Definition: OTHER SERVICES	
14/07/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$182.00	03/08/1999	BASS SOUTH AUSTRALIA	\$144.00
26/08/2000	ESTIA RESTAURANT	\$204.00	29/10/1999	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$23.00
29/08/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$34.70	24/11/1999	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$40.00
31/08/2000	THE UNIVERSAL WINEBAR	\$116.50	17/02/2000	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$28.00
08/09/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$45.25	22/02/2000	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$28.00
14/09/2000	BUZZ CAFE	\$109.30	25/02/2000	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$14.00
14/09/2000	YOTS CAFE	\$36.90	18/06/2000	ADELAIDE IND TAXI SERVICES	\$33.00
15/09/2000	PEE WEES AT THE POINT	\$91.15	21/08/2000	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$23.60
04/10/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$43.70	16/09/2000	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$44.40
06/10/2000	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$109.30	13/12/2000	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$22.40
13/10/2000	EUGENES FOOD & WINE	\$51.20	30/01/2001	ADELAIDE IND TAXI SERVICES	\$44.00
16/10/2000	CITRUS	\$29.00	27/06/2001	ADELAIDE IND TAX SERVICES	\$4.40
17/10/2000	RED OCHRE GRILL	\$164.60	18/07/2001	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$15.40
18/10/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$46.35	06/08/2001	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$4.00
23/10/2000	THE GRANGE JETTY KIOSK	\$109.55	27/09/2001	ADELAIDE IND TAXI SERVICES	\$19.14
27/10/2000	LA CASALINGA REST	\$103.60	12/10/2001	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$30.80
03/11/2000	SAMMYS ON THE MARINA	\$159.90		Total OTHER SERVICES	\$518.14
15/11/2000	PARLAMENTO	\$35.00		Industry Definition: LODGING	
17/11/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$49.30	24/07/1997	MILLENNIUM HOTEL SYDNEY	\$187.25
18/11/2000	CAFFE STELLA	\$299.70	24/07/1997	MILLENNIUM HOTEL SYDNEY	\$36.00
21/11/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$40.30	10/09/1997	LIMANI MOTEL	\$90.90
22/11/2000	THE HOUSE OF ROBERT TIMMS	\$23.20	27/10/1997	STAMFORD PLAZA ADELAIDE	\$69.50
01/12/2000	RED OCHRE GRILL	\$91.00	30/10/1997	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$140.00
05/12/2000	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$68.55	31/10/1997	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$184.30
10/12/2000	CAFFE STELLA	\$120.30	06/11/1997	THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$197.50
14/12/2000	CASA MIA	\$285.40	07/11/1997	THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$256.80
20/12/2000	MARCELLINA RESTAURANT	\$44.80	18/11/1997	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$353.25
21/12/2000	FISH CAF RESTAURANT	\$72.00	21/01/1998	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$229.75
22/12/2000	THE HOUSE OF ROBERT TIMMS	\$26.20	21/01/1998	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$160.00
27/12/2000	ESTIA RESTAURANT	\$156.50	03/02/1998	THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$57.50
28/12/2000	THE HOUSE OF ROBERT TIMMS	\$22.60	03/02/1998	THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$536.40
28/12/2000	IRODORI RESTAURANT	\$222.70	04/02/1998	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$546.10
26/01/2001	EROS OUZERI	\$79.60	13/02/1998	THE HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$638.65
30/01/2001	IN GOOD TASTE	\$20.00	18/02/1998	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$123.00
08/02/2001	REDDS CAFE RESTAURANT	\$36.00	13/03/1998	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$650.15
12/02/2001	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$43.05	15/03/1998	THE HERITAGE	\$685.80
17/02/2001	SAMMYS ON THE MARINA	\$242.90	20/03/1998	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$239.45
19/02/2001	CAFFE STELLA	\$153.90	20/03/1998	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$70.00
26/02/2001	ROCCO CAFE	\$20.00	18/04/1998	HYATT REGENCY SINGAPORE	\$1,333.69
01/03/2001	THE HOUSE OF ROBERT TIMMS	\$29.20	21/04/1998	HOTEL IMPERIAL KUALA LUMPUR	\$659.82
01/03/2001	CIBO RISTORANTE PASTICCERIA	\$309.70	04/05/1998	GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$420.01
02/03/2001	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$56.75	15/06/1998	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$227.35
08/03/2001	LAS CASALINGA REST	\$150.00	27/06/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$89.00
09/03/2001	MAMMA GETTA	\$24.70	29/06/1998	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$631.85
09/03/2001	GOUGER FISH CAFE	\$172.25	02/07/1998	GRAND HYATT MELBOURNE	\$254.68
16/03/2001	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$56.00	24/07/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$125.90
22/03/2001	LA CASALINGA REST	\$127.10	10/08/1998	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$351.00
23/03/2001	JOLLEYS BOATHOUSE REST	\$162.35	25/08/1998	STAMFORD PLAZA ADELAIDE	\$52.80
29/03/2001	EROS OUZERI	\$167.90	31/08/1998	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$799.50
08/04/2001	GAUCHOS ARGENTINIAN RESTAURANT	\$238.50	02/10/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$237.30
12/04/2001	A TASTE OF SPICE	\$17.10	06/10/1998	RENMARK HOTEL	\$114.90
20/04/2001	SAMMYS ON THE MARINA	\$160.70	20/10/1998	THE JOHN PIRIE MOTOR INN	\$181.35
25/04/2001	MARCELLINA RESTAURANT	\$16.60	27/10/1998	STAMFORD PLAZA ADELAIDE	\$49.30
15/05/2001	PARLAMENTO	\$15.50	09/11/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$62.50
23/05/2001	THE MARINA HOTEL	\$580.75	13/11/1998	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$249.80
26/05/2001	THE GEORGE WINE BAR	\$154.80	16/11/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$116.40
05/06/2001	PARLAMENTO	\$120.00	04/12/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$175.30
07/06/2001	THE ATLANTIC	\$290.00	09/12/1998	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$157.50
17/06/2001	FLOWERDRUM MARKET LANE P/L	\$432.00	11/12/1998	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$105.00
21/06/2001	PARLAMENTO	\$45.00	15/12/1998	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$84.90
06/07/2001	THE CHAPEL CAFE	\$34.60	11/02/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$46.50
16/07/2001	ROCCO CAFE	\$30.80	24/02/1999	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$382.00
18/07/2001	RIGONI'S BISTRO	\$52.00	26/02/1999	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$516.10
02/08/2001	THE OYSTER BAR	\$98.00	15/03/1999	THE WINDSOR HOTEL	\$241.00

26/03/1999	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$63.50	24/08/2000	MYER ADELAIDE CITY 082	\$23.75
08/04/1999	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$250.30	28/08/2000	DAVID JONES 5102	\$25.14
09/04/1999	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$711.40	22/09/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$23.30
07/05/1999	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$2,402.69	17/10/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$36.90
08/05/1999	GRAND HYATT TAI PEI	\$594.33	19/10/2000	MYER ADELAIDE CITY 082	\$20.10
27/05/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$45.00	15/12/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$24.90
02/06/1999	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$275.90	19/12/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	-\$82.80
10/06/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$104.00	19/12/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$82.80
22/06/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$159.00	19/12/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$49.30
10/07/1999	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$432.50	17/01/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$49.50
20/07/1999	CLARE COUNTRY CLUB	\$428.70	16/02/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$36.00
24/07/1999	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$1,293.85	23/02/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$37.80
25/07/1999	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$53.00	30/03/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$20.45
29/07/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$26.50	26/06/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$42.90
04/08/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$160.00	27/07/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$34.50
31/08/1999	ALL SEASONS PREMIER BAROSSA VAL	\$215.20	16/08/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$40.40
31/08/1999	ALL SEASONS PREMIER BAROSSA VAL	\$233.30	07/09/2001	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$35.90
08/09/1999	HYATT REGENCY PERTH	\$545.35	19/10/2001	MYER ADELAIDE CITY 082	\$2.20
06/10/1999	BARMERA COUNTRY CLUB	\$663.55		Total DEPARTMENT STORES	\$791.30
11/10/1999	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$1,034.57	Industry Definition: CAR RENTAL		
13/10/1999	YUSUNG TOURIST HOTEL	\$206.03	22/11/1999	AVIS NT	\$215.00
16/10/1999	GRAND HYATT SINGAPORE	\$1,658.33	16/02/2000	AVIS NT	\$198.38
29/10/1999	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$1,107.40	14/09/2000	AVIS NT	\$276.58
30/10/1999	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$887.00		Total CAR RENTAL	\$689.96
15/11/1999	CHARDONNAY LODGE	\$339.35	Industry Definition: AUTO SERVICES		
18/11/1999	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$100.00	05/10/1999	BP BARMERA	\$40.00
02/12/1999	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$626.77	14/04/2001	AMPOL NORMANVILLE	\$54.67
26/01/2000	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$1,284.18	17/05/2001	BP EXPRESS BELAIR	\$62.09
17/02/2000	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$762.65		Total AUTO SERVICES	\$156.76
18/02/2000	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$342.30	Industry Definition: ALL OTHER		
22/02/2000	LAKES RESORT—MT GAMBIER	\$1,313.65	13/02/1998	FEDERAL AIRPORTS CORPORATION	\$32.00
15/04/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$1,113.90	24/07/1999	ADELAIDE AIRPORT LIMITED	\$28.00
29/04/2000	WGTN PARK ROYAL HOTEL	\$838.12		Total ALL OTHER	\$60.00
26/05/2000	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$24.50	Industry Definition: AIRLINES		
16/06/2000	THE HERITAGE	\$163.00	12/10/1999	GRAND HYATT SEOUL MIRAMAR CO.	\$800.51
17/06/2000	THE HERITAGE	\$271.85	12/10/1999	GRAND HYATT SEOUL MIRAMAR CO.	\$7.08
30/08/2000	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$458.86	25/11/1999	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$957.00
01/09/2000	CARLTON CREST HOTEL SYDNEY	\$770.00	18/09/2001	QANTAS AIRWAYS	\$1,218.14
16/09/2000	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$150.00	18/09/2001	QANTAS AIRWAYS	\$198.00
16/09/2000	CARLTON HOTEL DARWIN	\$1,125.10	18/09/2001	QANTAS AIRWAYS	\$1,163.14
21/10/2000	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$2,261.84		Total AIRLINES	\$4,343.87
21/10/2000	GRAND HYATT HONG KONG	\$2,247.14	Industry Definition:		
13/12/2000	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$1,201.78	09/06/1998	HOTEL GRANVIA OKAYAMA-OKAYAMA-S	\$24.77
25/01/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$397.10	07/09/1998	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M, PARIS	\$2,737.81
31/01/2001	SHERATON ON THE PARK	\$427.86	09/09/1998	HOTEL VILLA MAGNA, MADRID	\$2842.58
06/02/2001	PARK HYATT TOKYO	\$1,057.84	10/09/1998	HOLIDAY INN LONDON VICTORIA SW1V1	\$663.54
06/02/2001	PARK HYATT TOKYO	\$5,146.67	13/09/1998	HARVEY NICOLS & CO LTD, LONDON	\$136.56
07/02/2001	AMBASSADOR-TRANSIT HOTEL T1	\$71.50	14/09/1998	THE SAVOY HOTEL, LONDON WC2R	\$107.88
15/02/2001	MCLARENS ON THE LAKE	\$223.80	15/09/1998	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$6,842.31
27/02/2001	PLAYFORD HOTEL ADELAIDE	\$232.95	16/09/1998	GRAND HYATT NEW YORK NEW YORK N	\$1,002.71
20/03/2001	LOXTON COMMUNITY HOTEL/MOTEL	\$70.50	16/09/1998	GRAND HYATT NEW YORK NEW YORK N	\$889.09
27/03/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$627.23	19/09/1998	SEQUOIA/SEAPORT NEW YORK NY	\$71.62
03/05/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$605.06	19/09/1998	WALDORF ASTORIA NEW YORK NY	\$2,570.02
10/05/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$1,457.99	19/09/1998	WALDORF ASTORIA NEW YORK NY	\$932.53
10/05/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$24.00	11/10/1998	THE RITZ CARLTON/PTGN CTY ARLINGT	\$72.19
17/05/2001	STAMFORD PLAZA ADELAIDE	\$49.60	12/10/1998	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTO	\$42.39
09/06/2001	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$2,446.44	12/10/1998	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTO	\$2,284.94
18/06/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$908.72	13/10/1998	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTO	\$1,829.21
18/07/2001	PARK HYATT SYDNEY	\$571.14	14/10/1998	NORTH RALEIGH HILTON RALEIGH NC	\$1,062.20
21/09/2001	HYATT HOTEL CANBERRA	\$1,067.06	15/10/1998	HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL NEW YORK	\$1,310.45
26/09/2001	HYATT REGENCY ADELAIDE	\$485.80	15/10/1998	WALDORF ASTORIA NEW YORK NY	\$2,886.93
29/09/2001	HILTON INTL ADELAIDE	\$226.80	15/10/1998	HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL NEW YORK	\$1,044.54
04/10/2001	STAMFORD PLAZA ADELAIDE	\$53.80	15/10/1998	HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL NEW YORK	\$1,806.54
12/10/2001	PARK HYATT MELBOURNE	\$1,512.29	16/10/1998	HOTEL INTER-CONTINENTAL CHICAGO IL	\$1,755.42
22/10/2001	STAMFORD GRAND	\$37.00	16/10/1998	PARK HYATT L A CNTRY CIT LOS ANGEL	\$516.18
	Total LODGING	\$59,941.00	16/10/1998	PARK HYATT L A CNTRY CIT LOS ANGEL	\$2,506.74
Industry Definition: DEPARTMENT STORES			16/10/1998	HOTEL INTER-CONTINENTAL CHICAGO IL	\$942.99
15/02/1998	MYER ADELAIDE CITY 082	\$50.75	16/10/1998	PARK HYATT L A CNTRY CIT LOS ANGEL	\$581.23
29/04/1998	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$35.60	16/10/1998	HOTEL INTER-CONTINENTAL CHICAGO IL	\$75.07
01/09/1998	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$23.90	16/10/1998	PARK HYATT L A CNTRY CIT LOS ANGEL	\$1,362.12
07/01/1999	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$38.90	21/04/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$13.41
10/12/1999	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$26.90	21/04/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$15.84
23/03/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$26.20	22/04/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$12.19
02/06/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$32.70	22/04/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$130.41
12/07/2000	DAVID JONES (SA) LTD 5101	\$32.51	27/04/1999	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M, PARIS	\$3,226.53
23/08/2000	MYER ADELAIDE CITY 082	\$20.80	27/04/1999	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M, PARIS	\$3,180.79

30/04/1999	BLUSHES CAFE, CHELSEA, LONDON	\$170.81
04/05/1999	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$37.88
10/05/1999	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$2,508.58
20/09/1999	THE RITZ-CARLTON DEARBORN DEARBO	\$597.27
20/09/1999	THE RITZ-CARLTON DEARBORN DEARBO	\$40.36
20/09/1999	THE RITZ-CARLTON DEARBORN DEARBO	\$29.39
20/09/1999	THE RITZ-CARLTON DEARBORN DEARBO	\$2,744.04
21/09/1999	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINTO	\$2,605.97
21/09/1999	AT&T-AIRONE JACKSONVILLE FL	\$99.94
21/09/1999	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTON	\$1,036.19
21/09/1999	PARK HYATT-WASHINGTON WASHINGTON	-\$903.71
21/09/1999	AT&T-AIRONE JACKSONVILLE FL	\$188.12
21/09/1999	AT&T AIRONE JACKSONVILLE FL	\$94.53
14/10/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$70.72
14/10/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$68.20
14/10/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$35.36
14/10/1999	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$1,428.50
14/10/1999	SKYPHONE SERVICES NORWEGIAN TLC	\$15.15
14/10/1999	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$1,174.77
27/01/2000	HOTEL NEW OTANI 40F REST-CHIYODA-	\$8,754.85
28/01/2000	PARK HYATT TOKYO-SHINJUKU-KU	\$2,618.54
28/01/2000	AIRCOM SERVICE-SR ATLANTA GA	\$87.74
30/01/2000	ATHENAEUM INTER-CONTINENTAL HTL	\$3,435.65
01/02/2000	CYPRUS HILTON LTD, NICOSIA	\$8,754.41
03/02/2000	HOTEL LE MEREDIEN LINGOTT TORINO	\$1,029.60
05/02/2000	BURJ AL ARAB, DUBAI	\$146.35
06/02/2000	BURJ AL ARAB, DUBAI	\$231.53
06/02/2000	CHICAGO BEACH HOTEL, DUBAI	\$9,579.38
30/06/2000	SINGAPORE AIRLINES ATLANTA GA	\$10.07
30/06/2000	SINGAPORE AIRLINES ATLANTA GA	\$46.31
30/06/2000	SINGAPORE AIRLINES ATLANTA GA	\$101.69
01/07/2000	TRATTORIA ST TEODORO ROMA	\$601.11
02/07/2000	HILTON ITALIANA S.R.L., ROMA RM	\$26.82
02/07/2000	HILTON ITALIANA S.R.L., ROMA RM	\$2,960.24
04/07/2000	GRANDE ALBERGO VESUVIO NAPOLI	\$5,441.74
08/07/2000	SAN MARTINO RESTAURANT, LONDON S	\$231.95
09/07/2000	INTERFLORA, SLEAFORD	\$157.40
09/07/2000	INTERFLORA, SLEAFORD	\$157.40
09/07/2000	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$9,424.96
09/07/2000	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$15,350.24
09/07/2000	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$91.81
09/07/2000	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$113.07
18/07/2000	WASHINGTON FLYER CABS ARLINGTON	\$87.77
20/07/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$1,678.20
20/07/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$839.10
20/07/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$1,439.46
20/07/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$1,678.20
20/07/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$1,678.20
24/07/2000	WALDORF ASTORIA NEW YORK NY	\$339.98
25/07/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$66.86
27/07/2000	THE RITZ-CARLTON DEARBORN DEARBO	\$107.57
29/07/2000	RITZ-CARLTON BOSTON F&B BOSTON M	\$215.06
01/08/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$8.46
01/08/2000	PARK RIDGE HOTEL 117 KING OF PRUSSI	\$587.57
01/08/2000	THE RITZ-CARLTON DEARBORN DEARBO	\$35.45
02/08/2000	HYATT REGENCY DALLAS DALLAS TX	\$1,037.37
02/08/2000	CONTINENTAL ELEC TICKETNG HOUSTO	\$1,934.79
02/08/2000	HYATT REGENCY DALLAS DALLAS TX	\$881.90
02/08/2000	HYATT REGENCY DALLAS DALLAS TX	\$42.50
02/08/2000	HYATT REGENCY DALLAS DALLAS TX	\$543.92
02/08/2000	CONTINENTAL ELEC TICKETNG HOUSTO	\$1,821.23
02/08/2000	CONTINENTAL ELEC TICKETNG HOUSTO	\$1,821.23
02/08/2000	HYATT REGENCY DALLAS DALLAS TX	\$7.58
03/08/2000	BEVERLY HILLS 1004 BEVERLY HILLS CA	\$106.66
04/02/2001	CHICAGO BEACH HOTEL, DUBAI	\$2,902.75
12/06/2001	HYATT CARLTON TOWER HOTEL, LONDO	\$3,929.10
15/06/2001	HYATT REGENCY PARIS M, PARIS	\$4,479.34
16/06/2001	SINGAPORE AIRLINES ATLANTA GA	\$30.00
	Total	\$147,163.91
	Total Spend	\$241,225.39

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, sir. I am just a little uneasy about the process of the member for Fisher's personal explanation. I can understand that the honourable member can make a personal explanation if he has been misrepresented, but the member for Fisher has now

incorporated material, which the house has not seen, into *Hansard* via the personal explanation. I would like an assurance that the material that has been incorporated by tabling would be permissible if tendered orally in a personal explanation, namely, that it relates to the member for Fisher's being misrepresented.

The SPEAKER: I do not know what the material is.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is the problem.

The SPEAKER: I am not sure what standing order it is that the Attorney-General wishes me to contemplate in the course of his point of order. If it is standing order 109, it is not a question for the chair to resolve. But if the honourable member in speaking to a question refers to a statistical table relevant to the question, the table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the house, be inserted in *Hansard* without being read. The honourable member has sought leave; he has been granted leave and the material stands.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Standing order 109 states:

When a member in speaking to a question refers to a statistical table relevant to the question, the table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the house, be inserted into *Hansard* without being read.

I suppose my point of order is that the honourable member must be speaking to a question. The member for Fisher was not speaking to a question: he was making a personal explanation—

Mr Brindal: Exactly right.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —and, in fairness to the opposition—I do not want unnecessarily to obstruct—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —what the member for Fisher is doing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney may not debate the standing order. I take the point that is made. I will give consideration to that point and, as soon as I have been able to do that, I will advise the house. The member for Bragg has the call.

RHINO ENCLOSURE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): I move:

That this house congratulates the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia on the opening of the Caddick Rhino Boma at Monarto Zoological Park on 22 November.

It is my pleasure today to move this motion. This is Australia's largest rhino facility. I advise the house that, following a year of construction, the Monarto Zoological Park purpose-built rhino boma (an African word for night quarters) was officially opened by Senator Amanda Vanstone on 22 November. Now the largest in Australia, plans for this rhino quarantine and habitat facility were based on similar boma to those in Kruger National Park, South Africa. Many people made a contribution to this event, and I particularly acknowledge the very generous donation by the Caddick family of Adelaide, that is, Alfie and Heather Caddick, Toby and Barnaby and Heather's mother, Diana Goldsmith.

I particularly wish to acknowledge the contribution made by the people of Bragg. I say that because when members of the house visit this magnificent facility (which I hope they will), they will note the brush roofing on the huts in this boma, which came about as a result of the Portrush Road redevelopment in Bragg. That brush was made available to help build the boma for these rhinos. There is, therefore, a direct connection with Bragg, and the constituents of Bragg and I are very proud to have made some small contribution.

Importantly, though, I want to mention the Director of Monarto Zoological Park, Chris Hannocks, and Geoff Brooks and Peter Ansell who comprised the project team.

I acknowledge the efforts of schools, community and the volunteers, which include the Zoo Crew and Girls Crew from Murray Bridge High School, the Unity College Work Group, Eastern Fleurieu R-12 from Strathalbyn, the Urrbrae Agricultural High School at Netherby, and the Tintinara Area School. Assistance was also given by Alan Beaumont and Roger Helps (Onkaparinga TAFE, Murray Bridge), Westminster School (Marion), Norwood Morialta High School (Norwood) and Alan Wilson and Geoff Slater, both volunteers.

In addition, I also acknowledge Stephen Thomas and Mac Hayes (Correctional Services), John Anderson (Sergeant, South Australia Police based at Ottoway), Mandy Bluett, Tracey Clegg and Mim Nash (Qantas) and Jeff Lloyd (Pickering Transport Group). However, of course, there are many who make these things come together. I would like to recite a poem that was read on the day by Professor Rob Morrison who chairs the Royal Zoological Society board. I thought it might be of interest to members, as follows:

When things seem quite improbable, we say that pigs might fly;
well, twenty tonnes of rhinos have just thundered through the sky!
From continent to continent they've flown and come to land,
to live within these bomas, where a city once was planned.

We've cheetah here, and nilgai; painted dogs and zebra too.
A city should have stood here, but instead these rhinos do.
In place of urban streetscape you will find zoology,
but how this came to happen, simply strains credulity.

It seems quite unbelievable that where we're standing now—
its mallee forests, chopped and sawn, it is soil raked by plough;
the dry Australian farming land where sheep and cattle fed—
is now a mini-Africa, with rhinos here instead.

To some it seems incredible that three decades or so
have passed since all the farms were bought, the livestock forced to
go.

And eager urban planners, solemn-voiced and straight-of-face
announced to us a city would be built upon this place.

It now seems quite astonishing that such a plan was made
to halt the southern sprawling of suburban Adelaide.
The capital had grown too big, and so the planners said,
the citizens of Adelaide could settle here instead!

We should not judge them harshly; it was not the planners' fault
the ground is full of limestone and the soil is full of salt,
and seldom does it rain here, and it's often hot and dry,
for they assumed they'd always have the Murray flowing by.

You won't believe that, in those days, the Murray flowed to sea;
it was not then the salty creek it's since turned out to be.
But even then, the doubters said, it must be very clear.
It could not yield the water to sustain a city here.

And so it proved. The planning stopped; the scheme was quickly
doomed.

The plans were quietly put away, and Adelaide's sprawl resumed.
The planners moved to other work, abandoning the charms
of newly planted forests round the old deserted farms.

Contrasting connotations can develop round a name,
Monarto heard them all. They ranged from glory through to shame,
from 'Visionary scheme,' to 'Demographically unwise,'
but from those planning ashes what a Phoenix would arise!

For others saw potential in this failed metropolis,
and, though it seems extraordinary, their impetus was this,
some others may have got it wrong, but they would get it right;
a zoo, and not a city, would be built upon this site.

So though it's not the usual way to plan a modern zoo,
the outcome's been terrific, and a great improvement, too.
Instead of roads and shopping malls, our visitors now see
a host of threatened species, which have found their sanctuary.

We've wild Mongolian horses, bison, black-buck, and the tall
giraffe that breed so plentifully; and now to top it all

we've volunteers who'll take you and escort you on a bus
to see what staff have built with funds the Caddicks gave to us.

And through their generosity, all Australasia gains,
for some of these rhinoceroses are bound for Western Plains
where, just like us, the staff will hope (once males and females meet)
to hear the gentle 'pitter-pat' of little rhino feet.

We know that many visitors will hurry here to see
this unbelievable result of such philanthropy.
So if they tell you pigs might fly (this won't be news to you),
remind them pigs don't do that, but our threatened species do!

I thank the Royal Zoological Society, the enormous team of
volunteers and the people of Bragg.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): I thank the honourable member for her motion. The rhino boma is a real, tangible example of how South Australians can work together to achieve a common goal. Boma is an African term for night quarters. The board of the Royal Zoological Society approved the acquisition of two rhinos from Africa, while the Dubbo Western Plains Zoo was planning to import five. Through the cooperation of AQIS and Environment Australia, all seven were brought to Australia at once and quarantined at Monarto Zoological Park. Clearly, seven rhinos require substantial housing. A very generous donation from the Caddick family set the ball rolling. A total of 4 800 poles were erected to form the boma. Zoo staff and volunteers worked together to complete this massive task. The bolts alone weigh in the order of 2.5 tonnes.

Many people helped. Correctional Services teams, church groups, schoolchildren and service clubs (notably Rotary) all pitched in to achieve this remarkable result. The director of Monarto noticed, while driving down Portrush Road, that many of the existing brush fences were being replaced as part of the Portrush Road upgrade. Being a true conservationist, he sought permission from Transport SA to recycle the brush for the roof of the boma. This was subsequently donated, as noted by the member for Bragg. It is not uncommon for one good deed to snowball into something extraordinary: the Caddick donation was significant but it also provided an opportunity for many people to demonstrate their generosity of spirit and donate time, effort and money to achieve this success.

The white rhino is an endangered species. This boma will play a significant role in future breeding programs and in increasing public awareness of the intrinsic value of this species, which is on the edge of extinction. At the opening of the boma last week, Mr Caddick wore a tie featuring flying pigs. Pigs may or may not fly but, as the President of the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia, Professor Rob Morrison, stated in his address, in this case seven white rhinos did fly halfway around the world to settle at Monarto.

I second the honourable member's congratulations to and appreciation of the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia, the staff and volunteers of Monarto, the Caddick family, and all those other people who, with little recognition and huge effort, made this possible. I urge members to visit Monarto to see for themselves what community application can achieve.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I am delighted to speak to this motion. I concur with all the facts and fabulous figures that we have heard this morning about the boma, but I want to take a slightly different tack and commend the work of the board and its program to make Monarto the shining example that it is. I first visited Monarto some years ago following the publication of a photograph of a mother giraffe and its baby.

It was a great thrill for me to go out in his vehicle with the then director and actually pat the head of the male giraffe which bent down and let me touch him. That was one of the most exciting experiences with animals that I have ever had, although I shall not be doing that with the rhino, whether white or any other colour!

Like the member for Napier, I want to commend the work of the President of the board, Professor Rob Morrison. I have had a little bit to do with Professor Morrison recently, and in a letter to me he has provided me with some information about the research efforts going on at Monarto, part of which, of course, involves this particular species of rhino. In his letter, Professor Morrison refers to the enormous increase in the society's research efforts over the past couple of years. Projects are varied (and, of course, we have heard about the rhinos today), but the volunteers have just picked up a prestigious award for pelican research at Outer Harbour. We do not hear very much about the other projects that are going on, but I am going to speak about science later this morning (if I can); this gives me an opportunity to speak about some of the things that are happening at the zoo. So, there is an award for pelican research.

Another great centre for pelicans in the world is in Louisiana, where the pelican is their state emblem. It may be that in time we will exchange research information with American scientists and ask for their help. Postgraduate scholarships are about to be offered to help train young researchers, and scientists are developing reproductive techniques involving surrogacy in marsupials which look as though they will, quite literally, save many native species from extinction.

In speaking to this motion, I congratulate everyone who has been involved with these rhinos, which obviously we do not want to lose. I also want to commend the excellent work that is going on at Monarto in respect of many other species of animals and birds.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Before moving on to the next motion, may I say that the Monarto facilities came into existence in consequence of the Lower Murray Tourism Promotion Association's and my pressing the government of the day to do better than just provide agistment paddocks. After a good many years of persistent argument, Monarto came into existence. It is a facility, as honourable members have observed, of outstanding merit regarded by zoologists as second to none anywhere for the way in which it has been established and the manner in which it is now managed to provide access by the public to what it has to offer. Does the member for Bragg have a point of order?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, I would like to ascertain, sir, with your guidance, whether the debate has been adjourned, as I understand others wish to speak.

The SPEAKER: The debate is concluded. The motion has been put and passed.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am sorry: I understood that that motion related to your speaking from the chair, but I obviously misunderstood.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Florey.

SCIENTISTS' ACHIEVEMENTS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I move:

That this house recognises the enormous achievement of South Australian scientists and their contribution to the state's economy

and wealth through intellectual endeavours that promote industry and employment.

In recognising excellence, along with sporting achievements South Australia has much to celebrate in the field of scientific endeavour. As we saw in relation to the last motion regarding the tremendous work that is going on at Monarto, much has been contributed to the wealth of this state and our well-being because of the calibre of our scientists and their dedication and commitment. This was brought home to me very recently with the announcements of two prestigious awards: first, the Eureka Prize, won by the President of the Zoological Board, our own Dr Rob Morrison. The Australian Eureka Prize has raised the profile of science in the community by acknowledging and rewarding outstanding achievements in scientific research, application, education, writing and journalism.

Begun in 1990, the Eureka prizes have grown into Australia's pre-eminent and most comprehensive national science awards. Dr Morrison is a science communicator and formerly a science journalist with the University of Adelaide. He won a \$10 000 prize for critical thinking. It was one of 18 Eureka prizes handed out recently and was awarded for investigation into beliefs that owe little or nothing to the rigours of scientific method. Dr Morrison won the prize for an article called, 'Trust Me, I'm a Science Communicator,' and for studying and examining how the mechanics and requirements of successful science communication differ sharply from those of formal scientific research reports and so bias science communication towards the sensational, speculative and even fanciful.

Dr Morrison wrote the article while working as a science journalist at the University of Adelaide last year, and an edited version of the winning article was printed in the *Adelaidian* last October. Dr Morrison believes it is time for action, and states:

Science reporting is becoming more sensationalist. We need a national code of practice that might help to moderate the excesses of science communication and journalism.

I will quote from Professor Mike Archer, the Director of the Australian Museum, as follows:

Rob Morrison reminds us that we are the losers if science reporting descends into pseudo-science.

Dr Morrison is a resident of the Adelaide Hills. He was the host in the 1970s and 1980s of a television program called *The Curiosity Show*, which fascinated children with startling science experiments and fired their imagination. Dr Morrison's essay examines how science is communicated to the public. He has worked for many years making science exciting to school children and adults alike. In his actual piece, he says that seven out of 10 main stories on stem cells on a major science web site were based on speculation rather than on solid evidence. He says:

A lot has almost become science fiction. It breeds too much enthusiasm. Scientists should initially publish their experiment in peer review journals rather than in the mass media.

He is giving us a word of caution on how science might progress.

The second award I came across was the Verco Medal, which was established in 1923 in honour of Sir Joseph Verco, a prominent medical practitioner and lecturer in medicine in Adelaide. It is awarded from time to time by the Royal Society of South Australia for scientific work published by a member of the society. This year's winner was Professor Prescott and his father had won the medal before him. It is a

very important medal. Joseph Verco was born in Adelaide in 1851, the son of a builder who migrated with his wife from Cornwall. He attended the University of London and won four gold medals there. He went on to distinguish himself as a general practitioner before returning to Adelaide in 1878. As President of the Royal Society of South Australia, a position that he held from 1903 to 1921, he created several endowment funds and the Joseph Verco Medal was first awarded in 1928 for distinguished scientific investigation. So, congratulations go to Professor Prescott on winning that award as well.

Another area of science that I have had something to do with as member for Florey is the Tall Poppy Awards. They were created in honour of Lord Florey after whom, of course, my seat is named. This year (2002) six of South Australia's brightest young scientists were honoured with the awards, coinciding with the birthday of Howard Florey. The Australian Institute of Political Science developed the Tall Poppy Day in 1998 to encourage young people to take up science careers. Three of the six winners were at the ceremony this year which was held at the east campus of Uni SA.

The list of winners are: Adelaide University adult diseases researcher Catherine Coulter; Michael Lee of the South Australian Museum, who studies reptiles and whom I had the privilege of meeting at the museum with Tim Flannery a few weeks ago; environmental researcher Holger Maier, whose model predicted blue-green algal blooms in the River Murray (of course, with the great concern for the River Murray, that is a very important discovery); social epidemiologist Vivienne Moore; Sandra Orgeig, who is researching the pulmonary system; and Professor Simon Stewart, who has shown that nurse-led home-based intervention results in fewer hospital admissions and death. With a health budget that is almost uncontrollable, the importance of that award cannot be understated.

I have a little more information on Professor Stewart, who is Uni SA's chair in cardiovascular nursing. A world leader in cardiovascular nursing from the School of Nursing and Midwifery, Professor Stewart has conducted a major study into the survival rates of heart attack patients. He found that, whilst more women than men died in hospital within a few days of heart attack, more men died before reaching hospital, making the total death rate from heart failure the same for both men and women. Obviously his work in this area will pay huge dividends for the many men and women who face cardiovascular disease in Australia, and we all wish him well with that research.

I also recently had the opportunity to attend the annual corporate day of another great South Australian success story in the science area: Advanced Rapid Robotic Manufacturing (ARRM) is a South Australian company formed in July 1993 in response to the ever-increasing worldwide demand for user-friendly and customised automation in research in pharmaceutical laboratories. The primary research and development areas for which ARRM develops products and provides services are: life sciences; proteomics; microbiology and viticulture, satisfying the company's mission of innovation, prototyping and commercialisation of world-class automation.

ARRM established its initial commercialisation company, Biotech, in 1998 to begin manufacturing systems for its first original equipment manufacturer—a customer in the US called BioRad Laboratories. I had the privilege of unveiling one of their robotic machines, and I will speak on that later. ARRM has played a role in developing robotics for high

throughput sample processing systems in pharmaceutical and research laboratories world wide. This has given scientists the ability to fast-track important and groundbreaking research. Such research has provided mankind with leading-edge solutions to major health and environmental challenges facing the 21st century.

Examples of this have been the automation of manual processes in the field of proteomics where laboratory tests and sample throughput have increased by more than 12 000 times that of the manual ones. Just to imagine the speed at which they can now do this research, and the importance that that will bring to future scientific discoveries, is overwhelming. Proteomics is part of a very important genomics research and development program world wide and plays a huge part in the betterment of research into finding cures for diseases such as cancer, Alzheimer's and other such life-threatening and debilitating diseases. The CEO and founder of ARRM is Mr George Kraguljac, whom I had the pleasure of meeting for the first time in his role as the sponsor at the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE awards earlier this year.

George has over 25 years' experience in business, with strong skills in market development, specialist consulting, business start-ups and commercialisation programs. George recently stated that ARRM's current team has, in the last four years, grown from a small handful of people to 34 executives, coordinators and associates with degrees in a diverse range of fields such as science, engineering, marketing, business administration, commerce and accounting, as well as skilled mechanical people, and they have all helped to make ARRM's research development and manufacture in unique robotic systems.

The success of the company so far can be attributed to the dynamic group of individuals who are all quiet achievers, passionate about what they do, and who all bring a wealth of specialist skills, experience and innovation to ARRM. To further confirm ARRM's success over the last few years or so, the company has been selected as either a winner or a finalist for 21 different industry awards in 20 months. For example, in the Deloitte Technology Fast 50 Top Ten of 2001, ARRM was named as the fastest growing technology company within South Australia and the ninth fastest in Australia, and was listed for the second year in 2002.

The list of all the awards for which this company has been selected as either a winner or a finalist can be found on their web site, www.arrm.com, and the amount of information on that web site is really worth having a look at. Robotics is a very exciting field. Having gone through their factory on that day, I was very impressed with what I saw.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I must acknowledge that the member for Waite was there. He is such a tall man that I do not know how I missed him in the room. But it was packed.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: That is right: it was National Scarf Day. ARRM has demonstrated the ability to quickly transform IP into workable prototypes, then rapidly commercialise this innovation so as to invest into further research and development projects. ARRM will continue to expand worldwide and particularly into the US market by securing further relationships with new collaborators that will provide ARRM with the opportunity for increased export benefits for the ARRM group of companies and, indeed, for Australia. It has been my pleasure to meet the whole team of the ARRM company, and I would like to talk about Gary McRae, the Chief Technical Officer.

In conversation he said to me that it seemed that in recent months there has been a lack of appreciation of what could be termed the current heart and soul of South Australian industry. Manufacturing is something we do particularly well here. Just look at the spectacular success of companies such as General Motors, Ellex Lasers, Shefenacker, Codan and Minelab, to name a few. We have a fantastic manufacturing resource within South Australia, and in engineering terms it seems there is little we cannot do. The quality of research and development within the state is very high, so why not actually encourage it and, in fact, embrace and promote it and give it the full support it deserves?

Another of ARRMs team is the Business Development Manager, Alistair Steven. He was telling me that ARRMs strength is its ability to take a product from the research and development stage through to commercialisation in a very short time. Successful commercialisation represents business growth and the growth of jobs in South Australia. It is important that government continue to invest in research and development in this state but also to support programs that encourage and develop sound business planning, the facilitation of market research and exporting. It is these processes that are the key to taking a good idea or product and making it a commercial success. We see too often that the industries that are supported well by government are in science and academia with little focus given to the next step, which is planning and business development.

Rather than reduce funding, it would be good in this current dynamic, internationally focused environment to keep South Australia competitive by investing in the area of research and development. George Kraguljac is very proud of his company, and rightly so. South Australia is dominated by small to medium-sized business enterprises, and they are all excellent at what they do. His is just one example of them. Without intense support from federal and state governments, South Australian businesses will never leverage themselves completely into the new international field of excellence, particularly in the industry of biotechnology, which is a very exciting industry of which we are at the forefront. There exist a large number of unique gems here in South Australia, and support in terms of funding, publicity, innovation and promotion is vital for them to continue.

The nurturing of these growing organisations will in turn make extremely valuable contributions not only to our state's economy but also, in terms of social and cultural improvements, it is vital for the success of this state. At a recent meeting with the Irish ambassador, on a visit to Adelaide, they had the opportunity to ask first hand what were the key points to the Irish success. It was a strong education base, full commitment to digital technology and infrastructure and the securing of Intel to use these facilities. The major contributor to this was that both sides of government collaborated on the objective of creating a new economic model. They both 'walked the same walk and talked the same talk.' I think he is talking about a bipartisan approach there. When Intel came to ask them about Ireland, there was political unity on this point, and there was true investment in the future. South Australia obviously needs to do something similar.

Recent actions can only be considered destructive to previous advancements in programs for small business, education, innovation, positive public relations and health, to name a few. We need to amplify South Australia's cash flow, not diminish it. For strong cash flow, you need to invest wisely, and it will feed on itself: the bigger the community

growth for economic stimulus, the greater the spending and the greater the future growth.

Last week, the member for Waite and I saw the amazing leap forward that ARRMs making. Its proposal to have so many of its machines overseas is a terrific example of value adding. I think that is the way that South Australia will move forward, rather than being a place that exports raw materials. We need to give jobs to our children and create, via science, the true wealth that I know we can achieve, not only for South Australia but also for Australia, making it strongly competitive on the world market.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to commend the motion and to congratulate the member for moving it. I enjoyed attending the ARRMs Innovation Centre open day with the member for Florey and meeting George Kraguljac and the other employees of the company. They really are a testament to South Australia's ability to innovate and succeed based on intellectual property. That is why I will use the opportunity of this motion as shadow minister for innovation and information economy to draw the house's attention to the total failure of this government to do anything to encourage and promote the enormous achievement and success of South Australian scientists. In fact, this government has been an abject failure at doing anything to support innovation and information economy.

I will recite some of this government's great achievements to date, including the announcement this week of the elimination of 40 positions at SARDI. What is it doing? It is slashing millions of dollars out of research and development in biotechnology and throwing 40 researchers and scientists on the scrap heap. Well done, Labor! What else has this government achieved? One of its first acts in its first budget was to destroy completely the \$40.5 million innovation fund established under the previous government, when I was minister, and trash the funding. The only component of that funding that survived was the \$12 million for the Australian genome research facility (GRDC) at the Waite campus. The government was committed to supporting that project, because the member for Newland, my colleague in the other place, the former minister for primary industries (Hon. Caroline Schaefer MLC) and I championed it through the former cabinet in the former government. So, this government has thrown away the innovation funding.

What else has it done? This stunning Labor government has completely abandoned the Thebarton Biosciences Precinct, the 4.8 hectare site for the future growth of biosciences in this state—trashed and thrown in the bin. We have heard nothing about it from the government. This Labor government has delivered chaos and inaction to South Australia's innovators and scientists. The universities, particularly Adelaide University, are in the throes of major reviews—the object being to cut funding. I have a thick file of correspondence from the Waite precinct, which is in my electorate, from scientists concerned about its future. Why? Because of more cost-cutting measures by a government that is an abject failure in the area of bioscience, in the area of information economy and in the area of intellectual property in general. In fact, this Labor government has no intellectual property whatsoever of any account. The government has done nothing.

In contrast, what about the achievements of the former government? First, with federal assistance, we established Playford Capital. We established Bio Innovation SA. We contributed to and participated in the commonwealth's

MNRF program and accessed a range of funding through its innovation funding package. We ensured that South Australia participated in four key programs and proposals that attracted substantial funding to the state. I will list them, and the Labor government might learn something for the future:

- The National Wine Industry Research Cluster, \$4.5 million;
- the Australian Proteome Analysis Facility—a \$16.25 million initiative;
- the aforementioned Australian Genome Research Facility—\$14 million; and
- the National Networked Teletest facility—\$4.75 million.

The former government, through the Office of Innovation for which I was the minister, and the department of industry and trade, as it was then, was working with project proponents constantly to maximise the ongoing benefits to the South Australian government and the people of this state from those projects. We even committed funding to a bid for an ICT centre of excellence—a \$129 million commonwealth initiative which, unfortunately, was unsuccessful. We were not the successful bidders, but at least we were out there bidding. By comparison, what is this government doing? Absolutely nothing! Not only that, but the Minister for Science and Information Economy had the temerity last week to make announcements about a new project at the Waite Campus—I think a figure of around \$9 million was mentioned—to do with innovation and genomic research. Well, guess what? It sounded very much like a reannouncement of that GRDC initiative from earlier this year. It sounded very much like another Media Mike reinvention and reannouncement of something that had already been announced. The government probably thought, ‘We will just massage the figures around, put out another media release and we will give everybody the impression that we are doing something new when, in fact, all we are doing is what we said we would do, earlier in the year which, in any event, was something that we inherited from the former government.’

This Labor government has no idea what is doing on science and research. It is slashing and burning. In another little piece of Media Mike magic, it said, ‘We will have a Premier’s Science and Research Council. Well, hoopla! Guess what the former government had? An innovation, science and technology council and, when you look at the members of those two bodies, guess what? You will find a lot of names appearing on both councils. The government obviously thought, ‘Let us take something that the former government had; let us reinvent it; we will give it another name; we will put Mike Rann in the middle of it, and we will give everyone the impression that we have created something new.’ And what has been created? Nothing but continuing the policies of the former government.

It is a joke, and the science and research community know exactly what is going on. They know that the 40 positions cut from SARDI will have an impact on this state’s ability to innovate and to leverage off that innovation. They know that the GRDC project was an initiative of the former government. They know that the \$40.5 million innovation fund has been scrapped by this government, and they also know that this government has no new ideas on innovation and, in particular, that it is not prepared to commit funding in order to attract federal funding for any new initiative. If I am wrong, could the minister please come in and enlighten us all? Can she tell us to which projects she has committed funding that will attract something new to the state? She will not come in here and say anything because nothing has been committed.

So, it is fine to get up—and I support the motion—and wax lyrical about how important innovation, science and technology is for the state, but back it up with some dollars and some results. Get something going. Do something: do not just sit there and waffle and create the impression that something is being done. If you really want to get going, look at the previous government’s election policy on innovation and find ways to mesh our centres of excellence and our brilliant scientific capabilities with private enterprise, government, venture capital and entrepreneurs. Find ways to create linkages that can enable the private sector to launch initiatives and to generate income from our scientists and our centres of excellence. It is no good—with typical Labor rhetoric—talking about how we need to spend more on education so that we can produce more graduates who are at an even higher standard than before who can then all go overseas and interstate to get jobs because there are no jobs for them here. Quite frankly, unless you are able to provide jobs for these graduates, there is no point in producing them. We are just a sausage factory for the benefit of other countries and other states. Get something happening in regard to commercialising intellectual property and you will start to get some results.

I commend the motion, because I think it is a brilliant motion. I would like to see the Minister for Science come down here and speak to the motion and tell the parliament what money and resources Labor is committing to generate commercial opportunities from the excellent work being done by our scientists at SARDI, by our three universities and at CRCs and our centres of excellence. What South Australians want from their intellectual generators—their intellectual powerhouses—is jobs, opportunities and a future. Could the government please provide them.

Ms CICCARELLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROSE FESTIVAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That this house commends the South Australian Tourism Commission for the outstanding success of the recent 2002 Adelaide Rose Festival and congratulates the organisers, competitors, volunteers and other participants, including the South Australian Police and ambulance services and other agencies, and calls on the government to continue funding support for the Adelaide Rose Festival in future years to build on this success.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2066.)

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out the words ‘continue funding support for the Adelaide Rose Festival in future years to build on this success’ and insert— ‘do an economic benefit analysis of future funding for the Adelaide Rose Festival’.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded? The amendment fails for want of a seconder. The member for Norwood may continue to speak.

Ms CICCARELLO: I seek to move an amendment because, as we all recognise—

The SPEAKER: You have already moved the amendment. There is no seconder; it has failed for want of a seconder. I have so ordered. The member may continue her remarks.

Ms CICCARELLO: The Adelaide Rose Festival was and continues to be committed to the marketing, promotion and

organisation of a world-class horticultural and lifestyle event. The primary aim of the festival was to attract visitors from interstate and overseas, and it was certainly successful in doing that. It effectively promoted Adelaide's position as a major producer of roses. More than 50 per cent of Australia's roses are produced in South Australia, and we have only to look at the many beautiful gardens in South Australia to recognise that fact. Further, the rose industry is significant inasmuch as it employs more than 1 000 people, and it is certainly of economic benefit to the state.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Then why are you pulling the funding?

Ms CICCARELLO: The member for Waite keeps interjecting saying, 'Why don't you put funding into it?' I think that, as a responsible government, we like to assess all the events that we have and ensure that they are economically viable. For the last eight years, we had to put up with the previous government saying that the former Labor government was irresponsible and not good economic managers. We are showing that we are good economic managers. I think that, after any event, it is important to do an economic benefit analysis to ensure that it actually performed in a way appropriate to be of benefit to the people of South Australia.

I think we are tired of having feel good events. It is all well and good, and very nice, to have something but, if it is not of economic benefit to the state, we need to look at other opportunities where we can provide economic benefit to the people of South Australia. The South Australian Tourism Commission's Major Events organisation has commissioned market research and an economic impact study, the findings of which will be taken into account in reaching a decision about the funding of a future rose festival.

The staging of the 2002 rose festival was an entirely professional event, and credit is due to international organiser Adrian Greenoak and the AME staff. The government will conduct a full economic benefit analysis into the Adelaide Rose Festival to ensure that taxpayers are receiving value for money in terms of direct economic benefits to South Australia. During the term of the previous government, a rose garden was opened in South Australia, and members of the public were expected to pay to go and enjoy the benefits of it. Fortunately, the people of South Australia can now enjoy the rose garden free of charge, and this has certainly been a very positive outcome. I am very disappointed by the comments made by the member for Waite in this debate—and also, in fact, in debates relating to many other issues. He seems to think that we should just have an open purse and continue to fund events willy-nilly, irrespective of whether they are of economic benefit to the state. The rose festival was certainly enjoyed by tens of thousands of people in South Australia, but I think it behoves this government to ensure that we are spending our money wisely and, if it is of economic benefit to the state, the state government will look at future events.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise in support of this motion. South Australia has long been known as an ideal place for growing roses, and names such as David Ruston at Renmark, Walter Duncan, and others, have long been associated with the rose industry here in South Australia, and they are also at the forefront of developing new varieties of roses. The idea for a rose festival was the brainchild of a former member of the upper house, the Hon. Legh Davis, during a visit to Louisiana in the United States, where a rose festival was being held. Adelaide and Louisiana have similar

climates, and the Hon. Legh Davis believed that, given South Australia's advantage with its hot, dry summers and its excellent conditions for growing roses, this could well be a form of festival which would be interesting, which would attract tourists to South Australia and which would, again, showcase another industry in this state in respect of which we do extremely well.

Of course, that idea of the Hon. Legh Davis then grew into the progression by the previous government of the rose festival and, of course, the planting of roses alongside the Botanic Gardens. Many rose growers donated roses for the garden, and those people are to be thanked. I know that Walter Duncan (who is a good friend of mine), Kim Syrus of Corporate Roses and David Ruston (and there may well have been others) had quite a good deal to do with the planning and layout of the rose garden where it now stands. The rose garden encourages tourism to South Australia, and for the people of Adelaide it is an excellent opportunity to be able to see the widest variety of different roses that are available. They can see them in bloom and then they can go to their local landscaping or nursery business and purchase the roses or order them from the growers themselves. It is an ideal opportunity.

The festival itself was a success. When I looked through the list of people who were exhibiting at the festival, I noticed some names from my electorate—Gawler River Roses and Knights Roses—and also, as I mentioned, Walter Duncan of Walter Duncan Roses, and Kim Syrus and Peter Trenorden who run Corporate Roses. It just goes to show what can be done from the seed of an idea from one person, which incorporates the industry, which in turn gets behind the idea and then puts on a splendid event. Some of the displays were just magnificent. Other rose festivals are held, and I have been to the Chelsea Flower Show in England, which claims that its show is one of the best in the world. Let me say that this festival is second to none anywhere in the world.

The idea behind the festival was our natural competitive advantage in growing roses in South Australia. David Ruston's business at Renmark on the River Murray is well known throughout Australia for the quality of roses that are grown there, and the conditions for growing roses are absolutely second to none. I know that he sells within South Australia and right throughout Australia stock that is produced on his property, as do many other growers of roses in this state.

The idea is to attract international and interstate tourists to South Australia and it is another way to showcase our state so that we are not only known as the wine state but also for our other advantages. The festival had international speakers who presented papers and spoke about breeding roses all around the world. It was an excellent festival. I support the member for Waite's motion and also his comments about cuts to the festival's government funding. This is the sort of festival that we should be supporting here in South Australia. Sometimes it makes sense to look at the benefits of such events, but you must look at the people who are attracted to them.

All states know that conventions and festivals attract visitors from other states and overseas, and that has a very beneficial impact upon the economy, because such events bring in people who would otherwise not have visited the state and so would not have spent their dollars here. It creates employment for the people who provide facilities to these sorts of festivals. Because they stay in our hotels, employment is generated in the accommodation sector, and they

spend money here in buying South Australian wine or other gifts and items that they take home. From my experience working for the Centre for Economic Studies at the Adelaide University, I know that these sort of festivals have a multiplier effect of about 5:1 to 7:1. They are an extremely good idea because they bring foreign income into South Australia. I commend the organisers of this festival and those who put in such a lot of work to make sure it was a success and I look forward to its continuing in the future.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out the words 'continue funding support for the Adelaide Rose Festival in future years to build on this success' and insert—

'do an economic benefit analysis of future funding for the Adelaide Rose Festival'.

Many members have risen to speak in favour of the Adelaide Rose Festival, and naturally I stand to do the same. The Adelaide 2002 Rose Festival was and is committed to the marketing, promotion and organisation of a world class horticultural and lifestyle event. Its primary aim is to attract visitors to Australia from overseas and to attract other rose lovers like me to our wonderful city. The Adelaide Rose Festival effectively promotes Adelaide's position as a major producer of roses; more than 50 per cent of Australia's roses are produced in South Australia. The South Australian rose industry is significant in as much as it employs in excess of 1 000 people. The South Australian Tourism Commission's major events group has commissioned market research and an economic impact study, the findings of which will be taken into account in reaching a decision about the funding of a future rose festival.

I reinforce the points made by the member for Norwood earlier in response to the member for Waite's comments: that upon coming into office this government will review and look at the success of many of the initiatives that were implemented by the previous government, and the initiatives that we wish to implement will undergo a very rigorous process of evaluation and review to see whether or not there is indeed any economic benefit to hosting such events. The idea is to attract people here and to reap the economic benefits of their visit to South Australia. That is what will be examined by the market research that the South Australian Tourism Commission will undertake with respect to the rose festival.

The staging of the 2002 rose festival was entirely professional, and credit is most certainly due to international organiser Adrian Greenoak and the AME staff, and in particular I would highlight the significant role played by Ms Belinda Dewhirst in the success of that event. The government will do a full economic benefit analysis into the Adelaide Rose Festival to ensure that the taxpayers are getting value for money—and that is what our government is about—in terms of direct economic benefit to South Australia. I commend the amendment to the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): This amendment signals a warning shot from the government to all involved in the international rose festival, and that warning shot is that the government has no intention of funding the rose festival and is setting the scene to pull the funding. It is very clever to do an economic benefit analysis of future funding for the Adelaide Rose Festival. The government has had the books for a long time and would already know what the benefits of the rose festival were. It has the full history of the rose festival going back to its origins and it has very good

information already available to it on the economic impacts. It does not need a long-winded economic benefit analysis. This raises questions as to what the minister has put in her bilateral submissions to the Treasurer in regard to the Adelaide Rose Festival.

The very fact that the minister did not have the pluck to come into the chamber and move this amendment raises questions about her determination to see the rose festival continue its success. The fact that it has been given to the government backbench to amend the motion and basically foreshadow that funding for the festival is in doubt tells the organisers that there is a cloud over the Adelaide Rose Festival. If the government is serious about this major event, surely it could be more definite than to say, 'We want to have another review,' because an economic benefit analysis is another review—on top of the hundreds we have already. The do nothing Labor government, particularly in respect of tourism, now wants to have another review about the Adelaide Rose Festival with a view to slicing its funding.

The opposition is very well aware of what is happening. We will ensure that the *Hansard* is sent to the tourism community and the organisers of the rose festival. It is pretty obvious what the secret agenda is. Will the minister come into the house this afternoon and tell the house what she has put in her budget bilaterals to the Treasurer in regard to the rose festival? Does the SATC have the funding from the Minister for Tourism to support this event, or has it already been pulled? Is it already down the gurgler; and is this economic benefit analysis simply a ploy to fob the matter off and to bury it? I suppose it will be announced the day before Christmas (or something) that the rose festival has gone. It is not good enough.

We have had an interesting and thorough debate about the benefits of the rose festival. Members opposite have congratulated the organisers and signalled its benefits to the tourism industry and to the state, and then at the eleventh hour a backbencher is sent skulking into the chamber by the minister on her own account. They could not even get it right the first time: they mucked up their own moving of the amendment—they had to have two goes at it—to foreshadow that the funding has been pulled from the Adelaide Rose Festival. It is a disgrace. If it has not been pulled, let the minister come in here today and say so: that is, that she has put funding in her bilaterals to the Treasurer. If she has not, at least have the courage to let the people of South Australia know the facts.

The rose festival is a very good event. It is building on our international reputation, and it needs to be held in the future. Without the Labor government's support it will struggle to survive, and this amendment foreshadows what it has in mind secretly behind closed doors. I suspect and the opposition suspects that the funding has been cut. The Treasurer is out there with his hatchet looking for more money, and the rose festival has been identified. Let him tell us. The Treasurer is in the chamber, so perhaps he could say now—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, he is indicating with his scissor motion that the funding has gone. It is a very sad day for tourism. I commend the motion to the house.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

CLASSIC ADELAIDE RALLY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:
That this House—

- (a) commends Silverstone Events Pty Ltd and the South Australian Tourism Commission for the outstanding success achieved in the conduct of the 2002 Classic Adelaide Rally;
- (b) congratulates all volunteers, South Australian police officers, State Emergency Service personnel, South Australian Ambulance Service personnel and St Johns volunteers, competitors, sponsors, local councils and other community groups who contributed to the success of the event; and
- (c) calls on the government to continue funding support for the Classic Adelaide Rally in the years ahead.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 1928.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I have a few minutes remaining to make remarks on this matter. I spoke on the last occasion about the benefits of this fabulous Classic Adelaide Rally, run so capably by Silverstone Events. I called on the government to continue funding for the Classic Adelaide Rally. In light of what we just heard about the Rose Festival, I suppose we will get an amendment suggesting that there be yet another review about the Classic Adelaide Rally. It is a Labor government of reviews—one review after the other—while tourism lies in tatters. At least \$16 million has been cut from the tourism budget at a time when the tourism industry is still struggling to survive the collapse of Ansett Airlines, the events of 11 September, and the ongoing impacts of global terrorism. When tourism numbers have slumped and when international arrivals are down, the government has got a terrific answer—‘Let us have another review’. I would like to see the minister come in here and speak about the Classic Adelaide Rally. I would have loved to have seen her speak about the Rose Festival, but a backbencher was sent in here to deliver the news that funding was on its way out the door.

I commend the motion on the Classic Adelaide Rally, which calls on the government to continue its funding. The government should be rejoicing in the fact that it has the outstanding support of Silverstone Events, in effect, to take over the running of this event, which is a very expensive event to run, and contain the government contribution to in the order of about \$150 000 per annum. If the government is going to pull the plug on the Classic Adelaide Rally, then it does not augur well for tourism opportunities that follow. The Classic Adelaide Rally attracts some of the most desirable tourists a state such as South Australia can hope to have, many of whom linger on (to use the minister’s terminology) to go to the Barossa Valley and visit other destinations in the state. It is exactly the sort of event we ought to be keeping. This is an outstanding motion, which should be supported by every member of the house. The conduct of the event was a credit to AME, Silverstone Events and all involved, and it should continue for years ahead.

Time expired.

Mr O’BRIEN (Napier): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraph (c) and insert—

- (c) notes that the government will support this event until and including 2004.

In supporting this motion, albeit in an amended form, I commend Silverstone Events and the South Australian Tourism Commission on the success of the 2002 Classic Adelaide Rally. The 2002 event was the sixth staging and the first by Silverstone Events. It was the most successful rally staged to date and the most ambitious. The event was extended from four to five days, with a prologue held in Murray Bridge. A safe-driving seminar was held in conjunction with this prologue for students from Murray Bridge High

School. The number of entries increased from 150 to 200; 100 vehicles were in the competition category and 40 were brought from overseas.

Both Mercedes Benz and Porsche participated in the event through entries of rare museum vehicles. Mercedes Benz chose this event to celebrate the 50th anniversary of its SL model through the participation of six classic vehicles from its Stuttgart museum in Germany. One of these vehicles was a futuristic gull-wing 300 SL. The Porsche museum also sent two cars that had won the Dakar-Paris. The event enjoyed a large number of international, national and celebrity competitors, including Bob Rahal (a former Indy winner), Vern Shuppan (South Australian LeMans winner), Eric Bana and Paul Mercurio (actors) and Jim Richards (2002 Bathurst winner and the Targa Tasmania 2002 winner).

The number of international competitors was the largest in the event’s six-year history. Spectator numbers were also up by 20 per cent based on estimates by course officials. The Gouger Street party also attracted the largest crowd to date, estimated at 15 000. For the first time, a second Gouger Street party was held at the conclusion of the final stage on Sunday. The event generated about \$2.5 million in direct economic benefits for South Australia. This was calculated to produce a return by the rally of about 14:1 on government funding of \$175 000. The rally, which is for cars built before 31 December 1982, was also listed for the first time as an international FIA motor sport event.

Given the event’s newly-won international status, it was highly appropriate that the first car to leave the start ramp outside the Adelaide Hilton, Victoria Square, was a dark blue 1933 Alpha Romeo 8C, valued at \$5 million—a very special motor vehicle to lead off an international event. The motion congratulates the volunteers and various service organisations on the success of the event. More than 800 volunteers were involved in the conduct of the rally, acting as marshals, officials and administrative support. The Royal Flying Doctor Service was the official charity to link with the Year of the Outback and, between the sponsors, guests, competitors and officials, the event raised \$16 000 for the service. SATC’s Australian Major Events has budgeted to assist financially the Classic Adelaide Rally in 2003 and 2004.

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright. If the member for Wright wishes to speak, the honourable member may do so. However, the honourable member should realise that were the member for Waite to speak the debate would be closed.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

The SPEAKER: There being only one vote in the affirmative, the motion is negated.

Motion thus negated.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to close the debate and to thank the government for allowing the debate to continue. We have just had from the government an announcement that it will axe support for the Classic Adelaide Rally, an important major event in the tourist calendar in 2004. In response to my motion, the government has skulked in here and amended the motion to clearly signal that the government will support this event until and including only 2004. The former government provided \$175 000 for the event in 2002-03 and \$150 000 for the event in 2003-04. It was not even money that the new government had to

provide. It was money that had already been put aside by the former Liberal government.

The Labor Party's response to the Classic Adelaide Rally is to chop the funding. This comes on top of the announcement this morning that funding for the rose festival is in doubt. The government is saying goodbye to the sponsors of the rose festival: SA Water, the Adelaide City Council, Channel 9, Malaysia Airlines, Sky City and others. It is saying 'get lost' to the sponsors of the Classic Adelaide Rally: P&O Nedlloyd, Bowden Printing, Peter Lehmann Wines, Malaysia Airlines, Channel 10, Mitsubishi, BEA, and many others.

This follows the minister's stunning announcement earlier this week that she thinks that her own department and Major Events are dysfunctional and not focused on attracting tourists. She thinks that the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority, which comprises over 270 representatives of the private and public sector involved in tourism, is not focused on attracting tourists and is dysfunctional. On top of this news and the \$16 million that the government has chopped out of tourism expenditure and the massive wind-back in tourism energy that has occurred since this government came to office, we now have the news that the Classic Adelaide Rally is up for the chop and that the Adelaide Rose Festival is in doubt and there will be another review.

The only thing in tourism which is dysfunctional and which is not focused on attracting tourists is the Labor government. The only person who is behaving like a vandal is the minister by chopping these events, cutting the funding and accusing her own department and the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority of being dysfunctional and not focused. This is not good enough for the tourism industry. The Classic Adelaide Rally, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, attracts exactly the sort of tourists that we want to come to this state. Silverstone Events has done a marvellous job of taking over the day-to-day management of the Classic Adelaide Rally. The whole event costs well over \$1 million—more towards \$2 million—and all the government has to contribute is \$150 000. At least Labor could have decided to have another review, but it came out and caned it today and indicated that the funding will not be there. At least we could have had another review to add to the other couple of hundred reviews, and it would have given them some hope for the future. But no, the funding will not be there.

This is a miserable Labor government. It is not focused on tourism. This industry employs 42 000 to 43 000 people and it generates billions of dollars in economic turnover for this state. This government thinks tourism is an endless party. I am advised that the annual Christmas network gathering of all tourism operators has been cancelled. This is a major tourism networking opportunity, and the industry has just put out a bulletin to cancel this networking conference. This is a tragic week for tourism. The minister needs to get the industry back on its feet. She could start by bucketing her own department, ACTA and other participants in the industry, getting up some new events, getting some new expenditure, winning some arguments in cabinet about funding for tourism, creating some jobs for young South Australians, helping small business, and getting the tourism industry restarted again in the face of 11 September. It will come back to bite you. It is not good enough—the Classic Adelaide Rally should have continued. You have failed yet again.

Time expired.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Kotz:

That the government show support for the leadership and elected traditional owners and managers of the AP Lands, the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council by a public announcement in this house.

(Continued from 29 August. Page 1449.)

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): The government is refusing further debate on this motion, which stands in my name. Having been gagged from concluding debate on the motion, I therefore move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12.30 to 2 p.m.]

DOGS, TAIL DOCKING

A petition signed by 159 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to note that any move to prevent the tail docking would likely lead to increased injury to dogs of breeds that have traditionally been docked, was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

A petition signed by 272 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to defeat any bill which seeks to remove the rights of the citizens of this state to continue tail docking of dogs or refer any such bill to a committee to allow for appropriate consultation, was presented by the Hon. P.L. White.

Petition received.

TINTINARA/COONALPYN ALLOCATION PLAN

A petition signed by 272 electors of South Australia, requesting the house to review the Tintinara/Coonalpyn Allocation Plan for the Tauragat Management Area; to substantially reduce draw-downs of underground water to fifty percent of the stated levels; to educate irrigators to reduce pumping when above drawdown levels are reached and to revert to original development timeframes, was presented by the Hon. R.B. Such.

Petition received.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia, requesting that the house reject voluntary euthanasia legislation, ensure medical staff in hospitals receive proper palliative care training and provide adequate funding for the palliative care of terminally ill patients, was presented by Mr Koutsantonis.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council (ESIPC)—
Report 2001-02

By the Attorney-General (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—

Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal Report to the Attorney-General and Chief Justice Pursuant to Section 90A of the Legal Practitioners Act—June 2002

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. M.J. Wright)—
National Road Transport Commission—Report 2001-02

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board,
Actuarial Investigation of the State and Sufficiency of
the Construction Industry Fund—Report 2001-02
Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board—Report
2001-02

Ordered to be published (Paper No. 129)
Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety
Committee—Report 2001-02

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Advisory
Committee—Report 2001-02

WorkCover Corporation—Report 2001-02
Ordered to be published (Paper No 165)

WorkCover Corporation Statistical Review—Report
2001-02

MOTOR REGISTRATION OFFICES

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (24 October).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The previous Liberal Cabinet approved the creation of a unit 'Service SA' located in the Department for Administrative and Information Services. Service SA is a service delivery concept to provide whole of government services at a single point of contact. The service delivered by a Service SA Customer Service Centre includes all services currently provided at a Transport SA Service Centre.

Service SA Customer Service Centres now operate at Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Gawler. A Centre at Port Augusta will commence operation early in 2003. So as not to duplicate service delivery and costs, the Transport SA Customer Service Centres in Port Lincoln and Whyalla ceased operations as Transport SA and became Service SA Customer Service Centres.

In August 2002, Transport SA and Service SA jointly commenced a project to assess the benefits of one agency operating a whole of government service delivery network and ascertain which agency is better equipped to manage the service. The scope of this joint project does include the examination of the number and type of over the counter services that are required, particularly in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. However, this part of the project has not been examined to any great depth.

The project is not yet complete. Once completed, advice will be provided to Ministers for consideration. Closure of a Customer Service Centre would only be undertaken after appropriate consultation had taken place with the employee organisation involved and other affected stakeholders.

No formal review of the viability of Transport SA Customer Service Centres currently is underway. Rather, there is ongoing attention to managing the performance of these centres, and making sure that the centres comply with budget requirements.

HEYSEN TUNNELS

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND** (21 October).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Transport SA's review of the speed limit through the Heyesen Tunnels confirmed that the existing 90 km/h speed limit is appropriate. In particular, the determining factors related to sight distance around the curve in the tunnels and the level of lighting.

A higher speed limit than the existing 90 km/h would result in:

- Motorists having insufficient sight distance to react and stop in the event of an incident or queuing within the tunnel.
- An increased speed differential between slow moving heavy vehicles and other traffic which, as a general principle, would be detrimental to road safety.
- A requirement to upgrade the level of lighting in the tunnel. Any upgrade would incur significant expenditure plus ongoing operating and maintenance costs.

MOTOR VEHICLES, REGISTRATION

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (15 August).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The issue of bull bars on motor vehicles was raised at a Ministerial Council meeting in Auckland recently. There are some safety issues with regard to bull bars and also with four wheel drive vehicles, as many of these vehicles have bull bars fitted. These issues are being investigated on a national level.

As I indicated in my initial response to this question, I will consult with motor vehicle manufacturers on any proposals presented to transport ministers relating to cars and their equipment.

While I have already highlighted that safety is an important issue for the Government, the road safety package which I have announced does not include any proposal to impose a levy on motor vehicles fitted with bull bars.

ART GALLERY BOARD

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (21 November).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Art Gallery has not been required to use its cash reserves (assets) to meet the cost of recurrent expenses. The reduction in cash reserves during 2001-02 is due to the acquisition of works of art by the Art Gallery Board.

The Art Gallery has a clear acquisitions policy. Funds arising from public generosity through bequests and donations are not used to fund recurrent expenditure.

In 2001-02, acquisitions by the Gallery exceeded funds raised for this purpose. This was largely due to the most significant purchase made by the Gallery for some time – that of the rare Tiffany Windows.

2001-02 also saw the acquisition of some significant works of art by the Art Gallery for the enjoyment of South Australians. These included works of art by renowned local and international artists including Albert Tucker and Clifford Possum.

In 2001-02, the value of the Art Gallery's heritage assets increased by \$5.8 million. The reduction in reserves of \$235 000 on the previous year is directly related to the purchase of works of art, which, in turn, contributes to the increase in heritage assets during the period.

DROUGHT RELIEF

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (15 October).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has provided the following information:

The north-east of the State is in the grip of a long-term climatic downturn. Following the visit by myself and the Premier to the area on the 30 September 2002, we instigated the assessment of that area for Exceptional Circumstances support. Members of a community reference group met with State and Commonwealth Officials at Yunta on 6 November to assess information gathered by PIRSA staff against Exceptional Circumstances criteria.

On the advice of Commonwealth Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry officers, State officials and the community members are currently gathering additional information to support an Exceptional Circumstances application. It is expected this additional work will take until the end of November and then the State will make application to the Commonwealth for this area, as well as an area in the Murray Mallee, to be declared eligible for Exceptional Circumstances support.

On the matter of cost sharing for Exceptional Circumstances funding, the Commonwealth have stalled the implementation of Exceptional Circumstances policy reform measures because they are seeking an increase in the level of funding States contribute to the business support component of Exceptional Circumstances.

The original proposal from the Commonwealth was for States and the Northern Territory to increase the State/Territory fund share from 10 per cent to 50 per cent for all EC business support.

At the Primary Industries Ministerial Council meeting held on 10 October 2002, Commonwealth Minister Truss proposed that business support funding for EC be shared 90:10 Commonwealth:State in year one of EC, and 50:50 in the second and any subsequent years.

All states and the Northern Territory oppose such a change in the current funding arrangements since they provide ongoing support to their farming communities, and more recently many, including South Australia, have injected additional substantial assistance to drought affected farmers, graziers and rural communities.

The negotiations to resolve the funding for EC are continuing but will not delay any applications this State may make for an Exceptional Circumstances declaration.

WATER PRICES

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Water prices for 2003-04 will be gazetted this week in accordance with the requirements of the Waterworks Act 1932. Prices will rise by an average 3.5 per cent in 2003-04, reflecting inflation of 2.5 per cent plus an additional 1 per cent surcharge required to fund the country water filtration program which is providing treated water to townships in the Adelaide Hills, Barossa Valley, Mid North and along the River Murray.

The price increase is based on the methodology established under the previous government and applied consistently in recent years. Water bills for the average residential customer will rise from \$301.25 to \$312.50—an increase of \$11.25 per year or 22 cents per week. After saying that, I would like to advise the house that the cabinet recently determined that the current pricing regime does not meet the priorities of this government nor of the community. As a result, we have instituted a review of water pricing which will be conducted by a high level interagency group made up of the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, the Department of Environment and Heritage and SA Water.

The review will ascertain the best way to price water, taking into account the complex issues associated with water use in South Australia. I am confident that the outcomes will provide a fairer and more sustainable pricing regime. The review will report to the Minister for Environment and Conservation and the Minister for Government Enterprises. I am sure that by this time next year we will have a pricing system which better meets the needs of our community.

DRUGS SUMMIT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Today the Premier announced the South Australian government's initial response to the Drugs Summit, held from 24 to 28 June 2002. The summit was a landmark for South Australia and made 51 recommendations to the government. They take in a wide range of areas that require careful and timely consideration. Today's announcement is the government's immediate response to the recommendations, with an indication of its broader long-term plans to address these matters. It was clear from the summit that drug problems do not occur in isolation but are inter-linked with a range of social issues, including poverty and crime. There will be no simplistic solutions to what are complex problems, but the government is confident that we have seen the beginnings of a way forward, the seeds of a long-term strategy to really make a difference in tackling drugs.

The South Australian government has identified youth education, better treatment, and the use of dance party drugs by young people as key areas in need of immediate action in its initial response to the recommendations by the Drugs Summit. The government has committed more than \$3.25 million in the first year for early intervention programs involving problem drug users, Aboriginal communities and prisoners, all areas identified as critical points during the Drugs Summit. Programs will include:

- Expanded drug education in schools and intervention for young people at risk of harm from drugs.
- Preventing the use of and harm resulting from dance party amphetamine-type drugs by young people, reducing the supply of these drugs and targeting specialist dance party media as part of an education strategy.
- Strengthening support for Aboriginal communities in relation to dealing with drug issues, with the appointment of additional community constables as part of Drug Action Teams to deal with drug problems locally.
- Developing ways to intervene as young people begin using drugs, with intervention to reduce the risk of drug overdose; also expansion of drug substitution schemes.
- Expansion of prevention and intervention strategies such as the Drugs Court, and referral through the bail process.
- Increasing community protection through law enforcement and legislation being introduced to toughen penalties for drug offences.
- Improving integration of strategies, programs and services, which means a whole-of-government approach to developing policies to tackle the drug problem.

These programs will improve education of young people about the harmful effects of drugs and will target intervention at people regularly using hard drugs, provide more timely treatment and help them regain control over their lives. The government is already introducing tougher penalties for those involved in the commercial trade of illicit drugs, including a maximum 25-year gaol term for makers of the precursors, or ingredients, used in the manufacture of amphetamine-style drugs. The government is also moving to protect children by punishing drug dealers with life imprisonment if they supply illicit drugs to children or use children to help them traffic drugs.

As Minister for Health, I will head a ministerial committee tasked with implementing the response. The committee will also be responsible for developing more detailed plans for implementing the response in association with appropriate government agencies and non-government organisations. The Social Inclusion Initiative has examined in detail the 51 recommendations from the Drugs Summit and will undertake further work on issues identified during the Drugs Summit. The government wants to thank all the participants in the Drugs Summit, including many members of both houses, who attended and participated. I also want to thank the Social Inclusion Initiative and, in particular, Social Inclusion Board Chairman Monsignor David Cappo, for their important work in drawing together the government's response.

The Drugs Summit set a precedent in that it has pointed a way forward for us to develop a more effective drugs policy and more effective ways to intervene and prevent problems associated with drug taking. The government's future response will examine in greater detail issues such as poor health, crime rates, problem drug use, poverty and decreased social cohesion, and the role they play in leading to social exclusion. Only by building social inclusion can we hope to tackle these problems with any chance of success. This means that a whole of community response is needed, one that includes an integration of services and the most marginalised people in our society.

SCHOOL CARD

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the disadvantaged student payment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Claims have been made by the Australian Education Union about the payment of the School Card disadvantaged student payment to non-Partnerships 21 public schools for 2002 and 2003. The Labor state government announced on Thursday 4 April 2002 that non-P21 schools would gain access to extra money for every student on School Card—money previously given only to P21 schools under the former government.

Instead of receiving \$170 for every secondary student on School Card and \$110 for every primary student, non-P21 schools received, for the first time, the full amount of the compulsory materials and services charge, which is \$161 for primary and \$215 for secondary—the same amount received by P21 schools. This funding was paid into school bank accounts on 9 May 2002, along with 90 per cent of School Card funds for 2002 and any adjustments for the 2001 school year.

It has always been the case that non-P21 schools have received an up-front payment of 90 per cent of the previous year's School Card approvals, with adjustments for the previous year paid at the same time. Next year, these schools will receive their advance payment and adjustments in January. Union claims that this payment will not be made until the second half of the year are wrong. As I have announced in the house previously, I have approved that School Card funding for 2002 will be paid based on a school's 2002 School Card approvals or their 2001 actuals, whichever is higher.

Parents who have been deemed ineligible for School Card this year have been notified in readiness for next year, when they will not be eligible for School Card unless there is a change in their circumstances. Next year, schools will receive funding for every student who is eligible for School Card, as normal.

CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Two years ago, parliament passed regulations that will come into effect on 1 January 2003. These regulations will expand the scope of South Australia's container deposit legislation by adding a range of extra containers that will require redeemable deposits. Adding more containers will deliver significant cost efficiencies and remove even more litter from our streets and waterways.

The expanded CDL program will now include, for example, containers for flavoured milks, fruit and vegetable juices, and extra glass containers. Flavoured milk containers, in particular, have increased in number in the litter stream. The application of a deposit will remove these containers from the waste stream in much the same way that beer and soft drink cans have been removed. Of course, an important consequence of CDL is the high level of recycling achieved in South Australia. For many items, we have the highest recycling rates in Australia. This is almost entirely due to the redeemable deposit.

Industry has had two years to prepare for the new legislation. From 1 January next year, the EPA will enforce the new regulations. The government has been working closely with the container industry for a number of years, and I pay a tribute to the former ministers for the environment who set this process in train. The government worked with

the industry to finalise these new regulations and has continued to work with them during the two-year transition period to help the industry meet these new requirements.

In addition to this direct consultation with industry, the government is launching an education campaign to inform the general public about how the additions to the container deposit program will work. Starting on 3 January, there will be a series of radio and print media advertisements, complemented by the distribution of 50 000 brochures throughout the community. This campaign will include details about specific containers being added to the program, recycling procedures and locations of collection depots. While it is acknowledged that there may be some initial teething problems associated with the new legislation, I believe the outcome will greatly benefit our entire community.

FOUNDRY INDUSTRIES

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I seek leave to make an additional ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Are the 50,000 brochures recyclable?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Absolutely.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Newland withdraw leave?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, she was being witty, Mr Speaker. Today I would like to inform the parliament about progress the EPA has made in resolving the ongoing conflict between local residents and neighbouring foundries, in particular, Castalloy, Hensley and Mount Barker. The Castalloy foundry has been of concern to nearby residents for some years due to emissions of noise and odour. On 31 May 2002, Castalloy announced that it will build a \$35 million foundry at Wingfield, and plans to commission the new foundry in 2004, with full production commencing in 2005. The company is expected to move much of its automotive casting production away from its present North Plympton site. However, current production will continue at the site until 2004, and spare parts castings are likely to continue at North Plympton after this time.

Castalloy has also announced that Harley-Davidson proposes to increase orders for wheels from Castalloy by 20 per cent. Castalloy will be required to demonstrate to the EPA that any increase in wheel production at North Plympton will meet environmental standards and criteria and comply with the general environmental duty under the Environment Protection Act 1993. The EPA has completed its preliminary assessment of Castalloy's environment improvement programs (EIPs) for odour and noise. The EIPs propose an expenditure of \$3 840 000 for both noise and odour over a three-year period beginning 1 July next year. The EPA board has noted with concern that the currently proposed time frame to implement these EIPs may be in the order of up to four years. The EPA will examine ways of expediting the EIPs to meet Castalloy's publicly stated vision of achieving zero discharge of emissions.

In order to determine whether the company can reasonably and practically afford to implement the EIPs, the EPA is also currently determining the financial status of Castalloy and its parent company Ion Ltd. The revised EIPs will be tabled at three independently facilitated consultative meetings planned for this month. Community representatives will be given the opportunity to make constructive input into those EIPs.

Hensley Industries has also been the subject of numerous complaints from local residents regarding odour and noise emissions. Hensley is licensed by the EPA. The EPA has found cause to issue environment protection orders to that company. Hensley Industries has determined that it is not in its best interests, environmentally or economically, to continue operations at its current Torrensville site and it has proposed relocation to the cast metals precinct at Wingfield. Hensley has agreed to cease manufacturing at Torrensville by 31 March 2004, and the EPA has resolved not to grant Hensley a licence for its Torrensville site after that date. Hensley plans to commence shutting down operations at Torrensville late in 2003 and expects to cease metal melting in December 2003.

The Mount Barker foundry is currently in the process of decommissioning its Victoria Crescent, Mount Barker, operations and moving to its new site at Murray Bridge. The company is aiming to close down the Mount Barker site as soon as possible. However, the move could not commence until the new factory at Murray Bridge was operational. Within the next several weeks, no more core making will occur at Mount Barker—the most odorous part of its operations. Two of the largest core machines have already been moved. It is expected that by Christmas the majority of production at Mount Barker will have stopped. I am advised that all operations at the site will be completed by March 2003. The company now has a one month shutdown over the holiday period. The EPA will closely monitor the operations to ensure that the Mount Barker foundry adheres to this timetable.

SCHOOLS, WARRAMBOO PRIMARY

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement about Warrambo Primary School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The Chief Executive of the Department of Education and Children's Services has received a request from the governing council of Warrambo Primary School for the school to be closed from the end of the 2002 school year. The governing council is advised that the school community has met and the recommendation was for the closure of the primary school. I have agreed to the request and, in accordance with section 14A(2)(b) of the Education Act 1972, I inform the house that today I agreed to that request and that the Warrambo Primary School will close its doors for the final time at the end of this term. This follows concern from the parents about the educational, social and emotional needs of the students from the Warrambo area.

Today there are 12 students remaining at the school. In the future, students from the Warrambo area will attend schools at either Wudinna or Lock. I thank the school community for its positive and collaborative approach to determining the school's future. I wish the Warrambo families every success as they continue their education in neighbouring schools. I also officially recognise the efforts that all staff, past and present, have made for this school and this small community on Eyre Peninsula.

QUESTION TIME

JUSTICE, BUDGET CUTS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Attorney-General advise the house how he intends to meet the planned budget cuts within the justice portfolio totalling up to \$16 million?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I cannot confirm the figure, but we will work through the budget process.

DRUGS SUMMIT

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Following today's release of the government's initial response to the recommendations of the Drugs Summit, what priority initiatives have been identified by the government for immediate action and implementation over the next 12 months?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for this important question. Funding totalling \$3.253 million in the first year has been committed by the government for the implementation of the following priority initiatives, beginning early in 2002-03:

- First, building resilience in young people through education to provide appropriate education programs for young people (funding of \$750 000 in the first year);
- Young people and amphetamine type drug use was a key focus of the summit, and there is funding for three initiatives focusing on the youth dance party culture to encourage users to access the primary health care system and to reduce the supply and availability of psychostimulants. (Funding of \$853 000 in the first year);
- strengthening support for Aboriginal people, particularly through tier one and the petrol sniffing task force (funding of \$111 500 in the first year);
- saving lives through timely treatment (funding of \$1 210 500 in the first year);
- timely intervention linking people into treatment (funding of \$328 000 in the first year);
- increasing community protection; and
- improving integration of strategies, programs and services.

As mentioned in my ministerial statement, an interministerial committee will be responsible for the implementation of the government response to the drug summit.

POLICE, BUDGET CUTS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Police assure the house that in achieving the \$8 million budget cut to the police budget, as part of the Justice portfolio \$16 million cut, police officers will not be taken off the beat and placed behind desks to cover the cuts to police administration?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Police): I honestly do thank the Leader of the Opposition for this question, because it allows me to highlight one of the major commitments of this government. I do not know where the honourable member is getting his numbers from. I am sure that if he is patient he will find out in due course about our next budget, and about our next four budgets after that; I hope members opposite leave him alone so that he has a long time to look at them.

I take this opportunity to make plain the commitment that this government made. For the first time in eight and a half years, we will recruit police against attrition—something the former government failed to do consistently. The former government recruited police only before elections, and the police in this state were on a rollercoaster ride. Morale sank to its lowest ever level, and at stages police were not able to do their basic job. I can reaffirm the commitment of this government to recruit against attrition. We have made very

plain our priorities—health, education and police—and we will preserve the police to do the good job they are doing.

SOLAR ECLIPSE

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. What are the estimated numbers of visitors to the South Australian Outback for yesterday's total solar eclipse?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No: the Minister for Tourism, not the aspirants.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the honourable member for her question, and may I say how much I enjoyed viewing the eclipse on television with her in her room last night. The eclipse was an outstanding success as an event in South Australia. It was one of the fitting finales to South Australia's Year of the Outback.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: The last eclipse was under a Labor government, too!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Yes. It is impossible to specify exactly how many people witnessed the spectacle in the path of totality, but we believe it was in excess of 40 000; 22 000 people were in the vicinity of Ceduna, a further estimated 10 000 people were in Lyndhurst, with 7 000 at Woomera and Roxby Downs. The Outback and Eyre Peninsula communities were thrilled and justifiably proud of the way in which they planned and managed the event and the huge influx of visitors, virtually without a hitch. I am aware of one road traffic accident in the vicinity of one of the sites visited by tourists.

Event organisers in Lyndhurst praised the crowds, both at the eclipse festival and at the public access site on Farina Station. The public sites at Purple Downs Station and Wirraminna Station were a great success and had perfect viewing conditions for all visitors. Whilst there was heavy cloud cover over Ceduna during much of the day, there was an awesome spectacle as the cloud separated just a few moments before totality, providing a breathtaking vista across Murat Bay. Detailed planning proved to be accurate at Ceduna and across all public access sites, with money committed by the state government to ensure adequate signage and infrastructure and to guarantee public safety and minimal damage to the state's environment. Eclipse tourists should all be commended for the way they behaved in the Outback, on the roads and at the access sites.

Global coverage for the state has been massive. Four television crews were filing live crosses nationally from Ceduna, and vision screened around the world on CNN, who described Ceduna—and I agree with them, having spent a marvellous holiday there—as a popular Australian seaside resort. The CSIRO reports that more than 500 000 people tried to access the live webcam from Ceduna, causing something of a meltdown to their mainframe. But hundreds of thousands of people are expected to watch the replay in coming days. The clean-up is now under way and will involve not only Ceduna but all other access sites. It is too early to estimate the economic impact of the event to Ceduna and Outback communities, although traders are ecstatic with the results, and the infrastructure investment in Ceduna has left a legacy for the future in terms of effluent upgrade.

POLICE PATROL CARS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Police advise the house what the impact on fighting crime will be from the government's planned cut of up to 16 police patrol cars from local service areas as part of an \$8 million police savings target?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Police): If you will indulge me, sir, I must say that they are absolutely Aerogard for cameras, are they not: they are a media repellent. I repeat the answer I made earlier. This is the first government that has made a commitment to police numbers in this state in 8½ years, and we will provide them motor vehicles to drive in as well.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is directed to the leader of government business. How many questions without notice has the government answered in 2002?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thought we would get a comment like that from the member for Bright. I am not surprised that members opposite do not want to hear the answer to this, Sir, but I am sure you do, because I think the answer will reflect very well not only on the openness and accountability of this government but, of course, on the compact signed with you for more open and accountable government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They certainly do not want to hear it, but I will persevere. In the eight months since the beginning of this session, this government has answered a third more questions than the previous government did in the whole of 2001. But wait—it gets better, because, if we concentrate on questions allowed from the opposition to the government, we find that, when members opposite were in government in the whole of 2001, they allowed 336 questions from us. In the eight months of this session, we have answered 600 of their questions—75 per cent more questions. How have we achieved that? I have to say there was only one area where they matched it with us: we had roughly the same number of questions allowed from backbenchers in this eight months as they had in the previous year.

We have made question time a time for the opposition to have scrutiny of the government in a way that has not been done before. They can howl and shriek but the simple truth is that we have been more open and accountable than any government—certainly far more than the previous government that was frightened of sitting and, when it sat, it ran down the clock during question time with some of the duller contributions. We will remember the member for Unley getting up and reading out what seemed to be the phone book some days. We have matched this with legislation to make government more honest, open and accountable. We will continue down this path, and I am sure that the people of South Australia will appreciate it on that magic day in March 2006.

STATE PROTECTION SECURITY BRANCH

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Further to my discussion last week, will the

Treasurer categorically confirm that South Australia Police (SAPOL) will receive an additional \$300 000 funding for the development of the State Protection Security Branch. Last week on the Father John Fleming program, a senior police officer tied up with the State Protection Security Branch was questioned about the funding. His response to the question from Father John Fleming was, 'We will continue working very, very closely with the government to see if we can secure that capital.'

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I am happy to get the honourable member an answer and provide it to him at the earliest opportunity.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What fire management preparation is undertaken by the National Parks and Wildlife Service to prepare South Australian parks for the coming summer?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the honourable member for this important question. As all members would know, we are obviously facing a very difficult fire season, and the Minister for Emergency Services has already issued warnings and made announcements in relation to the coming season and the problems we will be facing in South Australia. In the national parks system there are particular issues that need to be addressed.

I am pleased to advise the house that the National Parks and Wildlife Service of South Australia is responsible for fire management on land under its control to ensure the protection of life and property and the maintenance of biodiversity values. National Parks develops fire management plans in consultation with local district bushfire committees and other key stakeholders and maintains access within reserves for bushfire suppression. A detailed risk assessment program is under way for the Mount Lofty region. National Parks has budgeted \$1.1 million for fire management in the current financial year, and that includes \$215 000 for seasonal preparation works, including training, maintenance of equipment and protective clothing; a further \$205 000 for bushfire prevention works, fire access maintenance and fuel reduction programs in strategic locations statewide; \$250 000 for upgrading fire equipment statewide; \$220 000 for regional management support by the fire management section; and, an additional \$250 000 has been allocated for the same year to establish a National Parks fire strike force team, which will be based at Mount Lofty Ranges to provide an early fire suppression response in that region. National Parks and Wildlife will continue to work closely with the Minister for Emergency Services and the CFS to keep the community safe this summer.

TAFE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is a Paralympics tie, which I am very proud to wear. My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Will the minister advise the house how many and which courses will be affected by the \$3.5 million cut to the TAFE budget, and can

she advise the house how many students will now be able to access courses as a result of her cuts?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): Can I explain that the Office of Employment does not run the TAFE. I think the substance of the question relates to the budget implications across the TAFE sector or the VET sector. I am very happy to take that question on notice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I see by the behaviour of the opposition that most people would be justified in thinking them young enough to believe in Father Christmas, but it is unlikely they do or that Father Christmas will visit them if they continue to behave in that way.

JULIA FARR SERVICES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is directed to the Minister for Social Justice. Have there been any developments in relation to the provision of aged care at Julia Farr Services?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): The Julia Farr Services Board has been developing a strategic plan for the future which would see a shift from specialised aged care nursing services at Fullarton towards a mix of community and village-style accommodation for residents of all ages. This has led to suggestions that Julia Farr would either close or stop providing care for aged residents: it will do neither. Julia Farr Services is continuing with the development of a strategic plan which will be considered further by the board in February. High on its agenda is consideration of the types of accommodation and care services that will best meet the needs of its clients in the future. It will also examine the opportunities for Julia Farr Services to develop services that would assist elderly disabled people who are currently in hospitals and unable to be accommodated in suitable nursing home accommodation.

This will require discussions with aged care and disability sectors, hospitals and the commonwealth government. While I mention the commonwealth government, I should tell the house that I still have not received an answer to the two letters I sent to the federal minister in early December asking him to spell out any concerns he may have about Julia Farr. I am starting to think that the only way he wants to communicate is by press release. Nevertheless, whatever type of accommodation and services Julia Farr may develop in the future, I want to emphasise this point: Julia Farr will ensure that all current and new residents, who are either 65 or who turn 65, will continue to be cared for by Julia Farr for as long as they wish. While the strategic plan is being developed, Julia Farr Services will continue to fill the 70 commonwealth nursing care beds at the Fullarton site.

The Department of Finance and Treasury, Julia Farr Services and the Department of Human Services have looked again at the \$1.65 million administrative savings that Julia Farr Services has been asked to achieve. Julia Farr Services has been advised that the savings target will be revised to ensure that any administrative savings measures do not detrimentally affect the care of residents and clients. Julia Farr's finance committee and board are considering the issue and will consult fully with employees and residents before any changes are implemented. It has just been brought to my attention that in my criticism of the commonwealth govern-

ment minister I said that I had sent the letter in early December: I should have said early November which, as members will recall, was when there was publicity mainly by media release—I might say incorrect publicity—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: —I thank the member for Bragg—on this whole area of the future of Julia Farr Services. So, I just clarify that point.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Following the announcement by AGL of a 2 per cent electricity price rise in Victoria, will the Minister for Energy now change his government's approach to electricity price setting which, if unchanged, will see electricity prices charged to South Australian households rise by up to 32 per cent from 1 January 2003? Victorian electricity retailers have announced new prices to apply from February 2003 to Victorian households. Retailer AGL has announced an increase of just 2 per cent for Victorians. Last year AGL applied to increase Victorian prices by 15 per cent, an application that was refused by the Victorian government. Instead, only a 4.7 per cent increase was granted. In South Australia, AGL applied for a 32 per cent price increase for summer peak, and this was approved under the Labor government.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): On this issue I will try to be brief, because I have explained this over and over to the member for Bright. He is incapable of understanding, it seems. On this issue the opposition is a stranger to shame. Members opposite should be embarrassed about the situation they left for South Australians through their privatisation. I will explain it again. The process that was supported by this parliament, not simply by this government, for justifying price increases in South Australia was that set out at some length by the Essential Services Commission.

Let me again identify for the member for Bright what the major component of those price increases was, that is, the massive increase in the value of the infrastructure—the massive increase brought about by securing a high price at privatisation. It is there in black and white to explain the difference in prices. The difference is that they went out, they lied to the people of South Australia, they sold their electricity assets—

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding the minister's beliefs about what happened, it is unparliamentary to refer to anyone as having lied.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I apologise and withdraw. They grotesquely misled the people of South Australia as to their intentions. They said that they would not sell ETSA: they sold it. They maximised the price. They locked in higher prices. How many times do I have to explain it to them?

SCHOOLS, OB FLAT PRIMARY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Does the Minister for Education and Children's Services have any further information to add to her statement to the house yesterday about the closure of the OB Flat school?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I do. This morning on ABC radio the Leader of the Opposition complained about the ministerial statement made last night informing the house of the closure of the OB Flat school. He was not complaining about the

closure of the school. In fact, he made it clear that he did not have a problem with the school being closed; he was merely whingeing about the fact that I took the time and the opportunity available last night to inform the house about the closure of the school.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: In attempting to score some political point over something that the opposition claimed it does not object to, there seems to be some implication by the leader and now by the deputy leader that the school is being closed by stealth.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The opposition really knows how to lead with its chin. Out of the dozens of closures of schools by the previous Liberal government, a portion of which were done by the immediate former Liberal Minister for Education, I am yet to find a single ministerial statement informing the house that they were about to be closed. Talk about leading with your chin! Criticise if you will: all this really proves is the hypocrisy of the opposition.

TRANSPORT SA

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Transport advise the house whether he intends to continue to refuse Liberal members of parliament—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: —access to departmental public servants on all matters of public interest which are already in the public domain, and whether this directive is in contradiction to his government's policy on openness and accountability? Last Friday, an appointment for a Tea Tree Gully City Council officer and an officer of Transport SA to brief me on recent changes to road reconstruction in my electorate was kept only by the officer of the council. I was advised that the officer from Transport SA could not keep the appointment as he required from the Minister for Transport permission which was not forthcoming. Prior to this, on a different matter, I sought public information from the Department of Transport only to have my staff told that the minister had directed departmental officers not to talk to any Liberal member or staff member nor answer any email or fax from Liberal electorate offices.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Newland for her question.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Are you going to take the question on notice?

The SPEAKER: The member for Bright has had the call for the last time before Christmas.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The process that has been put in place in respect of what the member for Newland is talking about is no different from that put in place by the previous government. It is a very simple process. If local members go to the trouble of calling the office and request a briefing on a particular issue with a particular departmental person, that will be organised for them as a matter of priority. That has been told—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The honourable member might laugh.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, that is right; he wasn't. The member for Davenport may well laugh. In the majority

of cases, most members are aware of that standard and are more than happy to follow that course of action.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Despite the interjections from the member for Newland, who seems to want to not only ask but also answer her own question, she might care to listen to the answer. In future, if the honourable member would like a briefing about a transport issue, she should undertake the proper course of action. If she is unsure about the proper procedure and the correct course of action—and I would have thought she would be aware of it; she has been in this house for a long time—I will make it crystal clear for her right now. If she would like a briefing on any issue by any officer involving any part of the transport portfolio, there is a very simple procedure to follow and, if it is good enough for the former minister for transport to follow this procedure, opposition members can observe the courtesy of calling the minister's office and speaking to a Chief of Staff member, or any other staff member in that office, and go through that very simple procedure; and that will be organised for any member of the opposition as a matter of priority.

Members of the opposition have a right to those briefings. I am happy for those briefings to be organised—and, in fact, I am keen for those briefings to be organised. That is not a difficulty; that is not a problem; that is not a matter of conjecture. All they need to do is go through the correct procedure. We have been well trained by the previous government. The previous government put in place those practices and, certainly, when I was shadow minister, I cannot recall any occasion on which that procedure was not followed to the letter of the law. I cannot say with certainty that there may not have been the odd occasion when that procedure was not followed but, to the best of my memory, on every occasion—or near enough to every occasion—when I required a briefing, that is the procedure that I was asked to pursue. I was happy to do it, and the opposition well knows that that is the way to conduct its business.

GOVERNOR'S LEADERSHIP FOUNDATION

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is directed to the Attorney-General. What are the details of the recent graduation from the Governor's Leadership Foundation of the South Australian Victims of Crime Coordinator?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The Governor's Leadership Foundation program is part of the SA Business 2010 Inc., which aims to turn South Australia into one of the best places in the world in which to live, visit, work and do business. The former government agreed to proceed with the program in 1996, and it has continued under this government. Two weeks ago, Mr Michael O'Connell graduated as a Fellow of the Governor's Leadership Foundation.

Mr Brokenshire: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I note the approval of the member for Mawson. It is merited. Michael O'Connell was appointed the state's first Victims of Crime Coordinator in March last year. Michael's previous work history included about 20 years' service in the South Australia Police. While a police officer in 1989, he was appointed the state's first victim impact statement coordinator, and he was a strong advocate for victims to write their own victim impact statements. The government is a sponsor of the foundation program and, on its behalf, I am pleased to recognise Michael O'Connell's achievement.

In the mid 1990s, Michael helped organise the international symposium on victimology. His work in this field was formally recognised in 1995, when he was awarded the Australian Police Medal. While advancing his police career, Michael was also able to develop an academic career specialising in victims studies. Michael tells me that he has survived three attorneys-general, and I am the fourth. I believe that this is a testament to his willingness to work with others across the political spectrum to achieve real improvement for victims of crime. I look forward to continuing to work with Michael O'Connell to fulfil the Labor government's promise to improve the rights of victims of crime.

TOURISM MINISTER

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Does the Minister for Tourism stand by her remarks made on Thursday 28 November, when she claimed that the previous government had 'never compiled an annual calendar of events for tourism', and that state-wide events were 'not consolidated into one calendar'? If her statements were not correct, will she apologise to the house and correct the record?

I have in my hand a copy of the *South Australian Calendar of Major Events 2001-02*, which was released by the former government, which I am happy to provide to the minister. It contains a foreword by the former minister for tourism, the member for Morialta—my good friend. The calendar consolidates all events from July 2001 to July 2002, and beyond, and lists 528 events across the state, ranging from South Australian Tourism Commission sponsored events to arts and culture events, local government sponsored events, significant charity functions, sporting fixtures, conventions, expos and many other activities. I will make a copy available to the minister.

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Tourism.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Tourism has the call.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Waite for his disingenuous question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order and allow the minister to finish.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The document to which he refers is a fabulous holiday organiser for the public. It is a document I have used over many years in planning my own visits and holidays around the state. However, what that calendar does is essentially combine all events across Australia in an almanac-like style. When one is considering major events with an economic impact, Australian Major Events—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. When one considers Australian Major Events, one is looking in essence at those events that have a significant impact on the economy. Those events are large-scale conventions, large-scale conferences—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Allow the minister to finish.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker—and Australian Major Events sponsored events that attract many hundreds of thousands of people to the city and the state generally. In working out how one might even

out the peaks and troughs through the tourism industry, it is worth recognising that, whilst there are many community events in our state, not all of them engender significant tourism activity in terms of overseas and interstate visitors. To date there has been no compilation by the convention, arts and major events industries of those special events which occur particularly in the city and which will produce full hotels, full restaurants and full shopping malls. For instance, when you look at the impact of the Australian University Games you did not have to go very far to find a taxi driver who was enthralled or a pub that was overwhelmed by the number of people in the city during that event.

Whilst it is interesting that there should be a small festival in a small town in regional South Australia, the business of Australian Major Events is to even out the peaks and troughs that occur in the major hotels and event venues in our state. For that reason, this year for the first time I asked the convention industry to come together, the Convention Centre to consolidate its bookings and Australian Major Events to look at the calendar of events over the next few years to see whether there was a single hiatus. It is quite clear that when this was done—and I have to say with some reluctance, because the convention industry regards its events as commercial in confidence—there were some startling and shocking gaps in the calendar. Notwithstanding that there may have been a barbecue, special event or a party somewhere, there were some very shocking gaps that from memory represented nine months during the next five years. What happened during those nine months was that there was not, say, a festival of ideas, a 2000-plus convention, a cabaret festival or any event at all in a single month that could produce an economic impact in our state.

It is quite significant that the South Australian Tourism Commission until that point had not been aware of those major gaps. The other opportunity that this offers us is that we can then either attract particular conventions or special events or even generate new events that will fill those holes. The disconnect was left by the previous minister and his four friends; and perhaps he has more than four friends—who can tell? The five former ministers of tourism might have been just enough to run a basketball team. We have heard the member for Waite's comment: he thinks we should have more parties, launches and festivities rather than economic development.

They left a situation whereby Australian Major Events was producing fabulous, world-class, stand-alone events, and conventions were magnificent organisational events, but the previous government had no concept of the fact that none of those events was organised for any purpose other than tourism. If you organise a special event and allow the participants to leave, you have lost an opportunity. As I have tried to explain to the member for Waite previously—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Use smaller words, perhaps!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: That may be the answer. As I have tried to explain to the member for Waite previously, we are in a very fragile situation in terms of tourism. We have 2 900 inbound seats a week compared with 180 000 inbound seats between Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne. Even for our short-haul visitors, those coming from New Zealand, there is a significant impediment in getting to South Australia because it adds an extra four hours to their flights. We are very happy to fight for extra inbound flights and extra seats, and we are doing that on many fronts. Indeed, this was an activity in which the former government might have become gainfully involved.

The reality is that it is similar to running a business: it is much more effective to keep a customer than to recruit a new one. While the member for Waite might understand about army activities, when you are running a business it is much easier to keep a customer than to recruit a new one. It is one of the basic tenets of running a business. If we keep our customers who come to a major event or convention and have them stay five, six or eight days longer, it is actually as good as getting two new visitors. It is much easier to keep a tourist than to get a new one, because of the lack of inbound flights.

The government's view of tourism is that, instead of changing ministers—the way other people change their coats or shoes in the hope that one day they will get one with imagination, creativity and the ability to think laterally—we are trying to develop a strategy, a policy and an agenda. Just because the member for Waite failed to get one does not mean he should ridicule us for having one.

FLEET SA

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Administrative Services. What is the government doing to make its motor vehicle fleet more environmentally friendly?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): The Fleet SA division of the Department of Administrative and Information Services continually looks for ways to improve the costs and environmental effectiveness of the state government's light vehicle fleet, which consists of around 1 600 vehicles. Since this government took office, we have been vigorously pursuing measures which will reduce the emission of greenhouse gases in our fleet and considering alternative options, including the use of LPG fuel and electric cars where appropriate. Therefore, it was timely that Fleet SA recently submitted its emission performance to the National Greening Motoring Initiative. The later seeks to assist organisations to optimise the performance of their fleets, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the environmental impact of fleet vehicles.

I am delighted to inform the house that Fleet SA was awarded with a certificate acknowledging energy efficiency—best practice vehicle fleet for improvements in fleet efficiency and greenhouse emissions. The awards were presented at Parliament House Canberra on 17 October 2002. This is an example of where the public sector has successfully led the way, and we will continue to do so. This government has a positive green agenda, and I intend to pursue it as rigorously as possible through all my portfolio areas. This whole issue of procurement and the capacity to pursue a green agenda and provide the government as an exemplar for industry is an important strategy of the new government.

MITSUBISHI MOTORS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Investment and Trade. What is Mitsubishi's progress in South Australia following the government's historic deal to secure Mitsubishi's presence here?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Industry, Investment and Trade): Obviously, the member is within a southern suburbs electorate and, along with a number of my colleagues (in fact, all South Australians), has a key interest in the progress of the expansion of Mitsubishi. I thought it appropriate from time to time to update the house on progress

because, when we came to office, confronted with this potential crisis for our state, the new Labor government acted swiftly. As all members would recall, we brought in the talents of a number of people to assist us—including the former premier John Olsen—to ensure that we lobbied Canberra effectively, with purpose and with success as the outcome. Of course, getting that success is now history. The package of assistance is being provided over a number of years by both governments.

The Magna replacement is due for release in late 2005. A new long wheel based luxury vehicle is due for release in 2006. That is targeted at primarily the export market. The support provider will not just assist in retaining the 3 200 jobs but will also lead to the creation of a further 1 000 direct jobs and, obviously, with the multiplier effect, many more throughout the economy. Pleasingly, Mitsubishi has continued to make strong progress through its planning process and is on track to introduce the new model, as I said, in late 2005.

Of course, another major component of the deal is that Mitsubishi would increase its research and development facilities in Adelaide. A great deal of detailed planning has already occurred. The number of research and development staff has increased from around 100 last December to at least 150 at present. Most are working on the 2003 facelift but core staff—around 55—are working on the new 2005 model, and this will grow. Importantly, we should mention that the research and development facility will be one of a select number of facilities for the Daimler Chrysler group worldwide, and this R&D facility will be designing cars and vehicles for the world market out of Adelaide. That was a major component of what we would want in return for the significant taxpayer assistance.

I can also advise the house that Mitsubishi has already offered permanent employment to 100 casual production workers, and many other positive signs are emerging. The 2001 calendar year was a record export year, with 19 000 units, and, we are advised, the figure for 2002 will exceed 24 000 units. The company recently celebrated its tenth year of exporting vehicles to the United States. Until Holden's commences exporting the Monaro coupes to the United States in 12 months' time, Mitsubishi will continue to be the only Australian car maker exporting vehicles to the United States. Mitsubishi will be the first local manufacturer to release an Australian made all wheel drive sedan, and this will happen in the near future. Credit to the company: I am sure that all members in this place would join me in acknowledging the outstanding work of the work force, the management and the Chief Executive of the company, Mr Tom Phillips, as without his drive, passion and commitment this company would not have the rosy future that it has.

MAGIC MOUNTAIN

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I can perhaps teach someone here to speak more quickly! Will the Minister for Urban Development and Planning assure the house that he will do everything possible to remove Magic Mountain and replace it with a modern entertainment complex and increased open space at the Holdfast Shores stage 2B development? The question is being asked in the consultation process currently being organised by the Holdfast Shores Consortium, which asked respondents to approve one of three proposals. One proposal envisages a 15-storey apartment complex.

Many constituents have spoken to me to seek a halt to more high-rise residential development on the foreshore at Glenelg.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I thank the honourable member for his question. They return to the scene of the crime! The previous government has turned the foreshore of Glenelg into something that looks like a bizarre form of the Gold Coast. They seek to criticise this government, which now seeks to inject the views of the community into this development for the first time. We come up with a proposition to give back open space to people. We come back with a proposition to demolish an eyesore, which we have put in front of the people of this state and asked them to comment on—something unheard of under the previous regime—and we are criticised. We will make an intelligent decision, we will be informed by the public and we will make a massive improvement to that site.

EXCELCARE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Will the minister explain the reasons for the further extended delay in implementing a new staffing system Excelcare for major public hospitals? It is now three months since the threatened industrial action by nurses over the failure of the government to implement the new Excelcare system on 1 September. At the time, the minister said that a final decision for a replacement rostering system would be made within the next few months. I have been told that the decision is not close.

The SPEAKER: I can tell the deputy leader before I call the minister that, notwithstanding the fact that he may have been told things, the house does not need to know that in order to understand his question, and I regard it, as he well knows, as highly disorderly. The minister.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The colossal nerve and hypocrisy of the deputy leader is just breathtaking. The whole issue in relation to the Excelcare system is a fantastic example of how poorly the health system was managed under the former minister. I will spend a minute or two reminding the house of the facts around—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order and members will be warned shortly if they continue with their disruption.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I will spend a few minutes reiterating some of the issues around the Excelcare system. Members may remember that when the current government came to power back in March, about the first thing that I was made aware of, within two or three weeks of being minister, was that we were in danger of breaking an enterprise bargaining agreement, which the previous minister had signed, in relation to putting in line a new Excelcare staffing system for nursing. The ANF advised us that, because the work had not been done, we would definitely break the enterprise bargaining agreement. So, we started the work that the previous minister did not do.

The other thing we found out, of course, was that there was no money in the budget—what a surprise! This is not the only area where I have had to return to cabinet to obtain money to put in place decisions of the former minister that were unfunded. However, we got started immediately on the Excelcare issues. Members will remember that this matter reached the point of possible industrial action but which was

averted because the department continued its good work with the ANF and worked through the issues.

The issue of the replacement Excelcare system has been complicated. We have had a group working on the tender process. The member for Bragg shakes her head and looks aside. She has no idea of the complexities of what I am talking about and the issue before us, the issue that her own colleague shamelessly disregarded while he was the minister. The process of replacing the Excelcare system is underway. The money has been put in the budget by the current government. Unlike the previous minister, we are working on it as fast as we can.

REAL ESTATE DATA

Mr VENNING (Schubert): My question is directed to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. Is the minister aware of the negative impact that banning of the release of vendors' and purchasers' names from sales data—previously released by the government Land Services Group through Upmarket Software Services—has had on the private practising valuers, causing anxiety and concern? Vendors' and purchasers' names have been made available for decades with such information enabling valuers to be fully informed about property transactions. Valuation practice is based on the ability to analyse sales, and valuers will experience great difficulties in determining whether a sale is a genuine market transaction without any unknown facts. Being fully informed is vital, particularly in this day and age of litigation, and any uncertainty leaves valuers wide open to litigation. According to the Land Services Group, information can be purchased through the Property Assist online service, at a cost and more inconvenience. The ban commenced from October 2002, with previous names also being deleted, and a new service is proposed to be available after March 2003.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): This process of depersonalising the dataset that is provided to real estate agents was a process that, in fact, began under the former minister. It is a process that we have taken forward and it is a sensible measure. As I mentioned in an earlier answer to this house, the advent of new technology and, in particular, the way in which CDs are now provided, means that the personal information that is provided about land sales data can be used in a fashion which is not comprehended as the statutory function for the use of this information. In other words, this information can infringe on people's privacy in a way not comprehended by them when they hand over the information to buy or sell a property.

This is a process of depersonalising the dataset that has been going on for some time. There has been a process in place from the start which has engaged the industry through their representative associations. Those associations have, on behalf of the industry, raised the very concerns that the member has raised about the effect that this has on a particular slice of the industry, that is, valuers and their capacity to get information of a quality which allows them to make accurate valuations. For instance, one needs to know whether a transaction is between family members, to know whether it is a proper value for a transaction to value; so that that will affect the valuation.

We have tried to respond to that by introducing measures such as coding and a whole range of other measures that will ensure that the industry can get the information they need from a dataset and, indeed, in a fashion which is timely and

which does not cost them so much that it makes it impractical. That process is underway. We have only recently signed off on even further measures that will assist in that regard. We are confident that we have met the industry concerns, but it is a balance: the needs of the industry and also ensuring the proper privacy of individuals.

HANSARD, INSERTED MATERIAL

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise on a matter of privilege. This morning the member for Fisher rose, there being no question before the house, to make a personal explanation. In the course of that statement the member sought leave to insert into *Hansard* an answer he had received to a question asked in estimates. He did so without indicating either the nature of the question or of the reply. Indeed, the Attorney asked Mr Speaker to consider the propriety of the procedure. Mr Deputy Speaker, as you are aware, any member has the right to refuse leave. I therefore ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker, whether our rights and privileges have been trespassed when we are put in a position where we are asked by another member to sanction the insertion into *Hansard* of a document about which we have no knowledge?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the member for Unley, the Speaker indicated this morning that he would consider the matter and report back to the house. So, it is inappropriate for me to indicate anything other than that the matter has been referred to the Speaker for his consideration.

Mr BRINDAL: I understand, sir, but I got the Attorney to look at this. This is, in fact, an additional consideration that I am asking the Speaker to make. I do not expect you to rule on it.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On the matter, sir, could I suggest that it is simply answered: you could have refused leave.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker has indicated that he will consider the matter. It is inappropriate for me to pass any judgment on it.

HOUSING TRUST TENANCIES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The issue of disruptive neighbours has been the subject of public concern for quite some time. Accordingly, I am pleased to make available the new South Australian Housing Trust internal report of the difficult and disruptive tenants policy and procedures review. The policy was first introduced in 1991 and this most recent review suggests significant changes to the way in which the Housing Trust will deal with the problem of disruptive tenancies. The report proposes practical measures to improve responses to the poor behaviour of a small number of Housing Trust tenants.

I stress that antisocial behaviour is a whole of community issue and is not limited to public housing tenants. For example, in 2001-02 the Residential Tenancies Tribunal received almost 300 complaints under section 90 of the Residential Tenancies Act, seeking termination of tenancies

on antisocial behaviour grounds, with the majority being in the private rental sector. The review report demonstrates the ongoing commitment of the trust and its staff to responsible tenancy management.

I want to place on record my appreciation for the dedicated work of the Housing Trust and other departmental and community agency staff involved in this sensitive area of work. Nevertheless, we were well overdue for this review. The report will assist the government to provide effective social housing programs and also provides a useful reference document for the Legislative Council's inquiry into the South Australian Housing Trust. In the Housing Trust's experience, difficult and disruptive tenancy complaints fall into three main categories. There is minor disruption, which includes one-off neighbourhood disputes, and disruptions such as parties or TV and stereo noise. Also, there was more frequent repeated disruption such as unabated domestic disputes, harassment, regular, bizarre or frightening behaviour and repeated disruptive parties.

Then, of course, there is serious or extreme disruption that is defined as situations in which there is actual physical danger or risk to safety and health. Anti-social behaviour usually is rooted in broader social problems, including exclusion or marginalisation from economic and social activity. That is in turn exacerbated by poverty, long-term unemployment, health problems or substance abuse. The review established that the number of tenants engaging in antisocial behaviour at any one time is relatively small. Approximately 17 per cent of these were of a serious nature, with the number of serious cases reported each month ranging from 22 to 51.

The Housing Trust review of its difficult and disruptive tenants policy and procedures recommends early intervention strategies, improved enforcement and other incentives to crack down on the small number of public housing tenants who make life hell for their neighbours. The recommendations include:

- more early intervention to prevent the escalation of neighbourhood disputes;
- improved training for staff dealing with disruptive tenants;
- interviews with prospective tenants to better assess their accommodation needs;
- limiting the number of repeat transfers where a tenant has been disruptive;
- reviewing new tenancy probationary periods where a tenant has previously been disruptive; and
- improved cooperation between the Housing Trust and other agencies that deal with neighbourhood disruption, such as South Australia Police and mental health agencies.

The upcoming review of the Residential Tenancies Act also provides an opportunity to seek changes to assist in the better management of anti-social behaviour. I recommend the report to the house and hope that it will be of assistance to the imminent statutory authorities review in the Legislative Council. I might say, Mr Deputy Speaker, that some of the procedures here would probably be very helpful to you and the Speaker.

MINISTER'S DELEGATED RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise to advise the house that as Minister for Government Enterprises I will be delegating responsibility for SA Water to the Minister Assisting the Minister for Government Enterprises. I will delegate responsibility for the following acts: Metropolitan Drainage Act 1935; Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986; Sewerage Act 1929; South Australian Water Corporation Act 1994; and the Waterworks Act 1932. These delegations will be gazetted today. It gives me boundless pleasure to advise the house that the Minister Assisting the Minister for Government Enterprises will respond to questions in the house relating to SA Water.

MINISTER'S REMARKS

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yesterday evening (4 December), in answer to a question from the member for Newland concerning the Auditor-General's Report, I said that there is a net reduction across forensic science as a whole as a consequence of the overall budget saving target. That was inaccurate. In fact, there is a net increase, so it was an error against our interests. An additional \$543 000 was allocated to the Forensic Science Unit this financial year. This was partially offset on the budget papers, however, by a mandatory cut to DAIS as part of the budget saving strategy of 3.17 per cent, resulting in a net increase—not a net decrease—of \$217 000. I hope that clarifies the matter for the member for Newland.

TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: In the course of the debate on the Training Skills Development Bill the minister maintained, in respect of Australian Workplace Agreements, that the bill as presented to the house by me in the last parliament was identical to hers. Given the advice that I had been given as minister and the differing legal advice that I now possess, I disputed that particular. While I now believe that I was wrongly advised when I was minister, and while I in no way resile from the current policy position as enunciated by me on behalf of the opposition, I apologise to the minister and acknowledge that her assertion was, in fact, correct.

DARTMOUTH DAM

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Last week in answering a question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition I indicated that the Dartmouth Dam was at 15 per cent capacity. The Dartmouth Dam is in fact at 57 per cent capacity: it is the Hume Dam that was at 15 per cent. It does not make a material difference, however, to my answer.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

TOURISM CALENDAR

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise on the matter of tourism to summarise events of the last week, which have been in my view and that of the opposition quite tragic for the industry. I will start by addressing the question asked today of the Minister for Tourism in regard to her reckless claims last week in the house that the former government had not compiled an annual calendar of events. In the *Hansard* dated 28 November, the minister stated of the former government that 'it had never compiled an annual calendar of events'. The minister went on to say that events were 'not consolidated' by the former government. I have provided documentary evidence today that those statements are wrong.

I believe it is extremely important that the house have confidence in the accuracy of information provided to it by its ministers. Ministers are obliged to come into this place and not only tell the truth but also to have done their homework, and they are obliged to report facts accurately to the house. I ask the minister to apologise and to correct the record. I will read the minister's—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, while grievances are wide-ranging, it is not possible in a grievance debate for the member for Waite to allege that a minister has misled the house. That can only be done as a substantive motion as a matter of privilege and is incapable of being canvassed in this way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is part of the standing orders. If the member for Waite believes that a minister has misled the house, he must do it by way of substantive motion.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I have not mentioned that word, and I have made no such claim.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am saying that, if you do go down that path, it must be by way of substantive motion.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I understand that: there is a process through matters of privilege and substantive motion that will address it. I indicate that I will examine that. I sincerely hope that it does not need to proceed. Moving on to broader issues of tourism, I have made the point that this government came into office without a policy on tourism. I have made the point that funding has been reduced by \$16 million. The government wants to argue about the extent of that reduction in expenditure, but a clear examination of the budget papers shows the \$16 million figure to be so.

We have also heard the stunning announcements this morning that two major events are no longer to be funded, in particular the Classic Adelaide, and that doubt has been thrown over the Adelaide Rose Festival. In addition to that, the minister has described her own department and the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority as dysfunctional and not focused on attracting tourists to the state. A significant networking function for the tourism industry scheduled for Christmas has been cancelled, and industry representatives have rung me most alarmed about that as, I am advised, it is a major opportunity for businesses to get together and discuss business arrangements for the following year.

Doubt is now cast not only over the events of the last nine months in regard to tourism but also about what future is in store for tourism. So far this year we have had the Advisory Committee for AME disbanded; we had AME publicly

criticised by its minister last week; and we have now had two major events either cancelled or had doubt thrown over them. Is it the government's intention to close down and abandon AME? Has the government funded major events next year (and AME as the structure)? What are the government's plans for tourism? It is extremely important that we have accurate information and advice in this place, and that the house is advised on the government's intentions.

A number of issues have been raised over the last week that warrant close scrutiny and clarification. The industry is important to this state. It needs enthusiasm, it needs funding, it needs resources. The opposition has concerns about the future of major events and AME as an organisation. We also have concerns about the relationship between the government and the industry through ACTA.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr SNELLING (Playford): We read last week that a group of 14 lawyers had anonymously launched a campaign for the removal of the Attorney-General. The report stated that the 'group of 14 for justice in the criminal justice system' were issuing stickers and planning leaflet drops. Significantly, group members would speak out only on the basis that they were not identified.

Two things need to be stated about this report. First, as the Premier made clear last week, it should be seen as a good thing that the Attorney-General is not entirely fawned upon by the legal profession. A minister's job is to be the guardian of the common good. He is not the representative of any sectional interests in the cabinet. This is essential to good policy making in this state, especially in criminal law and procedure. Just as the Minister for Health is not the cabinet advocate for doctors, nor the Minister for Education the cabinet advocate for teachers, the Attorney-General is not the cabinet advocate for lawyers.

Secondly, it is fair for anyone to say whatever they like about the performance of the Attorney-General, within the limits of good taste and the law of defamation. Vigorous, open and public debate is a hallmark of our democracy. However, the public expects that, when a person makes public comment about another person, they should do so on the record and be identified. Political parties, at election time, are required by law to authorise their political material.

The so-called 'group of 14' does none of this. In my opinion, their attack is cowardly. The public have a right to know who these lawyers are. It was my hope that these lawyers would have had the courage of their convictions and switch to arguing their case under their own names. Sadly, they wish to hide behind a veil of secrecy for no good reason. After all, if they are members of the legal profession, as they claim, who can harm them?

Earlier this week, I was provided with the names of the people allegedly involved. I have been told that they have been handing out their material to other lawyers at legal gatherings. However, to be fair, I wrote to the individuals whose names I had been provided with to ask whether the information I had been provided with was correct. In no way could my letter be considered a threat: it was a request for information. I was treating parliamentary privilege with the caution and respect it deserves. I was providing the lawyers with natural justice—audi alteram partem.

In the responses I have received so far, some have denied being part of the campaign, other denials have been hedged

or conditional, and others have responded with abuse. One wrote:

Dear Sir, I do not know you and will not accept further correspondence from you. My solicitor is. . .

A tirade followed, but not a denial. As officers of the court, and as a matter of probity, these lawyers should conduct their campaign under their names. I call on the anonymous group of 14 to place their names on the record.

SCHOOLS, STUDENTS' PROJECTS

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise today to congratulate two schools in my electorate: Smithfield Plains Junior Primary School and Munno Para Primary School. Last week, I was invited to attend the opening of the peace garden at Smithfield Plains Junior Primary. It is really an excellent piece of work by the students and, in particular, by Mandy Koch, the teacher who coordinated the project. After Harmony Day celebrations in March this year, the SRC decided they wanted an area of the school that could represent that harmony and be a peaceful place. As a result, they have built a fantastic little peace garden. There is a seat in the garden for children who are feeling lonely or sad, where another student who sees them can sit alongside them and find out what the problem is. It is an ideal setting they have created.

Cherie Watkins, a representative of the Kaurna people, blessed the peace garden and also thought that it was an excellent piece of work by the students. Sadly, though, vandals have already struck the garden. It is a pity that, when young people such as these put a lot of time and effort into creating what is a very peaceful setting, it is destroyed wantonly by vandals. I am pleased to say, though, that the students have taken the bit between their teeth—they will not let these people beat them—and applied persistence and determination. The garden has been repaired and will continue to be repaired, I am pleased to say, if any other attacks occur on it.

I also want to thank local businesses, particularly the local Bunnings Hardware, which donated a lot of the materials to construct the peace garden. About half a dozen other local businesses also contributed, and they are to be commended for getting involved with the school and helping the children with this garden. Dozens of windmill-type flowers made by the young students have been painted and stuck in the garden. They make a fantastic display and are very colourful, providing a very happy place for these young students. Together with their teacher, Mandy Koch, they are to be commended on their work and the environment they have created.

The second school I want to commend is the Munno Para Primary School, which has adopted the local Munno Para railway station. This, of course, is a project in partnership with TransAdelaide. The SRC has designed murals for the station shelters. Obviously, there is a mural on both sides as there are two shelters. The central theme for one shelter is a sun rising over the nearby hills surrounded by sheep and local landmarks. The other mural depicts a train coming towards the platform.

Up to 28 children at any one time have been involved in the painting of the murals. This is having the effect of connecting these young people with the community and also the community seeing that these young people are very talented and have the ability to enhance the community and make it a better place for all concerned. In this situation,

TransAdelaide provided the materials. It also talks to the young people about safety at train stations.

The mural artist is John Whitney. He has done an excellent job in assisting the students with the layout and the painting of the murals. Hopefully, these murals will not be defaced. In most cases, where this type of painting occurs, people respect it. I trust that these murals will be respected, because they really do add to the life of the railway station, and they represent the life of the community. They are a very good outlet for young people to display some of their art work, and to give them a feeling of connecting with the community and ownership with respect to this art work.

PARLIAMENT, FUNCTIONING

Mr RAU (Enfield): Today I wish to raise a couple of matters about the way in which the parliament is functioning. I think it is interesting to do this on the last day of our sitting—I hope—for the year 2002. I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I have been very grateful for all the assistance that members on both sides have provided me with during the course of this year. As a new member, it has been of great benefit to me to have the advantage of obtaining advice from others who know more about this place than I do. It is probably from that position of relative ignorance that I am led to make the following observations.

I was looking today at the *Notice Paper* and listening with some interest to the private members' business, and I was reflecting on the fact that the people of South Australia are paying some considerable amount of money to have us sitting here every day that we are here. It is costing them millions. This building is expensive and, although many of us, perhaps, believe that politicians are not as overpaid as some people in the media think they are, nonetheless, we are paid a reasonable amount for being here. It occurred to me: what are we doing with all this time and all this public money, and what would the public think we should be doing? I just want to run through what we did during private members' time. We were talking about flower shows and roses—and with some passion, I might add. It was not just a simple observation about the humble rose: it was, if I might say so, from my observation, one of the most passionate contributions from the member for Waite that I have seen since coming into this place. I was so impressed with the passion that he demonstrated for flowers that I wondered whether it was, perhaps, a feature of being a child of the 1960s or whether, in fact, he had an interest in roses—from an arboreal point of view. In any event—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RAU: Trees, I am corrected. Anyway, he demonstrated considerable passion. And the passion was not exhausted with roses. We then had horses; he had a passion about horses. He had a passion about classic racing. Then there was a punctuation, because the member for Bragg read us a poem about a rhinoceros. Then we had more passion about car racing. I thought to myself, 'Goodness, aren't the people of South Australia getting value from private members' time! Aren't the people of South Australia (who might have thought that we would be debating something like the hospital system, schools or something else in private members' time) going to be absolutely ecstatic that what we are talking about is, in effect, the previous government's obsession with having bread and circuses.'

I remember that, before being elected to this place, I wondered when the state would start funding egg and spoon

ances, because not every Saturday or Sunday was occupied with a bicycle, a motorcycle, an old car, a new car, a loud car, a quiet car, an eclipse, a flower, a horse or some other form of entertainment. It was very impressive to me to see that it was deemed that public money should be devoted to all these activities. Not only is the state now funding all these activities to a considerable degree, but also people are spending huge amounts of time during private members' time debating what would have to be described as fairy floss, instead of dealing with something of any weight or substance.

Quite frankly, I think the public is sick and tired of this place wasting their time and money with fairy floss. They are looking for a bit of substance and a bit of weight. I look forward to the new year, because I expect that at least we will move down the *Notice Paper* to where the member for Morphett, who, although new like me, has touched on some matters which are of interest to public debate—Glenelg tram lines, employment advertisements—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Tail docking.

Mr RAU: And tail docking, which I agree is up there with rhino poems. I wish all the members of this place a very happy, healthy and cheerful Christmas and new year. Hopefully, we will not be back here in a huge rush. I understand that 20 February is the anticipated date of return. I hope that in the new year, as I have said, the fairy floss can be swept away and we can get down to something of substance. If that distresses anyone—the member for Waite or anyone else—why do not those people try and flick their switch to vaudeville on some topic other than flowers, to use the expression used by a former prime minister?

SCHOOLS, NORWOOD MORIALTA HIGH

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I always enjoy the contributions of the member for Enfield, and today he has talked to us about roses and horse shows. I smell a bit of cynicism in the griever, but I know that he means well, and it is great that he is bringing the matters of the house to our attention. Today I wish to talk about the Norwood Morialta High School ceremony last Monday evening, when over 300 students graduated. The Minister for Education was there as a special guest and speaker, and the members for Morialta and Norwood also attended. It was an excellent evening, and it is a showcase of public education. I am proud that Norwood Morialta is in my electorate. I would like to congratulate the principal, Sue McMillan, and I wish her well for next year, when she takes up her new appointment overseas. I also congratulate Ms Marilyn Jones, the campus head, who was the MC, the school council, the staff and everyone responsible for that excellent evening. I also congratulate the students. As I said, I am proud to have such an excellent school, which provides comprehensive education for all students, in my electorate.

I also wish to talk about Christmas and Father Christmas. One of my constituents has brought to my attention (and others have talked to me about this matter) the problems that some people have in accepting Father Christmas. I was really saddened when I heard that the Croydon Child-care Centre, which is run by Swinburne University of Technology, will substitute a clown for St Nicholas to avoid offending minority groups. I think that is going too far. St Nicholas was not a bad bloke, and Father Christmas is not a bad bloke. If it is not a part of our customs and traditions, why did we go to such lengths to enable the Christmas Pageant to take place and to

make sure that it was funded? Why do we have the Christmas Pageant on The Parade? Obviously, it is part of our tradition.

I support multiculturalism. I support the rights of people in a multi-faith society to worship in the way in which they wish. But we must not confuse customs and traditions with imposing those customs and traditions on minority groups. Minority groups should be able to see that it is part of the Australian culture and way of life. Perhaps the best way to illustrate this is if I read a couple of paragraphs from a letter from a constituent, Vivette Scherer, from Tranmere in my electorate, as follows:

The Christian belief is still the main religious belief in Australia. It is to the church that most Australian people go in times of trouble. When the disasters of September 11 2001 and Bali in 2002 occurred, there were church services. The Christian belief should not be shoddily treated. As it stands now, it is all right to be seen to go to church in times of trouble, but not all right to teach the customs of that faith.

It is very ironical. The faith that helps the most people is the faith that gets ignored. We are a great nation and the beliefs of the Christian faith have been some of the stepping stones to that greatness. The Christmas customs must not be ignored and cast aside. We should keep our customs. When we have visitors, we expect them to join in with what we are doing as well as show us some of their things. So, too, people coming into the country should have the grace to accept our customs. We should not feel so inferior or insecure that we have to change them for those people or anyone. Sure, we can enjoy the customs of other countries and it's fun to do so, but we should not feel guilty or unsatisfied with our own heritage. There is a lot of wisdom in that cultural heritage. It helps give us the happy society that we have.

I could go on, but that illustrates the point very well. For example, the customs of the ancient Greeks and Hellenic culture of Alexander the Great have not stopped in Greece, because it has a Christian faith.

POLITICIANS, TRUSTWORTHINESS

Mr CAICA (Colton): Last Tuesday, 26 November, an article appeared in the *Advertiser* based on an annual poll posing the question, 'What professions are those you most trust?' Interestingly, this article ranks ambulance paramedics and firefighters as the most trusted professions and hence the workers in those professions as those most trusted. I do not know whether it comes as a surprise to anyone in this chamber but, as was quoted in the paper, at the bottom of the pile of the 26 professions were politicians. It was almost nine months ago—until 5 p.m. on Friday 8 February—that I was employed as a firefighter, and at that stage I was one of those in the most trusted professions. This year it was second of the most trusted, and the year before that it was No.1, but by 8 p.m. on Saturday 9 February when the result in Colton was known fairly early in the night—the result was quite clear—I had gone from being employed in a profession that is trusted to being an incumbent in the least trusted profession. Yet I had not changed in those 28 hours. I would argue that I have not changed since that time, and the same values that underpin my decision making now are the same as existed then.

I often ponder and ask the question: why is it that we as politicians are regarded as being so untrustworthy? Is it that we say one thing as a collective and do another? Is it that there is perceived or real arrogance in the way in which we do our business? Or is it that we spend our time in this place and other places speaking sometimes for hours on end without ever saying anything we actually mean? After eight or nine months I am not suggesting that I know the answers to these questions: I would not be so arrogant as to suggest

that I do. However, in my Address in Reply speech I focused on the fact that as parliamentarians we are required to up the standard of our behaviour. We live in a fish bowl, so we ought to live our lives privately and from a business perspective at a higher standard than those that we impose on other people.

I was interested to read in *Hansard* from another place contributions made by the Hon. Robert Lucas. I am not sure what the Hon. Rob Lucas did in a previous life; in fact, it seems to me that he is perhaps one of the very reasons we are not highly regarded. That is, he has come into this place without any life experiences whatsoever. However, he starts off one of his contributions by saying:

I know that members are looking forward to this contribution.

There is a sense of arrogance in that. It is very interesting that in the contribution he made on 2 December he said:

The message that people should get from recent election results not only in South Australia but nationally and in other states over the last eight years—and I do not limit it to recent results—is that the people of an electorate, whether it be in South Australia, other states or federally, basically want to see honesty in their ministers, politicians and governments.

I expect that he has learnt that since he is no longer in government. I am not sure; someone might be able to tell me how many ministers were removed during the last parliament. In fact, if I recall correctly, a Premier was removed for behaviour that could hardly be described as honest. I would suggest among other things that what the Hon. Rob Lucas and others have to do is focus on those things that raise the standard and level of debate in this parliament—not make assertions about what the members for Enfield and Colton might think but focus on those things which are actually important and which will raise the standard of the way in which we operate in this parliament.

So, we all—and that especially includes the opposition—have a collective responsibility to get on with the job. I have enjoyed my first eight months here; however, I think that to a great extent I agree with the comments made recently in a radio interview with the member for Fisher when he said that the opposition is not presenting any alternative; he does not see any new ideas coming through; it is full of a lot of negativity and opposition to what the government is doing and it needs to get on with the job. I agree with that, and that will help us as a collective raise the trustworthiness and relevance of this parliament in the eyes of the people we represent because, contrary to popular belief, we are not judged every four years: we are judged every day of our lives. With that, I join with the member for Enfield in wishing everyone a very safe and happy Christmas and new year and look forward to the reconvening of this house in February.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CEMETERY PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I move:

That the select committee have leave to sit during the sittings of the house during the rest of the session.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I move:

That Mr T. Koutsantonis be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. R.J. McEwen.

Motion carried.

ELECTRICITY (PRICING ORDER) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electricity Act 1996. Read a first time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The principal purpose of this bill is to authorise some further amendments of the electricity pricing order that was issued on 11 October 1999 under section 35B of the *Electricity Act*. These amendments to the electricity pricing order (the "EPO") are made by reference to a notice published in the *Gazette* on 5 December 2002 at page 4458. I understand that a copy of this *Gazette* notice has been made available for Honourable Members.

Section 35B(7)(b) of the *Electricity Act* provides that the EPO cannot be varied (except as contemplated by the EPO) and cannot be revoked. This provision was included so as to give some certainty to both electricity supply industry participants and their customers at a time of considerable change brought about by the introduction of the National Electricity Market and the privatisation of the State's electricity businesses.

The EPO was previously amended by the *Electricity (Pricing Order and Cross-ownership) Amendment Act 2000* to rectify a number of inconsistencies that had been identified in the tariff control formulae. These earlier EPO amendments were also effected by reference to a notice previously published in the *Gazette*.

As part of the electricity reform and sale program, the former Government made a commitment that electricity prices for small country customers would be no more than 1.7 per cent higher than prices for equivalent small city customers.

This commitment was met through the country equalisation scheme established under clause 8.2 of the EPO.

The country equalisation scheme comes into effect on 1 January 2003 with full retail contestability and requires that retailers not charge a small non-metropolitan customer more than 101.7 per cent of the total amount charged to an equivalent metropolitan customer. Under the EPO, the Essential Services Commission is required to issue an equivalent country rate equal to 101.7 per cent of charges for city customers of that size and load shape.

In reviewing the implementation of the country equalisation scheme as part of the lead up to full retail contestability, the Essential Services Commission has found that the scheme as set out in the EPO is effectively unworkable. Clause 8.2 of the EPO details a very prescriptive approach for determining the equivalent country rate, specifically requiring that it be determined as a \$/MWh rate.

Modelling by the Essential Services Commission indicates that determining a single \$/MWh rate for a class of customers is not practicable due to the impact of different levels of energy consumption, supply charges and separate peak and off-peak energy charges. Either a very large \$/MWh rate must be determined, which makes the value of the scheme questionable, or the Essential Services Commission would have to issue a very large number of customer classes.

The Department of Treasury and Finance, the Crown Solicitor's Office and Parliamentary Counsel developed a simplified country equalisation scheme to be incorporated as a revised Clause 8.2 of the EPO. Essential Services Commission has been consulted as part of developing the revised scheme. The revised country equalisation scheme provides that if a retailer is to make an offer to small country customers, it must be the same as any tariff that is offered to small city customers by that retailer, except that the price for each tariff

component may exceed the price for a small city customer by not more than 1.7 per cent.

I note that AGL is required to sell electricity to small country customers pursuant to the recent 'standing offer' amendments to the *Electricity Act*.

A draft of the proposed country equalisation scheme was provided to AGL, TXU and Origin as the retailers most likely to be affected by the changes so as to seek their views.

A special deposit account in the Treasury has been established to fund the country equalisation scheme in accordance with section 21(1) of the *Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 1999*.

In addition, to provide consistency with the rest of the Act and current Ministerial responsibilities, the bill provides for the several remaining references to the Treasurer to be substituted by references to the Minister.

The bill will further facilitate the protection for small customers in regional South Australia and I commend it to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 35A—Price regulation by Commission

References to the Treasurer in section 35A are replaced with references to the Minister. The references relate to a power (currently vested in the Treasurer under section 35A(1)(d)) to notify in the *Gazette* goods and services in the electricity supply industry that may be the subject of price regulation by the Essential Services Commission. The power is a fall-back power, the principal subject-matters for price regulation by the Commission being set out in section 35A(1)(a), (b) and (c).

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 35B—Initial electricity pricing order
Section 35B allowed for the making of an initial electricity pricing order by the Treasurer and prevents variation of the order once made. The initial electricity pricing order was made in October 1999. A variation of the initial order was specifically authorised by a provision enacted and inserted into section 35B in July 2000. This clause authorises a further variation of the order—the contents of the variation having been notified by the Minister in the *Gazette* on 5 December 2002.

Clause 4: Exclusion of Crown liability in relation to electricity pricing order

The clause excludes any Crown liability in connection with the further variation of the pricing order.

Ms CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION FUNDS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This bill seeks to make important amendments to the governance arrangements for the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia. The Corporation, more commonly referred to as Funds SA, has the important task of managing superannuation investments of both the State and the contributors of the public sector superannuation schemes. These investments support the current and future payment of superannuation benefits to a variety of public sector employees.

Funds SA has over \$5 billion of assets under management and its performance in the management of investments has a direct impact on the financial performance of the State through the value of assets backing the State's superannuation liability. The level of funds under management has grown by over 36 per cent over the last 3 years. At 30 June 2002, the liability exceeded the level of asset backing by \$3.78 billion which is referred to as the net unfunded

superannuation liability. Negative earnings in 2001-02 increased the net unfunded liability, resulting in the budget recognising an increase in expenditure to fund the shortfall over time.

This bill seeks to improve the governance arrangements relating to Funds SA to reflect more adequately the legitimate interests of the government, whilst ensuring that the expectations and rights of contributors and superannuants are protected.

The proposed amendments to the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995, have the effect of:

- extending the existing functions of Funds SA relating to the investment and management of funds to include the investment and management of funds on behalf of such Government and related bodies as the Treasurer sees fit.
- extending the power of the Governor to remove Government nominated directors to the Corporation on such grounds as the Treasurer sees fit.
- providing the power of direction and control to the Treasurer, but with important limitations prohibiting a direction to Funds SA in relation to an investment decision, dealing with property or the exercise of a voting right.

Funds SA has developed significant ability in the management of superannuation funds on behalf of the State and superannuation beneficiaries.

The opportunity exists to utilise these abilities and related infrastructure to manage and invest funds on behalf of other government and related bodies.

Existing provisions of the act restrict the functions of Funds SA to the investment and management of public sector superannuation funds. The proposed amendments remove that restriction allowing for the investment of funds on behalf of such other bodies as the Treasurer may see fit.

Funds SA is governed by a board of directors and the act provides for at least five board members and at most seven. One board member must be elected by contributors and one must be nominated by the South Australian Superannuation Federation (representing unions and superannuants). The remaining 3 to 5 directors are appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Treasurer.

The act provides the capacity for the Governor to remove any director from office for misconduct, failure or incapacity to carry out the duties of office satisfactorily or non-compliance with a duty imposed by the act.

The circumstances prompting removal are quite specific and are considered restrictive to the proper direction and control of the operations of Funds SA by the Government.

The present act provides capacity for the Minister to request that Funds SA have regard to Government policy when preparing its performance plan or performing its functions. Funds SA is only required to have regard to such a request. The section is persuasive not compelling.

The Government has a very significant exposure to the performance of Funds SA and it is the Government's view that it is inappropriate for the Treasurer not to have the power or responsibility to effectively oversight the operations of the fund.

There are circumstances where it is appropriate that the Treasurer have the capacity to direct the Corporation. For example, it is appropriate for the Treasurer to direct the Corporation in relation to employment policy as generally applying in the public sector.

During debate of the original Superannuation Funds Management Corporation Bill, significant discussion surrounded the importance of protecting contributors and superannuants through the independently elected/nominated director positions.

Also during that debate the position was put that it was important that the interest of contributors and superannuants be protected by ensuring that the investment decision making of Funds SA be free from direct influence by the Government.

Therefore two key limitations are proposed in relation to removal of directors and the giving of directions by the Treasurer. It is proposed to limit the strengthened powers of removal for directors to those directors that are appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. This protects the elected contributor and Federation representatives on the Board from the power of removal, other than for the existing causes of misconduct and the like. This limitation will protect the interests of contributors and superannuants.

The amended power of direction and control available to the Treasurer in relation to the performance by Funds SA of its functions requires that a direction not include a direction to Funds SA in

relation to investment decisions, dealing with property or the exercise of a voting right.

These limitations on the power of direction and control protect the interest of superannuants and contributors.

The suite of amendments serves to broaden the functions of Funds SA, providing opportunities for a broader range of clients to access the skills and infrastructure of Funds SA, whilst also strengthening the underlying governance arrangements to protect the interest of the Government, contributors and superannuants.

I commend the bill to the house.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides that this act will be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts into the principal act a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure and removes some provisions that are redundant as a consequence of these amendments.

As the functions of the Corporation are expanded by this measure to include the investment and management of certain funds of public authorities, this clause inserts some definitions that clarify the meaning of terms used in respect of that function. For example, a "public authority" is a government department, a minister or a statutory authority and includes a body or person responsible for the management of an eligible superannuation fund. An "eligible superannuation fund" is a fund that does not fall within the definition of "public sector superannuation fund" but consists of money contributed by the Crown to provide a group of its employees with superannuation benefits.

Subsections (3), (4) and (5) of section 3, which enable the Minister to determine that a superannuation fund held by the Minister is a public sector superannuation fund for the purposes of the act, are removed by this clause as they are redundant as a consequence of amendments allowing the Corporation to invest and manage the funds of "eligible superannuation funds".

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 5—Functions of the corporation

Section 5 of the principal act, which describes the functions of the Corporation, is amended by this clause to include reference to the Corporation's new role in respect of investment and management of the funds of public authorities (where the Minister has agreed that those funds should be transferred to the Corporation for such purposes).

Clause 5: Insertion of s. 5A

This clause inserts a new section into the principal act. Section 5A provides that a public authority may apply to the Minister for approval to transfer funds to the Corporation so that the Corporation can invest and manage the funds on behalf of the authority.

The Minister may refuse an application under this section or may grant an approval for transfer to the Corporation of some or all of the funds referred to in the authority's application. The Corporation is obliged to invest and manage any funds transferred in accordance with the Minister's approval and must return any funds it holds to the authority on request.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 7—Object of the Corporation in performing its functions

This clause removes the words "public sector superannuation" from section 7 of the principal act so that reference is made in that section to "the funds" (now defined to include nominated funds of approved authorities). This amendment to section 7 is consequential on the expansion of the Corporation's functions and makes clear that the Corporation's objectives apply equally to the funds of approved authorities.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 10—Conditions of membership

Section 10(6) of the principal act lists the circumstances in which the Governor may remove a director from the board of directors. This clause adds an additional circumstance that applies only to directors appointed to the board by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. Such directors can be removed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister for such reason as he or she thinks fit.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 20—The performance plan

The amendments effected by this clause merely clarify that the performance plan required under section 20 relates only to the public sector superannuation funds and not to the nominated funds of an approved authority, which are dealt with in the new section 20A (inserted by clause 9).

Clause 9: Insertion of s. 20A

This clause inserts a new section. Under section 20, the Corporation is required to prepare a performance plan in each financial year in respect of the investment and management of the public sector superannuation funds. The proposed section 20A is a similar provision that requires the preparation of a performance plan in relation to the investment and management of the nominated funds of each approved authority. Subsection (2) provides a list of matters that must be included in the plan, including targets for rates of return, strategies, anticipated operating costs and factors that will affect or influence investment and management of the funds.

The Corporation is required to provide the draft plan to the Minister and the relevant approved authority and must have regard to any comments made by the Minister or authority. If the authority requests an amendment to the plan, the Corporation must amend the plan accordingly unless it considers, after consulting with the authority, that the amendment should not be made. If that is the case, the Corporation must provide the authority with written advice as to its reasons for declining to amend the plan in accordance with the request.

Clause 10: Substitution of s. 21

This clause repeals section 21 of the principal act, which requires the Corporation to have regard to Government policy when preparing a performance plan or performing its functions if requested to do so by the Minister. A new section is substituted, which provides that the Corporation is subject to the direction and control of the Minister. A direction by the Minister under this section must be in writing. The Corporation must include any direction made by the Minister in its annual report. A direction by the Minister must not include a direction to the Corporation in relation to an investment decision, dealing with property or the exercise of a voting right.

Clause 11: Repeal of s. 25

This clause repeals section 25 of the principal act. Section 25 relates to a transfer of funds in accordance with a determination by the Minister under section 3(3). Clause 3 of this bill removes section 3(3), which is redundant as a consequence of other amendments that have the effect of allowing the Corporation to invest and manage superannuation funds that are not public sector superannuation funds.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 26—Accounts

Section 26(2) of the principal act requires the Corporation to keep proper accounts of receipts and payments in relation to each of the public sector superannuation funds and to prepare separate financial statements in respect of each fund for each financial year. This clause replaces subsection (2) with a new provision that is substantially similar to the existing provision but extends these requirements to the nominated funds of each approved authority.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 27—Internal audits and audit committee

The amendments made to sections 27 and 28 by these clauses are consequential on the extension of the Corporation's functions to include investment and management of the funds of public authorities. These amendments simply ensure that the requirements of the principal act in respect of internal and external audits apply to all funds invested or managed by the Corporation.

Clause 15: Substitution of s. 29

This clause repeals section 29, which requires the Corporation to prepare progress reports in relation to investment and management of the public sector superannuation funds, and substitutes a new section that extends the operation of these requirements to the nominated funds of approved authorities.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 30—Annual reports

The amendments to section 30 effected by clause 16 extend the requirements of the principal act in respect of provision of annual reports to the funds of approved authorities.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 39—Regulations

Section 39(2) of the principal act provides that regulations under the act may prohibit the investment of the public sector superannuation funds in forms of investment prescribed by the regulations unless authorised by the Minister. The first amendment effected by this clause extends this power to prohibit certain forms of investment to the funds of approved authorities.

This clause also inserts a new paragraph in subsection (2). This paragraph provides that the regulations may prescribe fees payable in relation to an application under the act or in relation to anything to be done by the Corporation under the act.

Ms CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the protection and enhancement of the Murray River and related areas and ecosystems; to amend the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986, the Aquaculture Act 2001, the Coast Protection Act 1972, the Crown Lands Act 1929, the Development Act 1993, the Environment Protection Act 1993, the Fisheries Act 1982, the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993, the Heritage Act 1993, the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981, the Irrigation Act 1994, the Mining Act 1971, the Murray-Darling Basin Act 1983, the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, the Native Vegetation Act 1991, the Opal Mining Act 1995, the Petroleum Act 2000, the Soil Conservation and Land Care Act 1989, the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992 and the Water Resources Act 1997; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Today I introduce historic legislation for the protection of the River Murray. Sadly, but perhaps inevitably, I am doing so at a time when the need for such legislation could hardly be more self-evident. The Labor Party went to the last election promising to take bold action to protect the River Murray. Today I honour that pledge.

As serious drought faces many parts of the country, we are reminded daily, and starkly, of the crucial importance of good water management. Safeguarding water systems is vital to our well-being but more critically, it is vital to our very survival—the health of our economy, our way of life and social fabric.

The River Murray is our most important water resource. It provides water not only for important regional industries—irrigation, manufacturing and industry and the communities that rely on those industries for their prosperity—but also water for the River townships, water for the city of Adelaide, water for growing industries in the Barossa Valley, and water for northern regional centres of Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and numerous small townships between.

The River Murray is more, too, than a source of water for consumptive use. It is a living body whose ecological integrity must be maintained. Management of a river in a way that does not provide for environmental requirements threatens the entire river system and those who depend on it. At its most extreme, long term neglect of water for the environment threatens the very existence of dependent ecosystems, and the lives, livelihood and security of communities.

However beyond the fundamental and quantifiable value of a healthy river to our economy, and the importance of maintaining the River to ensure its future, is the subtle significance of the River to our cultural heritage, indigenous and since white settlement. All aspects of the River must be recognised and protected.

This is the first time in the State's history, and Australia's history, that the River Murray will be given special protection under its own legislation, in recognition of the importance of the river to all South Australians. The River Murray Bill takes us further in our commitment to the River than any other States' legislation. We hope it will create a bold precedent for other States as South Australia leads the nation in the protection and management of the Murray.

This legislation complements a number of other initiatives including the implementation of the Water Allocation Plan for the River Murray which I publicly released on 3 September 2002. Also, the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council is finally getting serious about environmental flows for the River Murray, and this legislation has a number of features which will pave the way forward for the restoration of river health.

Why a new Act for the River Murray? South Australia has a strong history of legislating for important reforms, including environmental reforms. For management of our natural resources we are well-served by Acts such as the *Water Resources Act 1997*,

Environment Protection Act 1993 and *Development Act 1993*. But it is clear that the River Murray needs more than the protection that legislation can give, and it needs more than amendments to existing legislation alone. It needs a concerted effort, in part through new legislation and reforms to existing legislation, to ensure that protection and enhancement of the River is a paramount consideration for activities that have the potential to adversely affect the River.

The Parliamentary Select Committee on the Murray River, of which I am proud to have been a member, investigated the current health of the River, the causes and impacts of its deterioration, and the further threats that face it, at both a national and local level. Many aspects of that report relate to integrated catchment management, an initiative I am actively pursuing with a view to introducing further legislative reforms in 2003. Many of the recommendations relate to operational and budgetary matters, and those too are being pursued at Departmental level. Many of the recommendations related to the national scene—the crucial Murray-Darling Basin Agreement, of which South Australia is, by necessity, a most active and committed partner. And a number of recommendations relate to identified legislative gaps that can be, and will be, covered by the River Murray Bill now before you.

Economic importance of the River

The Murray-Darling Basin in South Australia supports significant economic activity based on irrigation and dryland farming, and associated food processing, and tourism. The Murray Mallee and Riverland regions alone generate a gross regional product of over \$1.5 billion (or 4 per cent of the gross state product). The regional economy is substantially based on the primary industry sectors, in particular grapes, cereals and irrigated horticulture. It is estimated that more than 70 per cent of the economic activity in the Riverland is based on the irrigation industry.

Benefits from this new legislation will include improved biodiversity, tourism, agricultural and recreational value. Sustainability of practices affecting the River will deliver improved long term security for the River and all those who are dependent on it.

Overview of the River Murray Bill

The Object of the bill is to achieve a healthy working River Murray system, sustaining communities and preserving unique values. The bill aims to do this through ensuring that development and other activities with an effect on the River are ecologically sustainable, and undertaken in a way that does not harm the River. The bill also provides other mechanisms to enhance management of the River and its catchment.

The 'River Murray' is defined broadly to mean the main stem of the River Murray, and all anabranches, tributaries, wetlands and flood plains, including the Lakes and Coorong. The definition incorporates the natural resources of the River Murray including the soil, water, ecosystems, cultural and natural heritage, and amenity and geological values of the River.

The River Murray Bill is a package in two parts.

The main part of the bill:

- establishes Objectives for a Healthy River Murray ('ORM');
- gives the Minister for the River Murray certain new powers and obligations, including preparation of a River Murray Act Implementation Strategy, obligation to promote integration of the *River Murray Act* with other relevant legislation, reporting to Parliament on the health of the River and implementation of the Act, having an input into statutory planning documents such as development plans, and having an input into some statutory authorisations;
- establishes a new duty of care—a duty not to harm the River, enforceable by a River Murray Protection Order or Reparation Order;
- establishes a Parliamentary Committee; and
- includes a power to make regulations which could include regulations to restrict or prohibit, subject to conditions, classes of activities that may harm the River.

The bill also builds on and improves existing legislation to help to control and reverse the problems facing the River. The Schedule to the bill amends 20 existing Acts in order to improve the current regulatory framework. Amendments will require bodies administering those Acts to:

- take the River Murray into account in the preparation of plans and undertaking of functions; and
- seek input from the Minister for the River Murray before granting certain types of activities approvals in certain locations. Regulations will set out in detail the types of activities, in particular locations that are sensitive to the River, that will in the

future be referred to the Minister for the River Murray under these new arrangements.

Additional amendments made in the Schedule to the *Water Resources Act 1997* will provide for closer controls over water licence conditions and water use. The changes will allow the recently released Water Allocation Plan for the River Murray to be fully implemented, supporting the improvements that have been made by South Australian irrigators over many years, and encouraging all irrigators to meet high standards.

Consultation overview

I have consulted widely over the bill now before you. Following informal discussion with some key stakeholders, a Discussion Paper was developed and released for consultation. Comments received helped in the preparation of a draft River Murray Bill, which was itself released for consultation. In addition to direct contact with key groups and individuals, and loading the bill and Explanatory Paper on the Departmental website, all River Murray licensees received a brochure informing them of the bill. Stakeholder and representative groups were also engaged through small focus groups to discuss in detail the draft bill and its potential application.

This is the first legislation of its type to be introduced anywhere in Australia. It meets one of the Rann Government's major promises to the electorate and has been embraced by the community.

It is now up to my parliamentary colleagues to ensure that we meet the expectations of the community and protect the River Murray.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1 PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause sets out the meanings of term used in the measure. Some key terms include the "River Murray"; "natural resources" of the River Murray; and the "Murray-Darling Basin".

Clause 4: River Murray Protection Areas

This clause empowers the Governor to make regulations in order to designate areas as River Murray Protection Areas for the purposes of this measure or other Acts. The areas designated may vary for different purposes and Acts.

Clause 5: Interaction with other Acts

The measure does not derogate from the provisions of any other Act, unless that intention is otherwise expressed. This clause also sets out other Acts that are "related Acts" for the purposes of the measure.

PART 2

OBJECTS OF ACT AND STATUTORY OBJECTIVES

Clause 6: Objects

The objects of this measure include to ensure that all reasonable and practicable measures are taken to protect, restore and enhance the River Murray, to develop mechanisms to ensure that any development or activities do not have an adverse effect on the river and are undertaken in a way that best protects and benefits the river while providing for the economic, social and physical well being of the community, and to promote principles of ecologically sustainable development in relation to the use and management of the river.

Clause 7: Objectives

This clause sets out the objectives to be referred to collectively as the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* (ORMs) that will apply in relation to the operation of the measure. These are:

- the river health objectives, which include the protection and restoration of habitat, floodplains and wetlands of the River Murray System and the prevention of extinction of native animals, fish and vegetation;

- the environmental flow objectives, which include the reinstatement and maintenance of the natural flow regime of the river, keeping the Murray mouth open and improving the connectivity between the environments of the River Murray system;

- the water quality objectives, which include improvement of water quality, minimising the impact of salinity, reducing algal blooms and the impact of sediment and pesticides on the River Murray system;

- the human dimension objectives, which include taking a flexible approach to river management to take account of community interests, knowledge and understanding of the River Murray system, recognising indigenous and other cultural and historical relationships with the river and the importance of a healthy river to the economic,

social and cultural prosperity of the communities along the river and the community more generally.

Clause 8: Administration of Act to achieve objects and objectives
Those responsible for the administration of this measure must act consistently with, and seek to further the objects of the measure and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*.

PART 3

ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION 1—THE MINISTER

Clause 9: Functions and powers of the Minister

This clause sets out the functions and powers of the Minister under this measure. These include to prepare an Implementation Strategy, to approve and provide advice regarding activities undertaken within the Murray-Darling Basin, to act to integrate the administration of this measure with other legislation and promote the co-ordination of policies and programs that may affect the River Murray and to undertake monitoring programs and promote research and public education in relation to the protection, improvement and enhancement of the River Murray. The Minister also has the function of reviewing the operation of this measure or a related Act and the extent to which the objects and the ORM's are being advanced. The Minister has such powers as are necessary to perform his or her functions under the measure.

Clause 10: Annual report

The Minister must prepare an annual report, to be laid before both houses of Parliament, on the implementation of this measure, the extent to which the objects and the ORM's are being achieved, and issues relating to enforcement.

Clause 11: Three-yearly reports

The Minister must undertake a review of the measure every three years to assess its interaction with the related operational Acts and to assess the health of the River Murray in light of the ORM's. This review must be included in the annual report for that year.

Clause 12: Power of delegation

The Minister may delegate any of his or her powers under the measure or any other Act.

DIVISION 2—AUTHORISED OFFICERS

Clause 13: Appointment of authorised officers

The Minister may appoint such authorised officers as are required.

Clause 14: Powers of authorised officers

This clause sets out the powers of authorised officers in relation to the administration, operation or enforcement of the measure. An authorised officer may use force to enter a place or vehicle on the authority of a warrant issued by a magistrate, or if immediate action is required in the circumstances. However, an authorised officer will not be able to use a power under this provision to enter residential premises.

Clause 15: Hindering, etc., persons engaged in the administration of this Act

It is an offence to hinder, obstruct or abuse an authorised officer or fail to answer or otherwise mislead an officer.

PART 4

MINISTERIAL ACTIVITIES AND ARRANGEMENTS

ASSOCIATED WITH THE RIVER MURRAY

DIVISION 1—MINISTER MAY UNDERTAKE

WORKS

Clause 16: Minister may undertake works

This clause provides for certain activities of the Minister for the purposes of furthering the objects of the Act or the ORM's, carrying out projects, and performing other relevant functions.

DIVISION 2—MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS

Clause 17: Management agreements

This clause allows the Minister to enter into a management agreement with the owner of land within the Murray-Darling Basin.

A management agreement may, with respect to the land to which it relates—

- (a) require specified work or work of a specified kind be carried out on the land, or authorise the performance of work on the land;
- (b) restrict the nature of any work that may be carried out on the land;
- (c) prohibit or restrict specified activities or activities of a specified kind on the land;
- (d) provide for the care, control, management or operation of any infrastructure, plant or equipment;
- (e) provide for the management of any matter in accordance with a particular management plan (which may then be varied from time to time by agreement between the Minister and the owner of the land);

- (f) provide for the adoption or implementation of environment protection measures or environment improvement programs;
- (g) provide for the testing or monitoring of any aspect of the natural resources of the River Murray;
- (h) provide for a remission or exemption in respect of a levy under Division 1 of Part 8 of the *Water Resources Act 1997*;
- (i) provide for remission of rates or taxes in respect of the land;
- (j) provide for the Minister to pay to the owner of the land an amount as an incentive to enter into the agreement.

A term of management agreement providing for a remission or exemption with respect to the specified levy or for the remission of rates and taxes has effect despite any law to the contrary.

Subclause (4) requires the Registrar-General, on the application of a party to a management agreement, to note the agreement against the relevant instrument of title or, in the case of land not under the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886*, against the land.

Subclause (5) provides that a management agreement has no force or effect under this Act until a note is made under subclause (4).

Where a note has been entered under subsection (4), the agreement is binding on both the current owner of the land (whether or not that owner was the person with whom the agreement was made, and despite the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886*) and any occupier of the land.

The Registrar-General must, on application, enter a note of the rescission or amendment against the instrument of title, or against the land if satisfied an agreement has been rescinded or amended. The Registrar-General must also ensure that the note is not otherwise removed once made.

DIVISION 3—ENTRY ONTO LAND

Clause 18: Entry onto land

This clause provides that a person may, for specified purposes, enter or pass over any land that is not vested in the Minister, bring vehicles, plant and equipment onto that land, and temporarily occupy land not vested in the Minister. In doing so, a person must minimise disturbances to any land, and, subject to any alternative arrangement agreed between the Minister and owner of the relevant land, must restore any disturbed land to its previous condition. No compensation is payable with respect to the exercise of a power under this clause.

DIVISION 4—COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND

Clause 19: Compulsory acquisition of land

The Minister may, if necessary, exercise powers of compulsory acquisition under the *Land Acquisition Act 1969*.

PART 5

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Clause 20: Implementation Strategy

This clause sets out the requirements of the River Murray Act Implementation Strategy, which must be prepared by the Minister. The strategy must set out the priorities and strategies of the Minister in order to achieve the objects and implement the ORMs. The strategy must be reviewed every five years and must be published in the *Gazette* and be available for public inspection. The strategy is a policy document and does not affect rights or liabilities.

PART 6

DEVELOPMENT OF RELATED POLICIES AND CONSIDERATION OF ACTIVITIES

Clause 21: Development of related policies and consideration of activities

This clause deals with statutory instruments that apply within the Murray-Darling Basin and applications for statutory authorisations that are referred to the Minister for consideration under a related operational Act or as prescribed by the regulations.

A statutory instrument is defined in the interpretation provision as being a plan or policy prepared under an Act. A statutory authorisation includes such things as an approval, consent, licence or permit granted under a related operational Act.

In considering a statutory instrument or statutory authorisation referred to the Minister, the Minister must have regard to the objects of this measure and the ORMs. Additionally, in relation to a statutory instrument, the Minister must also take into account any agreement or resolution of the Ministerial Council under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993*. In the case of a statutory authorisation, the Minister must also take into account the possible effects of the proposed activity on the River Murray and the extent to which similar activities undertaken may have an accumulative effect on the River. The Minister may also have regard to the views of other relevant

persons and bodies the terms of the Agreement under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993* and any relevant policy.

If the Minister considers that a statutory instrument should be amended but cannot reach agreement with the Minister responsible for the administration of the Act under which it was prepared, the matter must be referred to the Governor for resolution.

The Minister may impose conditions on the grant of a statutory authorisation, including a condition that a person enter into a bond to cover the cost of any damage to the River Murray caused by a breach of a condition, or develop an environmental improvement program.

The Minister may publish policies in connection with the Minister's function of assessing statutory authorisations referred to him or her. These policies may set out matters the Minister may take into account or conditions that may be imposed in relation to specified classes of authorisations, or set out circumstances where the Minister may oppose the grant of a class of authorisation.

PART 7

GENERAL DUTY OF CARE

Clause 22: General duty of care

Under this clause, a person has a general duty of care to take all reasonable measures to prevent or minimise harm to the River Murray through the person's actions or activities. Harm includes the risk of harm and future harm. There are certain things to be considered in determining what measures must be taken. These include the nature of the harm and the sensitivity of the environment, financial implications of alternative action and the level of risk involved. A breach of this duty does not constitute an offence but compliance may be enforced by the issuing of a protection order or reparation order under this measure.

PART 8

PROTECTION AND OTHER ORDERS

DIVISION 1—ORDERS

Clause 23: Protection orders

This clause provides that the Minister may issue a protection order to secure compliance with the general duty of care, a condition of a statutory authorisation or any other requirement under this measure. An order may require a person to stop or not start a particular activity, to only carry on an activity at a particular time, to take specified action within a certain time, to undertake tests or monitoring or prepare a plan or report. If urgent action is required, an authorised officer may issue an emergency protection order which will cease within 72 hours if not confirmed by a written order issued by the Minister. It is an offence not to comply with a protection order.

Clause 24: Action on non-compliance with a protection order

If a protection order is not complied with, the Minister may take any action required and recover any reasonable costs and expenses as a debt due.

Clause 25: Reparation orders

This clause provides for the issue of a reparation order if the Minister is satisfied a person has caused harm to the River Murray by contravening the general duty of care, a condition of a statutory authorisation or any other requirement under this measure. A reparation order may require a person to take particular action to make good any damage or make payments to enable action to be so taken. The order may include other requirements to prevent or mitigate further harm to the River. An authorised officer may issue an emergency reparation order, which will cease to have effect within 72 hours unless confirmed in writing by the Minister. It is an offence to fail to comply with a reparation order.

Clause 26: Action on non-compliance with a reparation order

If a reparation order is not complied with, the Minister may take any action required and recover reasonable costs and expenses as a debt due.

Clause 27: Reparation authorisations

This clause provides for the issue of a reparation authorisation if the Minister is satisfied a person has caused harm to the River Murray by contravening the general duty of care, a condition of a statutory authorisation or any other requirement under this measure. A reparation authorisation may be issued whether or not a reparation order has been issued and authorises an authorised officer or other person to take particular action to make good any damage to the River Murray. The Minister may recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred in taking action under the authorisation as a debt due.

Clause 28: Interim restraining orders

If the Minister is of the opinion that a particular activity may cause harm to the River Murray, or there is insufficient information to

assess the likelihood of harm or it is necessary to ensure the protection of the River, the Minister may issue an interim restraining order requiring a person to cease or not start a particular activity. It is an offence to fail to comply with an order.

Clause 29: Consultation with other authorities

Before issuing a protection order, reparation order or reparation authority, the Minister should consult with any relevant public authority unless it is a matter of urgency.

DIVISION 2—REGISTRATION OF ORDERS AND EFFECT OF CHARGES

Clause 30: Registration

If an order or authorisation relates to an activity carried on land or requires action to be taken on or in relation to land, the Minister may apply to have the order or authorisation registered in relation to that land and will be binding on the owner and the occupier of the land for the time being.

Clause 31: Effect of charge

A charge imposed on the land as a result of costs recoverable in relation to an order or authorisation has priority over any prior charges.

DIVISION 3—APPEALS TO COURT

Clause 32: Appeals to Court

A person is entitled to appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court against the issue of a protection order, reparation order, or interim restraining order, or any variation to these.

PART 9

MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 33: Native title

Nothing done under this measure affects native title in any land.

Clause 34: Parliamentary Committee

This clause establishes the River Murray Parliamentary Committee. The functions of the Committee include taking an interest in the protection, enhancement, and improvement of the River Murray and the operation of this measure, undertaking an annual review of the work of the Minister in implementing this measure and consideration of the three yearly review of the Minister undertaken under this measure.

Clause 35: Immunity provisions

This clause provides that no act or omission of the Minister or a person acting under the Minister's authority in order to protect, restore or enhance the River Murray or further the ORMs subjects the Minister, that person or the Crown to liability, even if in doing so, damage is caused to land or the use and enjoyment of land is affected.

Clause 36: False or misleading information

It is an offence to make a false or misleading statement in providing information under this measure.

Clause 37: Continuing offence

A person convicted of an offence in relation to a continuing act or omission is liable for a penalty for each day that the act or omission continues of up to one tenth of the maximum penalty prescribed for the offence.

Clause 38: Liability of directors

If a corporation commits an offence under this measure, each director is guilty of an offence (unless the offence did not result from the failure of the director to take reasonable care). A director may be prosecuted regardless of whether the corporation has been prosecuted or convicted.

Clause 39: Criminal jurisdiction of Court

An offence against the measure will lie within the jurisdiction of the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

Clause 40: Service

This clause sets out the manner of service of a document, order or notice under the measure.

Clause 41: Application or adoption of codes or standards

This clause facilitates the adoption of appropriate codes, standards and related documents. Any such document will be required to be kept available for inspection by members of the public without payment of a fee.

Clause 42: Regulations

This clause sets out the power to make regulations for the purposes of the measure. These include regulations to prohibit or restrict activities within a River Murray Protection Area, or set requirements or conditions in relation to such an activity, or prohibit or restrict access to a River Murray Protection Area.

SCHEDULE

Amendments

1. *Amendment of Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986*

The amendments to this Act require that various programs undertaken under the Act and decisions to issue various permits that relate to any part of the Murray-Darling Basin must seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*, insofar as they are relevant.

The amendments also provide that if an application for a permit is of a prescribed class, and relates to a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the River Murray Act must be consulted and any directions of the Minister in relation to the grant of the permit, including that the permit not be granted or must be granted subject to specified conditions, must be complied with.

2. Amendment of Aquaculture Act 2001

The amendments to this Act require that insofar as an aquaculture policy applies within the Murray-Darling Basin, the policy must seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. The agreement of the Minister administering the *River Murray Act* must also be obtained before a draft policy that will apply to a River Murray Protection Area is approved.

3. Amendment of Coast Protection Act 1972

The amendments to this Act require the Coast Protection Board to take into account the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*, insofar as they are relevant, when taking any action in relation to any part of the Murray-Darling Basin.

The Board must also consult the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* when it prepares a management plan that may affect the River Murray.

4. Amendment of Crown Lands Act 1929

The amendments to this Act prevent the Minister from acquiring land within the Murray-Darling Basin solely or predominantly for the purpose of closer settlement.

In granting a licence under the Act that relates to the Murray-Darling Basin, the Minister or person authorised to grant the licence must take into account the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. If a licence relates to a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act* must be consulted and any directions of the Minister in relation to the grant of the licence, including that the licence not be granted or must be granted subject to specified conditions, must be complied with.

5. Amendment of Development Act 1993

The amendments to this Act provide that the Planning Strategy is to include the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*, and the Strategy may be amended to reflect this.

The Development Plan may be amended by the Minister administering the *Development Act 1993* at the request of the Minister for the River Murray in order to promote the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. If the two Ministers are unable to reach agreement on a proposed Plan amendment, the matter may be referred to the Governor for determination. The Minister for the River Murray is also given the power to comment on Plan Amendment Reports prepared by Councils or the Planning Minister if the amendment relates to an area within the Murray-Darling Basin.

The amendments also provide that the Minister administering the *Development Act 1993* may, at the request of the Minister for the River Murray, declare that the Development Assessment Commission is to be the relevant authority in relation to a development proposal on the grounds that the proposal may have a significant impact on the River Murray.

The Major Developments Panel must include a member selected by the Minister for the River Murray where the development or project may have a significant effect on the River Murray.

Where an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Public Environmental Report (PER) or Development Report (DR) relate to a development or project to be undertaken within the Murray-Darling Basin, they must include a statement of the extent the project is expected to be consistent with the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* and the general duty of care under that Act. The EIS, PER and DR must also be referred to the Minister for the River Murray for comment.

The amendments also provide that where the Governor may approve a development that may have an impact on the River Murray, the Governor must have regard to the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002*, the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* and the general duty of care under that Act, and any requirements under the Agreement under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993*.

6. Amendment of Environment Protection Act 1993

The amendments to this Act require that in administering the Act or taking any action under the Act that relate to any part of the Murray-Darling Basin, the Minister, the Environment Protection Authority and any other relevant persons must take into account, and seek to further, the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*, insofar as they are relevant.

7. *Amendment of Fisheries Act 1982*

The amendments require that where this Act applies to the River Murray, it must seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. The Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must also be consulted in relation to any proposed research, exploration, works or operations that relate to the River Murray.

The amendments also require that in granting licences of a prescribed class, or various permits or exemptions that relate to the River Murray, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any directions of the Minister in relation to the grant of a licence, permit or exemption, including that it not be granted or must be granted subject to specified conditions, must be complied with.

8. *Amendment of Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*

The amendments will require licences (unless excluded by regulation) that relate to waters that form part of the River Murray to be referred to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002*, and that Minister will be able to give directions in relation to the grant of the licence, including that the licence not be granted, or if it is granted, that it be subject to specified conditions.

9. *Amendment of Heritage Act 1993*

The amendments require that if various permits granted under this Act relate to a River Murray Protection Area, the State Heritage Authority must, in granting a permit, take into account and seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. If the permit is of a prescribed class, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any directions of the Minister in relation to the grant of the permit, including that the permit not be granted or must be granted subject to specified conditions, must be complied with.

10. *Amendment of Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981*

The amendments to this Act require that if an application for a permit under the Act relates to a shipwreck located in the River Murray, the Minister must in considering the application, seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. If a permit is of a prescribed class and relates to a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any directions of the Minister in relation to the grant of the permit, including that the permit not be granted or must be granted subject to specified conditions, must be complied with.

11. *Amendment of Irrigation Act 1994*

The amendments to this Act require that an irrigation authority must not breach, or impose requirements that cause another person to breach, requirements imposed under the *Water Resources Act 1997*, or a duty or requirement under the *River Murray Act 2002*, in determining terms and conditions on the supply or drainage of water.

An irrigation authority may also reduce water allocations if necessary to meet a reduction of its allocation under the *Water Resources Act 1997*. In making any reduction in allocations, the irrigation authority may take into account opportunities for more efficient use of water in the district and the types of crops grown and may reduce various allocations by different amounts or proportions.

12. *Amendment of Mining Act 1971*

The amendments require that in granting applications for various licences, leases and authorisations under this Act that relate to the Murray-Darling Basin, the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* must be taken into account.

If the licence, lease or authorisation relates to a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted on the application. If agreement cannot be reached on whether or not such a licence, lease or authorisation should be granted, the matter must be referred to the Governor for determination.

13. *Amendment of Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993*

The amendment to this Act inserts a new subsection that makes clear that the Minister is the Constructing Authority in relation to any works, or measures authorised by, or associated with, the Murray Darling-Basin Agreement

14. *Amendment of National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*

The amendments to this Act require that any lease, licence or agreement that relates to a reserve located within a River Murray Protection Area, must be consistent with the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. In granting a prescribed class of such a lease, licence or agreement, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any directions in relation to the lease, licence or agreement including directions that the lease, licence or agreement not be granted, or if granted must be subject to certain conditions, must be complied with.

The amendments also provide that an objective of managing a reserve located within the Murray-Darling Basin is to promote the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. The Minister must also consult the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* in preparing a plan of management for a reserve located within the Murray-Darling Basin and must have regard to the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*.

A proposal to constitute or alter the boundaries of a reserve that relates to land within the Murray-Darling Basin must be submitted to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002*, and that Minister's views considered.

The amendments also provide that a permit granted in relation to an activity that may be undertaken in a River Murray Protection Area must be consistent with the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. In granting a prescribed class of permit that relates to a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any directions in relation to the permit, including that the permit not be granted, or must be granted subject to certain conditions, must be complied with.

15. *Amendment of Native Vegetation Act 1991*

The amendments to this Act require the Native Vegetation Council to obtain the approval of the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* before delegating any of its powers in relation to a matter within the Murray-Darling Basin.

Guidelines in relation to the management of native vegetation prepared by the Council that relate to the Murray-Darling Basin must seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* and a draft must be submitted to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* for comment during consultation. The guidelines will only apply to land within the Murray-Darling Basin if they explicitly state that they do.

The amendments also require prescribed classes of applications to clear native vegetation within a River Murray Protection Area to be referred to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002*, and any directions of the Minister as to the grant of the application or any conditions on the grant must be complied with.

A new requirement is also included in the Schedule of the Principles of Clearance of Native Vegetation that vegetation should not be cleared if it would cause significant harm to the River Murray.

16. *Amendment of Opal Mining Act 1995*

The amendments to this Act require that if a proposed declaration of a designated area or exclusion zone applies to any part of a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted.

17. *Amendment of Petroleum Act 2000*

The amendments to this Act require that if a statement of environmental objectives applies to any part of the Murray-Darling Basin, the Minister must obtain the concurrence of the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* before approving the statement. If agreement cannot be reached, the matter must be referred to the Governor for determination.

18. *Amendment of Soil Conservation and Land Care Act 1989*

The amendments to this Act require that a soil conservation board with a district that is located within the Murray-Darling Basin must take into account and seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* in carrying out its functions. The board must also consult with and consider the views of the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* in developing or revising its district plan. Before the Soil Conservation Council approves a district plan, it must also consult and consider the views of the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002*. Both a district plan or a soil conservation order that relates to land within the Murray-Darling Basin must seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*, insofar as they may be relevant.

If a soil conservation order is within a prescribed class and applies to land within a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister

administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any direction in relation to the order, including any requirements of the order, must be complied with.

19. *Amendment of the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992*

The amendments require that in administering the Act or taking any action under the Act that relates to any part of the Murray-Darling Basin, the Minister, the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board, the Council or any other relevant persons must act consistently with and seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*, insofar as they are relevant.

The Board, in reviewing its management plan is also required to consult with the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* insofar as the plan affects the River Murray. Any water management works undertaken by the Board that may affect the River Murray must comply with the approved management plan or otherwise have the approval of the Minister administering the *River Murray Act*.

In granting a licence of a prescribed class to carry out work in relation to a River Murray Protection Area, the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* must be consulted and any directions of the Minister in relation to the grant of the licence, including that the licence not be granted or must be granted subject to specified conditions, must be complied with.

20. *Amendment of Water Resources Act 1997*

The amendments will ensure that insofar as this Act applies to the Murray-Darling Basin that persons involved in its administration act consistently with and seek to further the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*.

The Minister administering the *Water Resources Act 1997* is the relevant authority for issuing permits for prescribed classes of activities within the Murray-Darling Basin.

The amendments also provide that an activity required by a protection order, reparation order, or reparation authorisation issued under the *River Murray Act 2002* will not require a permit under the *Water Resources Act*.

A person undertaking an activity in the Murray-Darling Basin pursuant to a development authorisation under the *Development Act 1993*, will not be exempt from the requirement to hold a permit under the *Water Resources Act* unless the development authorisation was referred to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002*, or the exemption is otherwise excluded by the regulations.

The amendments also require prescribed classes of applications for permits that relate to an area within a River Murray Protection Area to be referred to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002*, and any directions of the Minister as to the grant of the application, including that the application not be granted or that certain conditions be imposed on the grant, must be complied with. Consideration of an application that relates to an area within the Murray-Darling Basin must take account of the terms and conditions of the Agreement under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993* if relevant.

A prescribed class of application for a licence or transfer of a licence must be referred to the Minister administering the *River Murray Act 2002* and any directions of the Minister as to the grant of the application, including that the application not be granted or that certain conditions be imposed on the grant, must be complied with. Consideration of an application that relates to an area within the Murray-Darling Basin must take account of the terms and conditions of the Agreement under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993* if relevant.

The amendments provide that a licence condition that relates to a water resource within the Murray-Darling Basin may require that a licensee enter into a bond or otherwise make a payment to ensure that money is available to cover costs of any damage to the River Murray due to the taking or use of water under the licence. A condition may also specify that a licensee develop or participate in an environmental improvement program or other scheme to protect, restore or benefit the River Murray. These conditions may be imposed in relation to licences granted or damage caused before these amendments come into operation.

The amendments also provide for interstate trade to occur in water entitlements in accordance with the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement.

A water licence may be varied, suspended or cancelled if a licensee contravenes a protection order or a reparation order under the *River Murray Act 2002*.

The amendments insert a new Division which allows for the implementation of schemes by the Minister administering the *Water*

Resources Act 1997 to encourage (but not require) licensees to transfer or surrender their licences.

The amendments will also require the Minister administering the *Water Resources Act 1997*, insofar as the Act applies within the Murray-Darling Basin and is it is reasonably practicable to do so, to integrate the administration of this Act with the *River Murray Act 2002* and to integrate and co-ordinate policies, programs, plans and projects under both Acts.

A catchment water management plan that relates to the Murray-Darling Basin must identify changes and set out how a catchment water management board will implement the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray*. A plan must seek to further these objects and objectives and be consistent with the requirements of the Agreement under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993*.

A catchment water management plan or water allocation plan may be amended so that it furthers the objects of the *River Murray Act 2002* and the *Objectives for a Healthy River Murray* and has greater consistency with the requirements of the Agreement under the *Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993*, without following the usual procedures for amendment, provided the Minister certifies that the amendments will not significantly impact on the water allocations of licensees.

The amendments will also allow a differential levy to be declared in relation to the River Murray dependent on the effect that the use of the water may have on salinity levels in the River.

Under the Act, a catchment water management plan or the regulations may set out certain water usage and land management practices that may result in a refund of a levy. The amendments to the Act provide that these may include establishing or participating in a drainage scheme. The Minister will also be able to grant a refund of, or an exemption from, the whole or part of a levy as a condition of a water licence, through the mechanism of a management agreement under the *River Murray Act 2002*, or by notice in the *Gazette*.

Mr BRINDAL secured adjournment of the debate.

TERRORISM (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Page 4, lines 27 to 34 and page 5, lines 1 to 12 (clause 4)—
Leave out subclauses (6), (7) and (8).

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council appointed the Hon. S.M. Kanck to fill the vacancy on the committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.J. Elliott.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Legislative Council appointed the Hon. I. Gilfillan to fill the vacancy on the committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.J. Elliott.

STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council appointed the Hon. I. Gilfillan to fill the vacancy on the committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.J. Elliott.

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.W. Weatherill:

That this house, pursuant to section 13(7) of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act 1987, grants its approval to the West Beach Trust granting a lease or licence for a term of up to 50 years over each of the areas within the reserve within the meaning of the act identified as 'BB', 'Y' and 'Z', respectively, in the plan described in the General Registry Office numbered GP 496/1999.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2095.)

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): This is a relatively uncontroversial measure. I spoke in favour of it on the last occasion that it was before the house. It is required that this motion be passed by both houses; in fact, the other place has passed an identical motion. The purpose of the motion is to ensure that a small piece of land that exists on the West Beach Trust reserve is capable of being developed for a small sliver of development. It is already developed in part. An identical lease was sought to be executed by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in her capacity as minister for urban planning and development on a previous occasion. She is aware of this motion, and she is supportive of it. The member for Light, the shadow minister on this matter, has been consulted. I had a discussion with him—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The house is absolutely disorderly. I cannot even see the minister, let alone hear him.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The member for Bright has been consulted about this matter. I had a discussion with him earlier today concerning the issue, and he is content with it. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

UPPER SOUTH EAST DRYLAND SALINITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 December. Page 2134.)

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I hope the house does not detain itself too long over this matter. With the concurrence of my leader, while I will be spearheading the debate, the member for MacKillop, being the local member and the person with the most to contribute, will take the opposition's position as lead speaker on this issue, so his time will be unlimited. Therefore, I ask that the clock be turned on so that I be given just the normal 20 minutes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have to have 20 minutes!

Mr BRINDAL: I will be as brief as I can.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the member for Unley the lead speaker or just being generous?

Mr BRINDAL: I will be leading the bill but, with the concurrence of my leader, the member for MacKillop will be taking the role of lead speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In that case, the member for Unley has a limited time.

Mr BRINDAL: The decision of the Liberal Party, as the minister knows (because the minister himself has some reservations about the development of this bill and bringing it to the place), to support this bill has not been reached without major reservations. As was said by my colleague in

another place, it does not fit easily with me, her or our colleagues to allow any minister to have the unfettered powers that the minister will enjoy under this bill. As was said in the other place, I am sure that, from time to time, we all have been forced with reluctance to take decisions for the greater good. In the view of the shadow minister who leads this in my party, and in the view of my party, this may well be one of those times.

As I was minister for a time and was partly responsible for this matter—along with my leader—there was an understanding on this side of the house that the scheme needs to be urgently completed and that as an opposition we would be irresponsible if we did not try to facilitate the speedy completion of this scheme, which has gone on for too long and, as the member for MacKillop I am sure will say, which is coming at an ever greater cost, partly in consequence of the time lags that have occurred.

My having said that, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer in another place (and I acknowledge the help of government in this) has allowed to be inserted into the bill a number of amendments, all of which dilute the opposition's fears and lead us to consider that the bill at least in a form worth supporting. The area affected by this bill is 476 kilometres of drains, with 100 metres on either side, equalling approximately 9 530 hectares of land, which is approximately 2 per cent of the salt-affected land that needs to be restored urgently.

The Upper South-East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Program was initiated with four main elements, those being: drainage; vegetation protection enhancement; salt land agronomy; and wetland enhancement and management. The funding proportion has been 37 per cent from the commonwealth government; 37 per cent from the state government; and 26 per cent collected by a levy system from landholders, many of whom have already been paying the levy for four years but all of whom are continuing to watch their land increasingly affected by rising salinity. In some areas, following the advent of lucerne thrips—

Mr Williams: Flea.

Mr BRINDAL: After the advent of lucerne flea (and this is why I have to rely on my rural colleagues), vast areas of pasture were lost. At the time it was not readily identified that lucerne, being a deep-rooted crop which is very water hungry, was keeping the groundwater levels under control after the clearing of the native vegetation. That deep-rooted crop being lost, there occurred relatively quickly a build-up of the saline groundwater tables and a breaking through to the surface so that there are increasing amounts of salt affected areas in the South-East. That area is increasing, if not daily, certainly on a yearly basis; hence the urgent need for this scheme.

The commonwealth component of the legislation is dependent upon an offset of the environmental asset such as revegetation. The minister would have been aware of some difficulties experienced by the last government when he was shadow minister, and some disagreement with the then federal minister (Hon. Robert Hill) in respect of two issues, one being the clearance of native vegetation, even though the then state government moved for at least a restoration program, plus more native vegetation. The other concern of the commonwealth, which the member for MacKillop will remember well, was that, even though the Coorong traditionally had been a natural sump for drainage from the South-East into the bottom blocks of the Coorong, that had been interfered with by the construction of the earlier drains, notably the one that goes to the sea at Kingston in the South-East. Nevertheless our proposal, which would put some water

back into the Coorong that one would have naturally expected to go there in earlier times, was vigorously opposed on the grounds that Environment Australia argued that having modified the environment of the Coorong it became a habitat, especially for some wading birds from Siberia, and it would be dangerous for us to only partially restore it.

While they acknowledged that the environmental aim of total restoration of the Coorong was probably a laudable one, they seemed to think that partial restoration was not so wise, and there was some argy bargy about that. That has caused numerous delays. At one stage—the member for MacKillop may well touch on this—the commonwealth government was refusing to make any payment and work virtually ground to a halt. The causes for delay did not involve just the commonwealth government: they have been numerous. Some landholders have been at fault where they have been less than cooperative. There seems to have been some failure on the part of certain government officers to negotiate speedily or efficiently. Certainly the board, when I was minister, several times complained to me that they thought things could have been handled more efficiently and expeditiously. For whatever reason, only 25 per cent of the total area to be drained has been completed and there have been inordinate delays, so they have cost dearly the environment, the landholder and the taxpayers of South Australia.

The acquisition of a number of alignments has already been negotiated with existing land-holders, but under this legislation the minister will have the power to compulsorily acquire the remaining alignments and must identify them in plans lodged with the Surveyor-General. The powers vested in the minister also provide for no compensation. That was the provision, although I believe that is amended, and I acknowledge that as it comes into this house.

This bill does not sit easily with the Liberal Party. The member for MacKillop, exercising his right as a Liberal to speak freely on this matter, since it is in his electorate and part of his constituency, does not favour the majority position taken by our party. He is an influential voice in our party and is listened to, and it is with some reluctance that we move in a slightly differing direction from him, if that is the way he is minded to speak. Having said that, we do so only because, while we fear some of the provisions of this bill, we accept that it is brought in here in good faith to a laudable end, that being that this significant work must be completed for the good of existing land-holders, for future generations in the South-East and for the better utilisation and productivity of the land. That will not come at a cost to the environment but rather with environmental enhancement through improvement in wetlands, vegetation and a better understanding between land-holders, government officers, the drainage board and all players in what constitutes better management of the environment and the productive capacity of the Upper South-East.

That said, there remains one thing for me to say. I believe the Hon. Caroline Schaefer in another place asked of the minister who handled the bill a question which was to be answered by the minister here. As the minister knows, the land on either side of what will be the channel is to be compulsorily acquired by the minister. The minister will then gift back, as appropriate to the land-holder, the land he has compulsorily acquired, so there will be a net loss of land to most land-holders of only the width of the channel. However, the interesting proposition the Hon. Caroline Schaefer raised in another place was that, because most of the land dates back prior to the date on which capital gains tax was payable,

because the minister will now acquire the land and gift it back, clearly a transfer of land has taken place at a date at or about now; it may be early or late next year.

In that circumstance, the transfer being affected, will capital gains in future be applied to that corridor of land simply because a new arrangement has been made? Between the houses has the minister found any way to get out of what would almost certainly be an inadvertent problem that we have discovered in debate? I will ask the house to note that I have taken only 11 minutes. I will not detain the house longer and hope the minister will clarify that issue in closing the second reading debate. If he does so, I will see no reason to move into committee.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I express my thanks to the shadow minister for giving me the opportunity to possibly speak for more than 20 minutes on this matter. I am not sure how long I will go on for, but I want to canvass a large number of issues. I want to put a lot of facts on the record and bring to the house some understanding of the situation in the South-East as it has been since white man first arrived in this part of the world, and an understanding of some of the things that have happened in the meantime. Unfortunately, I suspect that the shadow minister, the minister and I will probably be the only three members who will contribute to this debate. Notwithstanding that this is the last day of the session, I am somewhat disappointed that an issue as important as this attracts the attention of only three members of the house.

One of the issues I have had to contend with many times in this chamber is the fact that the South-East of the state is quite different geographically, hydro-geologically and in many other ways from the rest of the state. It is also quite distant from the major population centre of Adelaide, and consequently a lot of people in South Australia, including members of this chamber, have a limited understanding of some of the issues that occur in that part of the world. That does not delight me and makes my job representing those fine folk of the South-East even more difficult—a challenge that I readily accept.

The landscape of the South-East is basically a series of ranges parallel to the distinct coastline. In between these series of ranges there are flats. Before we started any drainage works in the South-East, the water—and that part of the world enjoys a significant rainfall—would accumulate behind these ranges and flow in a north-westerly direction. Occasionally, natural gorges had developed in the ranges and eventually most of the water find its way, either through soakage under the ranges or by flowing through the natural gorges, into the Coorong and out to the sea through the Murray Mouth.

Between Kingston and Naracoorte there are seven distinct series of ranges and eight flats between them. I refer to the time when the white man came to South Australia and started to develop away from central Adelaide. We must realise that the Henty brothers travelled from Tasmania and set up an establishment at Portland just across the Victorian border and, indeed, were probably at Mount Gambier at about the same time that Adelaide was established in 1836.

Mount Gambier, which was very fertile and enjoyed good rainfall, was a part of the state that attracted farmers and graziers in those early days. A problem that the people of Mount Gambier found was that, although they were part of South Australia, the communications between them and the capital in Adelaide, as well as the rest of the colony, was very difficult, principally because of the nature of the landscape,

as well as the water which lay across the landscape and made travel, in those days on horseback, very difficult.

I understand that it took at least several days to get the mail through from Melbourne to Mount Gambier, whereas it took almost twice that time to get it there from Adelaide. The first push to open drains to enable water to drain directly westward to the sea came not because of the desire to open up more agricultural land but, indeed, because of the desire to construct decent roadways to aid the passage of goods, mail and people to and from that part of the state. I think it is fair to say that initially most of the South-East was, at least in winter, just an inland sea. George Goyder once wrote in one of his papers:

My opinion is that from Salt Creek southward the area of the South-East is equal to 7 600 square miles, and in every wet season half of that is under water. The depth of the water varies from one to six feet, and some of it is never dry. Some swamps extend from four to six miles.

You can image, Mr Acting Speaker, as I am describing, travellers traversing the land, going into a swamp with their horse and not coming out the other side for four or six miles. Obviously, that made travel very difficult. I particularly want to mention Goyder here and, even though I think his name is well known in South Australia, I think he deserves much greater recognition than he has achieved here in South Australia. As a schoolboy, I was taught about Goyder's line: Goyder delineated an area of the state which he thought would be suitable for agricultural pursuits from that which he thought would not be—and I think Goyder's line is still appropriate. Indeed, I think he got it very right.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I was a very good one—and a very well behaved one, too. It was Goyder who had a vision that the South-East could not only be drained to allow access, but that it could also provide much wealth to the state through the drainage and development of agricultural land. For the benefit of members, I will quote from a book called 'Down the Drain: The Story of Events and Personalities Associated with 125 Years of Drainage in the South-East of South Australia' by Malcolm Turner and Derek Carter. Goyder is quoted as saying:

The subject [of drainage] is of great importance to the residents in the South-East, and to the colony at large—as a successful prosecution of the work would not only double the area at present available to the stockholder and place at the disposal of the Crown a large extent of rich agricultural land, but it would also materially aid the general traffic of the country, and enable good roads to be formed at much less cost than must necessarily be expected if the country continues to be liable to inundations from inefficient means to carry off the ordinary winter's rains.

That was in the 1860s. I have one other connection with the drainage system in the South-East. Not only am I the local member representing the area but, in 1867, two of my great uncles arrived in a group of 100 men in the South-East to start digging drains in the Millicent area. My great grandfather—the brother of those two gentlemen—joined them shortly thereafter and our family became established in that region, and turned to farming after a turn at digging drains.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: This is the Williamses, yes. I have enjoyed a very keen interest in the drainage system of the South-East all my life and, indeed, before coming into this place I spent a little over 12 months as an elected land-holder representative on the South-East Water Conservation and Drainage Board, which administers the drainage legislation in the area. I bring that to the attention of the house, because

one of the difficulties I have in understanding what the minister is trying to achieve with this act is why the minister, whose portfolio area includes oversight of the management of the South-East Water Conservation and Drainage Board and that act, has not chosen to put any additional powers that he might need into that act.

I do not believe that the minister needs any of the additional powers that he is seeking from the house in this bill. As the shadow minister quipped a moment ago, I was a schoolboy. One thing I learnt when I was a schoolboy was to count, and I understand that, much to my disappointment, the minister has the numbers to get this piece of legislation through. I say that because I think it is bad legislation, and as the current Attorney once said: hard cases make for bad law.

This is a hard case in the South-East; there is no doubt about that. I do not think there will be any doubt that, when history has had a chance to look at what we are doing here this evening, this will be seen to be bad law. It was nowhere near as bad a law when it came to us from the other place as it was when it entered that place, and I would like to congratulate my colleague in the other place, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, for the work that she did in significantly amending this piece of legislation and, as the shadow minister has said, making it considerably more palatable to the Liberal Party.

Nevertheless, I still have grave difficulties with it, as I do not believe that the minister needs any of the powers that this piece of legislation gives him, and I will explain why I have that belief as I continue my remarks. But, once again, I thank and congratulate the Hon. Caroline Schaefer in another place for the work that she did. I should offer my thanks to the minister for accepting most of those amendments moved by the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, because I think that the minister is doing this in good faith. He has taken advice that this is what is necessary to proceed the upper South-East project, but I certainly disagree with the advice that he has been given.

I spoke earlier about the state of inundation in the whole of the South-East. What happened over a period of 100 years, starting in the 1860s up to about 1970, was a series of drains which crisscrossed the Lower South-East and channelled that water westward to the ocean through a number of cuts. The shadow minister talked about the outlet at Kingston via Maria Creek and later the Blackford Drain. There are openings south of Millicent into Lake Bonney, which is then drained into the sea. The cuts that run into the sea at Robe, Beachport and Southend are the most significant of the man-made drains in the area. They drain the whole area as far north and east as Bool Lagoon, which collects water out of Mosquito Creek and the Naracoorte Creek, the headwaters of which are in Victoria, and that water ends up in the Southern Ocean adjacent to Robe, Beachport and Southend. The water that traditionally travelled in a north-westerly direction up between these dunal systems and ended up largely going into the Coorong through various outlets, one through Henry Creek and then up the Tilley Swamp watercourse or eventually at Salt Creek itself, has not had the opportunity to travel north for probably in excess of 50 years. It is probably much longer than that since significant amounts of water have travelled north, and that land has dried out significantly.

Having dried out, the land was then opened up to farming or grazing pursuits, and most of the land has been cleared of its natural vegetation. This is where we have the problem of dryland salinisation. We have cleared the land, the natural rainfall is not being used, so it accumulates below the surface soils forming a water table, and that water table is rising, bringing with it the salts that it mobilises out of the soils. This

did not occur initially with the clearing because, as the land was cleared, it was sown with lucerne. The lucerne plant is a very deep-rooted perennial that has a similar effect on the recharge of the aquifers underlying the surface as would a forest or native tree-type vegetation, with its deep roots and ability to extract large amounts of water from a reasonable depth under the surface.

As the shadow minister said, in the late 1970s (about 1978 or 1979), with the introduction into the area (by accident, of course) of two insect pests, the lucerne flea and the spotted alfalfa aphid, the lucerne stands across huge tracts of the Mid and Upper South-East died right out. All of a sudden, as early as about 1983, some land-holders in the area started to talk about the salinisation of their land, the increase in size of salt scalds in some of the lower areas, and started to talk about what was going to happen to the South-East. A few of them started to talk about ways in which they might be able to overcome the rising water table and the attendant salt problem. So, it has been a long time coming. For almost 20 years discussions have been taking place about an engineering solution to the problem we have in the Upper South-East.

The government of the day got serious about this a bit over 10 years ago. In the early 1990s a series of reports was written and environmental impact statements were commissioned, and the plan that we see before us now was largely established in the early 1990s. There was a lot of negotiation, because the powers to undertake the works were largely available to the government of the day through other pieces of legislation. Interestingly, the South-East Drainage Act gave the South-East Water Conservation and Drainage Board the power to levy land-holders. Those powers were used to raise levies across much of the South-East to contribute to the funding of this drainage scheme. The drainage scheme originally was planned as a \$24 million scheme, and the funding package was one where the commonwealth contributed \$9 million, the state was to contribute \$9 million and the land-holders across the region contributed some \$6 million.

The \$6 million levy raised from the land-holders happened through a huge amount of negotiation. Nobody likes paying levies, but eventually a negotiated settlement was reached whereby the region to be levied was split into four divisions. Zone A was those areas where a land-holder could expect to get a direct benefit from a drain, and a particular levy was set in zone A. Zone B was those areas where the land-holder might not get an absolute direct benefit; he would be a little more removed from the drains, but the expectation was that he or she would receive a substantial benefit, and they were levied at a different level. Zones C and D were further removed. Zone C goes right across to the Victorian border, so you have people to the east of Naracoorte, a long way away from the nearest drain, who were never going to be subject to salinisation: that was their belief, and no-one suggested they would be.

They were being levied at a lower rate again, because it was argued that, having cleared their land and turned it into grazing land, they had contributed to the rising water tables to the west, where the ground waters, which had been created by their clearing their land, were flowing under the surface and also contributing to the rising water tables in the west. The people who actually carried those arguments through did a terrific job. I was not in one of those areas but I have had plenty of representations from constituents who were, and they have put very sound arguments as to why they should not have been levied. Since that levy came into being we have

had the Water Resources Act 1997, whereby some of those same people who are paying levies because they ostensibly have created or added to this problem of rising water tables in the west are paying a water levy to the South-East Water Catchment Management Board because there is not enough water and they need to get a water licence if they want to use the water.

So, the same land-holders are paying one levy to a catchment board because they need to protect the water resource, and paying another levy to another board because they need to dig drains to get rid of the water. There are some obvious inequities there. One of the things that this bill seeks to do is transfer those powers of raising levies from the South-East Drainage Board to the minister, and I hope that the minister is very careful if he tries to instigate a new levy and levy those people who would in no way receive a direct benefit from either the drains that have already been constructed or those that need to be constructed. One of the powers that the minister is seeking from this legislation is that of levying. That power is already available to the minister. That is one of the reasons why I say that we do not need this bill.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mr WILLIAMS: The Upper South-East scheme, as I have said, has been operational for a number of years. The first drain, the Fairview Drain, was completed probably five or six years ago, some time around 1997. We have three parts to the landscape: the northern, the central and the southern basins. The proponents of the scheme always wanted to start at the north, because that is where they thought the biggest problem was and most of the water would naturally run to the north and, if they started at the north and then worked southwards, that made very good sense. It would have been the natural way to undertake the scheme. Unfortunately, if you started at the north and were generating water and sending it up drains to the north, you had to have some way of getting rid of the water when it got to the north. This is where the biggest stumbling block to this scheme has been.

Originally, the proponents suggested that the best place to get water out of the northern part of the scheme through the last of the sand ridges and into the Coorong at Salt Creek would be to construct the drains through the Messent Conservation Park. Straightaway, the proponents came into great difficulty because the environmental movement would not wear the drain going through Messent Conservation Park. They said that it was sacrosanct and the drainage scheme had to stay out of there. I still believe that the best route for the northern outlet would have been through the Messent Conservation Park, and I lament that the proponents did not pursue that option. I believe that, in the future, the Messent Conservation Park will still suffer from salinity because the drainage scheme will not go quite that far north.

The next option was to come just south of the Messent Conservation Park and build the outlet there through a property known as Currawong. The alignment of the drain was planned, and Currawong is a fairly long, narrow block of land running from a south-west to north-east direction. The route of the drain would have gone pretty well straight up the centre of this property and divided it into almost equal parts.

The owner of the property objected and continued objecting to that proposal for a number of years. His objections were so strong that the proponents then said, 'We've been collecting this money. We've got to keep faith with the land-holders who have been paying it,' and they started digging drains in the south. The Fairview drain was constructed and its outfall is into the Blackford drain, which runs to the sea at Kingston. So, they did not have a problem with finding an outfall for the water generated out of the drain.

Meanwhile, the largest land-holder in the area—Tom Brinkworth—and I know the minister does not want to admit that this bill is largely to do with Tom Brinkworth; I will save him from having not to admit that: this bill is largely to do with Tom Brinkworth, and I think that is a great pity—had accumulated large tracts of land in the Upper South-East and had been constructing quite minor drains for many years going back probably into the 1980s.

In the mid 1990s, he started to get very serious about digging drains. He dug a drain from the Marcollat area—the drain known as the Didicoolum drain—to run water basically westward. He went on to dig what he called the Water Valley drain, which delivered water to a point on the Petherick Road to what I think is called Log Crossing. Water has been running to that point for a number of years now, and a series of drains have been constructed via the scheme—mainly the Wongawilly drain, the Ballater East drain and a connection up the Old Bakers Range watercourse into the Water Valley drain.

A lot of water being generated out of that drainage system arrives at this crossing on Petherick Road. From there it runs up the natural watercourse into a large area known as the Mandina Marshes. A few years ago, Tom Brinkworth contacted the drainage board and the proponents of the scheme and said, 'The Mandina Marshes have been inundated for a number of years. We've got to get rid of some of this water. We've got to allow this area to dry out, and we should be able to run water back down through the natural outlet at Henry Creek and then up the Tilley Swamp watercourse, through the Morella Basin and out through Salt Creek.' I think that was a fairly sensible thing to do. Indeed, when I was on the drainage board in 1976, we discussed that particular issue. However, that is about as far as it got.

After arguing this for a fair while—and the minister is probably totally unaware of this—I understand that the reason water was not allowed to go out through Henry Creek was that the argument was always made that this water is reasonably saline—up to about 7 000 parts per million—and the Native Vegetation people and the environmentalists in the Department for Environment were worried about causing damage by putting saline water out through Henry Creek. So, this water continued to flow into the Mandina Marshes.

More recently, Tom Brinkworth purchased another property called South Flagstaff and dug another drain to divert this water around the Mandina Marshes and to drop back into wetlands much further north. Once again, he got into trouble with the Native Vegetation Council by digging that drain. In my opinion—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister says that he broke the law. The minister is administering the law. If he believes Tom Brinkworth has broken the law he should be prosecuted. He is not the first minister to whom I have given that advice. Plenty of people keep saying that Tom Brinkworth has broken the law, but no-one responsible will actually prosecute the man. Tom Brinkworth saved the Mandina Marshes and,

through the drains that he has dug in that central basin, he has saved many tens of thousands of hectares of land from dryland salinity. That is my opinion, and I think that anyone who studies the drainage system and the landscape could not help but agree.

Unfortunately—and I take no joy from this—this is a fairly long story. I will move along quite rapidly now. The southern and central parts of the scheme have largely been constructed. It is the northern part of the scheme that is still relying on getting an outlet. The central part of the scheme also had a problem with getting rid of this water which was still flowing into the Mandina Marshes or around the new drain constructed by Tom Brinkworth. It was slowly and inexorably moving further north and, at some stage, was going to create a problem when it reached that bottleneck in the north.

Indeed, recognising that something had to be done, Tom Brinkworth came to the proponents of the scheme and, through the environmental trust he set up, offered to negotiate with the trustees of Wetlands and Wildlife, the owners of the next property south of Carrawong to construct a drainage outlet through that property. At the end of the day, those negotiations were successful. Tom Brinkworth again got into a bit of trouble with the Native Vegetation people over the construction of that drain but, nevertheless, someone at some stage somehow had to construct that drain. The whole system relied on the construction of that drain to allow the water to run out of the catchments and into the Coorong. That drain was completed probably about 14 months ago in the winter of 2001—at the end of autumn. Now we have the final key to the completion of the drainage system.

It is interesting that Tom Brinkworth has been painted as being the ogre here, the person who has held up the scheme, the person who has frustrated the proponents of this scheme. I have two maps: one was given to me when I was a member of the Public Works Committee of this parliament and it is dated June 2000; the other was given to me just recently, dated 15 November 2002. Both maps depict basically the same thing: the Upper South-East and the proposed alignments of the drains for the scheme. Both maps have a series of colours and in dark blue they show the alignments of the proposed drains.

When I study these maps, I try to see which drains that were proposed in June 2002 have actually been constructed by 15 November 2002—that is almost 2½ years—and the only drains that I can see having actually been constructed in that time are the northern outlet, which was constructed by Tom Brinkworth, and another seven kilometres of drain on a property called Taunta, which adjoins the north-eastern end of that northern outlet. So, from June 2000 to 15 November 2002, the only actual work done on this project has been done by Tom Brinkworth, yet the minister says that he needs these powers so that he can overcome the frustrations that Tom Brinkworth is causing. I would argue that it is not Tom Brinkworth who is causing frustration to this scheme, it is the mismanagement of the scheme over a very long time. I am not suggesting that the management of this scheme has been easy. It has been trying to get that balance between the various agencies here at the state level and, more particularly (and this has been more difficult), with the agencies in Canberra. There have been incredible hold-ups there. I would argue that the minister should, indeed, have come to the parliament seeking to inert some extra powers, if he thought he needed them, into the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act and handed the management of this whole

project over to the South-East Water Conservation and Drainage Board. That board has a very proud history of this sort of work, which stretches back well over 100 years, and it has never got itself into the mess that this project has got itself into in the last five or six years.

I fail to see why the minister needs these powers. He came in here originally wanting the power to acquire land without any compensation and, again, my colleague in the other place has softened that up a little. To be quite honest, in some ways I am sad that she has done that, because I think the minister was heading for very serious trouble. I believe that, without the amendments (and even with them he may still have problems), he would never have been able to negotiate funds out of the commonwealth government. We know that section 51C, I think it is, of the Constitution of Australia does not allow the commonwealth government to be involved in appropriating people's property without due compensation, and that is what this bill originally intended to do. I am not too sure that it is a hell of a lot better now, but it is somewhat better. I think the minister should thank the Liberal Party for getting him over that hurdle (if he does get over that hurdle), because I do not believe that his original bill would have given him the ability to progress this project at all.

I also point out to the minister that, when I was a member of the South-East Water Conservation Drainage Board, we had a situation much further south, in the Lower South-East, where a landowner was frustrating the drainage board in some actions that it wanted to take to give relief to a landholder upstream. Eventually, we used the powers that we already had under the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act and the Land Acquisition Act, and compulsorily acquired land to construct a drain. So, the power is there.

The minister comes in here and argues that he needs these powers, but I do not think the minister could cite to the house an instance where he has tried to exercise the powers that he already has and has been frustrated because he does not have strong enough powers. I think that is the crux of this bill, and it is one of the reasons why I do not believe that the minister needs this bill at all—because he has not been frustrated to the point where, using the existing powers, he has not been able to progress.

There are many other points that I would like to raise. I have given an undertaking to the minister that I will not talk for too long, and I have probably used almost as much time as I indicated I would be speaking for. However, there are a couple of things that I want to point out. I understand that there are probably three places where the project is being frustrated by land-holders. I want to briefly mention these three areas and point out why it is being frustrated—and I do not think anyone should take the blame for this apart from the proponents. With respect to the most northerly of the drains that is proposed (and I think that drain would be called the Mount Charles Drain), I understand that a land-holder there objects to the drain passing through his property. My understanding is that he objects not to the drain per se but to the alignment of the drain, it having been put straight through his laser levelled irrigation paddock. He is not objecting to the drain or the principle, or probably even giving up some land. It is the route—where it is to go—that will cause severe inconvenience to his operation. I think that is merely a matter of negotiation with the land-holder.

Another land-holder certainly has been holding up the project in the Marcollat area, where the proponents wish to extend the Didicoolum Drain in a south-easterly direction adjacent to the Marcollat water course, so that it can pick up

highly saline water in that area to the west of Padthaway. My advice is that it is essential that that drain be dug, but the land-holder at the northern end of that proposed drain has grave concerns, because the ground water under his property, which he uses for stock water, is very sweet, and he is very concerned about digging a drain through his property and delivering salt water onto and through his property. He is very concerned about the impact that might have on his property.

That is one of the reasons why the Liberal Party has insisted that, at the end of this project, these people can, indeed, have a look to see whether their property has been devalued. That property, I believe, probably would be devalued by the drainage system; the land-holder would receive no direct benefit. All the benefit would accrue to upstream land-holders, and this person could suffer a substantial loss. This land-holder certainly has not been convinced that he is not in line for suffering a substantial loss.

The only other place where I think there has been an argument with a land-holder (and, again, this is with Tom Brinkworth) is in the area known as Kercoonda, where, as I said earlier, the native vegetation people would not allow water to be run down through Henry Creek. The proponents wish to put a separate cutting through to deliver water across into the Tilley Swamp watercourse. Tom Brinkworth argues that, now that he has put the diversion drain around the Mandina marshes, that is unnecessary. To be quite honest, it will not be necessary for a number of years; there is plenty of pondage area to the north of the Mandina marshes. If the minister insists on putting that cut through at Kercoonda (and I believe that it will be necessary in the longer term), if he instituted action under the Acquisition of Land Act, even if it took a couple of years, he would be able to achieve his ends. Again, I do not understand why the minister would want to bring into this place what I regard as heavy-handed and poor legislation when he already has the ability to achieve his ends through other means.

As I said, looking at these two maps, in the last 2½ years virtually no drainage works have been carried out by the proponents of the scheme. To my knowledge, there is absolutely no reason why the extension of the Tilley Swamp drain down into the Taratap area has not been completed. The minister has said on radio in the South-East, and to anyone else whom he would want to talk to, that he went to the South-East, he talked to land-holders, and they said, 'Get on with the scheme.' Indeed, they have. I am absolutely certain that the land-holders he talked to are those in the Taratap area. They have been tearing their hair out for a number of years. I have not been given any information as to why that drain has not been constructed. I do not believe any land-holder has been frustrating the construction of that drain. And it is the same story with respect to the Winpinmerit Drain and the Bald Hill Drain. There are similar people in that area to those in the north-east of Kingston. I do not understand why those drains have not been constructed.

With respect to the drains in the Mount Charles/Bunbury area and the Taunta area, as I said earlier, the northern outlet was completed some 13 months ago. No work has been done to construct those drains, yet the minister says that he has been frustrated. In fact, the minister has been helped significantly by Tom Brinkworth, and this project would never be able to progress without his help.

I want to talk for a few minutes about the provisions of the bill. The shadow minister indicated that he did not think it was necessary to go into the third reading, and I am quite

happy for us to go straight to the adoption of the bill, through all its stages, as long as I can put on the record several matters that I would like the minister, in his winding up of the second reading, to address. I have very significant problems with the idea of the minister's instituting a levy and then offering exemptions to the levy in return for land-holders signing management agreements, because I believe that some land-holders will be forced, by dint of this legislation, to do something that they do not want to do. During the last couple of weeks I have spoken to a number of land-holders about this matter, and I did not come across one land-holder who said that they would accept the exemption. They have all said, 'I will pay the damn levy,' because they do not want to sign heritage agreements. That is one issue.

The minister would also have powers, under clause 15(2)(c), to prohibit or restrict specified activities, or activities of a specified kind on the land. To my mind this is aimed fairly and squarely at Tom Brinkworth. We all know that one of the things that Tom Brinkworth sponsors in the region is hunting. He is a very keen hunter and there are a lot of keen hunters in the area. He holds several duck shoots on a lot of the wetlands on his properties during the year. I would like to know from the minister whether this is a backdoor way of forcing Tom Brinkworth into signing a management plan to restrict him from holding duck shooting or other forms of hunting on his land. I can see no other reason for having that clause in the bill.

By way of example of the sort of problems I have with giving the minister these powers, as luck would have it, another constituent contacted me late last week and I met with her on Monday of this week, when she raised an issue about which I am very concerned. Her property (and this will identify it, although I will not use her name) is section 40 in the hundred of Peacock. Some years ago she was approached when the proponents of the scheme said they wanted to clean out the channel of the old Bakers Range watercourse from what is known as the G cutting on the Kingston-Willalooka road so that, instead of all the freshwater generated in the Fairview drainage area running out to sea in the winter time, we can push that up through the G cutting, through the old Bakers Range watercourse and into the wetlands further into the Upper South-East. They came to her and said that the drainage route would go through her property, and indeed the drain meets her property and runs down adjacent to the fence line on her property for a distance of probably a kilometre. Since that time she has wanted the proponents—the diggers of the drain—to fence off the drain so that her stock will not fall into it, and if somebody comes onto her property they would have no claim if they were injured by falling or driving into the drain.

The problem is that the minister's department has been arguing with her for a number of years that she should sign a heritage agreement with the department to hand over some 237 hectares of land. This land includes some pristine grazing area and some very pretty country of high heritage value, and I do not resile from that. I might say that 237 hectares would be approximately half her property, just looking at the plan that she has shown me.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Tom Brinkworth did suggest that it is similar to what President Mugabe is doing.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Comrade Mugabe!

Mr WILLIAMS: Comrade Mugabe. It is not just her; I have not spoken to her neighbours at this stage. However, at least four neighbours were then pressured to sign away some

384 hectares of land. I think the house should be well aware that some years ago when this drain was proposed to be pushed through it came up against a large block of native scrub in an area known as the Hanson Tiver Scrub, on two properties belonging to Messrs Hanson and Tiver. It is my understanding that the proponents of the scheme have said to Environment Australia and your department, 'We will get some heritage agreements to offset the permission to go through the Hanson Tiver Scrub so we can divert this water up the old Bakers Range watercourse.' These land-holders in sections 40, 59, 58, 96 and 34 of the Hundred of Peacock have been pressured into signing away 384 hectares of land under a heritage agreement. It is my understanding that none of them wants to do that. That is why I have difficulty in giving you the power you wish to have under this act.

Another thing I am particularly concerned about is the minister's requirement to have the land either side of the proposed centre line of the drain to a distance of 100 metres. It is my understanding that everywhere else where these drains have been dug up the amount of land has been given up freely. These land-holders are more than happy to give up the land; they do not have a problem with that, but it has generally been about 40 metres, whereas under this bill you are asking for 200 metres. I do not know why you want 200 metres. Not having a devious mind, I am sure there are very good reasons for it, but I have not been able to ascertain them and I cannot understand why you want it. Section 16 of the bill gives you power to gain access. If you wanted to put down a 1 metre drain and you only had 1 metre, you could get unfettered access to it through clause 16 of this bill. So, I really think the minister has gone over the top in seeking 200 metres.

I know that in the briefing the minister gave to me and some of my colleagues it was argued that the absolutely final alignment of these drains was not quite known, and you might need to dodge out and around some native vegetation. I have already pointed out that the northern part of this scheme has been sitting there waiting for the northern outlet for three or four years. The people behind this scheme have had three or four years to work out exactly where they want these drains to go, and after all this time they still cannot work out within a couple of hundred metres where they want the drains to go. That is a problem for the minister's department: I do not think it is a problem for this house, and that is why I question why the minister is asking for a 200 metre strip through all this farm land. In my opinion that is just a way on his department's recommendation for the minister to overcome the management problems it has encountered. When I talk about management problems, I am talking about its own incompetence to get on top of scheduling these works and having a decent program of going out and determining exactly where the alignments would be. It is not as though it has not had time; it has had a number of years—at least two, and probably three, four or five—and this work has not been done.

I also want to know from the minister how he can guarantee to the house that he will deliver this project, even given these powers, because he now has to go off and argue with Environment Australia and the commonwealth government to get the money out of them. I have already alluded to the problem with appropriating land. I understand that Environment Australia has said that a comprehensively documented, overarching management plan acceptable to Environment Australia must be put in place prior to the provision of any commonwealth financial assistance for the

stage 3 construction work. Where are we with that? Do we have that plan and those sign-offs, or will that take us another two or three years? If it will take us another two or three years—which I suspect it might—the minister does not need these powers; he has plenty of time under the existing powers. I come back once again to the argument that the department is having with Tom Brinkworth down at Kercoonda. I know they want to run water through this cutting at Kercoonda to put water up the Tilley Swamp drain and into the Tilley Swamp area. Has a risk analysis been done of what effect this might have on Tilley Swamp? I know that Environment Australia is insisting that that be done. Has it been done? If it has not been done, when can we expect it to be done and when can we expect a sign-off?

There are a whole heap of things behind the scenes which might well hold up this project, if they have not already been responsible for holding it up, and which are quite foreign to and removed from the arguments the minister's department has had with two or three land-holders. I want an assurance that those things have all been put away and that the only problems the minister has are in getting access to this land. This is a very draconian piece of legislation. I know the minister has agreed to insert a sunset clause, but I guarantee that, once this piece of legislation passes this house and appears on the statute books of South Australia, this will not be the last time we see it. The sunset will happen in three or four years, and then there will be some other reason. A bureaucrat will have a fantastic idea about a project somewhere in the state and go knocking on the minister's door and say, 'The precedent was set in the South-East; we went out there and appropriated people's land without compensation. The precedent has been set; this is the only way you will ever get this project through.'

I am afraid that this may become common practice in South Australia. As I have said to people in the South-East, it would certainly solve the problem of getting the traffic from the Southern Expressway to South Terrace. If these sorts of powers were used in the city of Adelaide, we could build a freeway from South Terrace to the Southern Expressway at no cost to the taxpayers. I do not think the minister or any of his colleagues would ever contemplate doing that sort of thing in metropolitan Adelaide. Why is it okay to do it in the South-East? I do not accept the argument that the common good should allow us to accept these very draconian powers. I do not think that stands up. I have grave concerns about setting that sort of precedent.

I have spoken longer than I originally intended. I hope I have been able to make a cogent argument that, first, it is not Tom Brinkworth, or he and several other land-holders, who are frustrating this project. As I have said many times publicly, I think history will show that Tom Brinkworth is a bit like George Goyder and one of the heroes in relation to drainage of the Upper South-East. Without his work we would not have anything like what we have now. I do not think the minister needs the powers. I doubt whether given these powers the minister will progress this scheme very quickly. I am absolutely certain that he still needs to work through and get signed off many other issues. If the minister ran the acquisition he believes he might need parallel with the appropriate sign-offs, at the end of the day he would get what he needed just as quickly. I am concerned about instituting another levy on the land-holders in this area and then using that as a big stick to belt them into submission over management plans. They are my three main concerns.

I will be exercising my right and will not be supporting this bill. In all conscience I cannot support the bill. I have had representations from many people in the South-East, some of whom have been urging me to support it and others of whom have been urging me not to do so. My own conscience will not let me support the bill because I think that putting these powers on the statute book is a wonderful example of what the Attorney-General once said, that is, 'Hard cases make for bad law.' I freely admit that it is a hard case, but I think it will be bad law.

No-one I know in the South-East wants to frustrate this scheme. Everyone wants to see this scheme come to a successful conclusion sooner rather than later. It has been my opinion for a number of years that we have been saved by the run of dry seasons in the South-East and, if we had experienced several exceedingly wet seasons in the past few years, we would now be witnessing an environmental disaster in that part of the state. I say to the minister that he should complete the works; and that he will get the powers but not with my blessing.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I do not intend to delay the house, but there are fundamental principles upon which this democracy is founded. One of those is that we protect people's property rights. From the moment this legislation passes the parliament, this parliament and the minister will have abrogated their power to a group of public servants, who are not answerable to this place and who are not compelled to answer questions, unless we take steps to cross-examine the minister in this house. No matter the reasons or circumstances, it is my view that it is unwise and unnecessary to set a precedent to compulsorily acquire people's property without compensation.

We have seen what has happened in other parts of the world. There are two questions which I believe the minister needs to answer. First, does he realise that, once this bill is proclaimed, court action will be taken against him and it will slow down the process? Will he try to stop people from taking court action? If he does, that will be a Mugabe act. Secondly, why is it necessary to take this unprincipled action to endeavour to force any land-holder to sign a heritage agreement? That in itself is an outrageous suggestion. People should be made aware that they do not have to sign anything, even if some aggressive bureaucrat tries to coerce them.

Unfortunately, within the ranks of the Department for Environment and Heritage there are those who believe that people's rights should be circumvented. There are nasty little characters at Quorn, for example, who want one law for themselves and one for everyone else. Fortunately, the local council dealt with one of those people—and I will deal with him on another occasion; I have a lot to say about him. Let us look at the process. At the end of the day we had an ambit claim. A draft bill which contained the most horrendous powers was presented. Those who proposed the bill said to the minister, 'Minister, this is where we will start and we will end up here. We will make people feel warm and fuzzy by backing off on the issue.' That is not good legislation. If you have a good proposal, you should come up with it at the beginning, not the end. I will not be voting for the bill. I support the project. But it concerns me that this bill is aimed at Mr Brinkworth. I know Mr Brinkworth has been difficult to manage and that he has engaged in some rather unique exercises, but he has been allowed to get away with it. That is the fundamental point.

My neighbour on Eyre Peninsula, who served this country as a soldier in Vietnam, is now suffering. He has a child suffering with a health condition. He was accosted and intimidated by one of these nasty little apparatchiks from the department but, because Mr Brinkworth has the power and prestige, they never touched him. That is one of the things that upsets me. Even worse than that, it is alleged that one of the heinous crimes this poor fellow committed is that he put in a decent firebreak. New South Wales is on fire and the greenies have nearly burnt out Sydney. My poor, long-suffering neighbour tried to protect the public. Do you know why? There is a monument outside his house to recognise that the last time it caught fire, a hard-working person lost his life and a former chairman of the council nearly lost his life putting out the fire.

However, there are two sets of rules. Let me say that we will pursue these bureaucrats in this place because we have no other alternative. We would be failing in our obligation to the people of South Australia if we did not stand up and exercise some degree of care and caution. The member for MacKillop is right: officers from another department will trot along to a minister with some harebrained scheme to seize people's property.

Mr Acting Speaker, if they went to your electorate and tried to grab three or four houses without paying compensation, I wonder what would happen. I bet it would not happen in a marginal seat. If it was in the electorates of Hammond, Mount Gambier or Chaffey we would have a negotiated settlement and arrangement. However, because it is in a blue ribbon Liberal seat, and because Mr Brinkworth has had the audacity to stand up to these little operators, they have not liked it. Democracy is about treating people fairly and justly. I do not have a problem with the minister's being firm with this matter and completing the project quickly and efficiently. I do not have a problem with that because that is in the long-term interests of the people of South Australia. I have a problem when the minister tries to create a precedent. I do not want to delay the house, because everyone has had enough. I support the member for MacKillop.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank those members who have contributed to this debate. It is an important debate, and it is appropriate that we hear the views of members opposite, in all their passion and with all the argument put forward. I understand from the shadow minister that we are not going into committee, so I will spend a few minutes attempting to answer the questions asked by members and try to explain, if I can, the reasons for my introducing this legislation. As both the member for MacKillop and I have mentioned, some six to eight weeks ago I travelled to the South-East to talk to people who were hopefully being affected by this scheme. I spent a reasonable amount of time there, I visited a number of properties and spoke with a range of people—people from the board, ordinary members of the community, farmers, people from council, and so on—and the clear message I got was one of frustration that the scheme had been on the cards for a very long period and had not been completed. They urged me to complete, and they said, 'We really want this to be finished.' So I said that I would do what I could.

As part of that process I met with Mr Brinkworth. It was not my intention to name any individuals in this debate, but his name has now been raised. So, I really want to put into the debate my interactions with Mr Brinkworth. It had been put to me that Mr Brinkworth's actions were frustrating the

scheme. So I went to meet with Mr Brinkworth. I sat in the cabin of his vehicle at the top of one of the drains he had constructed, which was then paid for by the former government, and I spoke to him about the scheme. I might say that, when I was sitting in the cabin, he had a weapon of some sort—a shotgun or a rifle—on the bench behind me. There was another one in the passenger seat, with the barrel facing to the ground between my legs. However, I did not feel intimidated by the presence of these two weapons in the cabin of the vehicle, as he drove me along the edge of this very steep precipice, and I talked to him about this scheme. I said, 'Tom, we want to get this scheme completed.' He argued that he agreed with that general proposition. I said to him, 'We can have only one scheme though. We can't have two schemes—our scheme and your scheme; we must have one scheme. We want cooperation with you. We either have cooperation with you or we will have a showdown.' He said to me, 'I look forward to that'—referring to the showdown. I said, 'Right. Okay. That's it. I understand your position; you understand mine.' I got out of the vehicle and repeated the conversation to my officers who were present. I said to them, 'We need to introduce some legislation to allow us to continue with the scheme, because I'm certain from the conversation I had with Mr Brinkworth we won't get cooperation to complete the scheme.' As a result of that, this bill was introduced.

I am the first to admit to this house and to the public that this bill contains very strong measures. However, they are measures necessary to achieve the outcomes of the scheme. This scheme will be valued at up to about \$60 million. It has been in the planning for many years, and it has been under construction for a number of years. The commonwealth, the state and the community have all made significant contributions to it. If we cannot get it completed, those contributions will be wasted, and the benefits to that local community in terms of reduction in salinity will not be achieved. So, this is an important scheme, and that is why we have the legislation.

I would like to say how grateful I am for the support of the majority of the opposition. When I contemplated this scheme, I asked my officers to brief thoroughly the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister responsible for primary industries (the Hon. Caroline Schaefer), because I knew that both of them had been dealing with this matter when they were in government, and I wanted to make sure that we had their understanding and, if we could, their support. I am very grateful to them for providing their support—with some qualifications.

After having them initially briefed, I sat down with them and the members for Unley and MacKillop and spent three hours going through the original draft bill. In that session I made a number of significant amendments based on the objections that were provided to me by those members in their initial briefing. I said, 'Take the bill away and have another look at it. If you have other concerns, I'm happy to address them.' Subsequent to that, I sat down with any members of the Liberal backbench and frontbench who wished to meet with me and one of the officers of the department to go through the bill and explain to them why we believed that we needed that legislation. As a result of that, a number of other amendments were created.

The opposition in the other place has moved a number of amendments, and I indicate to this house that the government will support all those amendments. Those amendments do four or five things. They make sure that this legislation is limited in time, as well as in place. These measures—which

have been called draconian—are limited only to the Upper South-East Drainage Scheme. They cannot be used in any other part of the state, no matter what others may say. As a result of an amendment by the opposition they can only be used until 3½ or four years' time when the sunset clause will cause the bill—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That's right: they are temporal as well as spatial in their impact. In addition, the opposition has moved—and I must say that it was on my suggestion—that there should be a scrutiny by a parliamentary committee so that the minister would be required on a regular basis to report to the committee to have this bill analysed. That is in the bill as well. Further, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer moved a couple of amendments, one of which was to do with compensation. I will not go through the scheme but it is a narrow notion of compensation, and I was comfortable with that. She also introduced a measure to provide some limited appeal rights, and I was comfortable with those matters as well.

Central to the scheme are the powers given to me as minister to take land for the purposes of the drainage scheme compulsorily, without compensation and without review. We believe that all those measures are required. However, I just say in relation to the issue of compensation that, while there is no direct financial or monetary compensation to landowners whose land has been taken away (and only about 2.5 per cent of the total land is being confiscated and most of that only for a short time), there is no direct compensation in terms of a cash payment. However, there is very much compensation in terms of added value to the land because, if we did not have this scheme in place, the salinity would continue to increase and the value of the land would decline. I have been told that, as a result of this scheme, the productivity of the land will double. There will be 100 per cent increase in the productivity of land. That is very strong compensation—in an indirect form perhaps—to those landowners. By and large, the majority of that money which is providing this direct benefit to those landowners is coming from the commonwealth and state funds, that is, the taxpayers of South Australia and the commonwealth are funding this scheme, and there is direct benefit to those individuals. So, to say there is no compensation is a simplistic argument.

The member for Unley raised the issue of capital gains tax which may apply to small parcels of land that have been confiscated and returned to the owner. I agree that this is an issue, and it is certainly one that the government wants to address. I have had a preliminary conversation with the state Treasurer, who is also now the Minister for Federal/State Relations, and I will write to him formally and ask him to take up with the commonwealth Treasurer whether or not the commonwealth will waive any capital gains in this instance. It would seem to me a reasonable thing for it to do that, because this is a scheme which is designed and paid for by commonwealth, as well as state funds. It is not a scheme to cheat the taxation system. In fact, it would be a windfall gain to the tax man if he were to institute a capital gains tax in this instance. We will certainly raise those matters.

I will briefly go through the questions raised by the members for MacKillop and Stuart. The member for MacKillop referred to the levy and was concerned about it continuing. This is a joint scheme, funded by the commonwealth, the state and the landowners. That has always been the basis of the funding package. In order for us to get

commonwealth funding, we have to demonstrate some sort of local commitment.

Already some money has been collected by a levy and it may well be that some in future may be, but it is the desire of the government and my department to limit the amount of levy that will need to be collected. That is why we are attempting through negotiations with land owners to develop land management plans to protect native vegetation and wetlands on their properties. Part of the reason the commonwealth is funding the scheme is not just for economic benefits to landowners but to protect the environment. This was under the NHT scheme initially: it was a Natural Heritage Trust scheme to start off with and is now an NAP scheme and part of the purpose of it is to protect the environment. If we can come to arrangements with the landowners that achieve that as a substitute for a levy, we will certainly try to do that.

The member for MacKillop asked me whether one of the measures was a contrivance to allow me to ban Tom Brinkworth from hunting ducks on his property. That is not what I intend to do. I assure all members that we are not trying to stop Tom shooting ducks on his property. The member for MacKillop gave an example of a property involving fencing an area and my office is not completely sure which property the honourable member refers to. They think it is a property where the fencing off is required is a wetland and the owner of the property wants to drain that wetland for other purposes. It may not be that property.

Mr Williams: They in fact want to flood it.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not sure of the detail, but if the honourable member can give it to me I will follow it up. The honourable member also asked why we need a 200 metre strip. It is a bit arbitrary: I would be the first to concede that, but we cannot just say that we want a one metre or five metre strip because, once you get on the terrain and work out where the drain will need to be, obviously the person building it will have to take into account the local terrain, the native vegetation, the hardness of rock and so on, so a figure of 100 metres either side, a 200 metre width, is considered to be a reasonable amount in order to allow this drain to go through. I give the assurance to the member and landowners in the South-East that we will return that land to them.

The member for MacKillop raised a question about Environment Australia, which I understand is happy with the project. The management planning arrangements have been agreed to and are supported by the commonwealth. I can provide him a briefing on that in due course. He also raised the issue of a precedent and the fact that this measure will be used as a precedent by future governments. How do I answer that? It will always be up to the parliament. The point I make in relation to this measure is that, although the member for MacKillop is not supporting it, he should draw comfort from the fact that both the government and the opposition are supporting this. There is a large measure of bipartisan support for what are, I agree, are fairly strong measures.

The member for Stuart asked me about court action in relation to this measure. The government has had legal advice in relation to this package. We believe we are secure in relation to court action, but there is nothing we can do to stop an individual taking action in the court and it would be up to the courts, all the way to the High Court, to do that. The member for Stuart also raised the issue of heritage agreements. There is no intention to force heritage agreements on to landowners. He may be confusing that with the land management agreements that we have in mind.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I will not take much longer. I wanted to address the issue the member for Stuart raised about the activities of Mr Brinkworth and the relationship between Mr Brinkworth and government officers. This is not just about Mr Brinkworth: it is not a 'get Tom Brinkworth' piece of legislation, despite the way it has been characterised in the media. A minority of landholders have made it difficult to progress this legislation, which is to try to achieve an outcome, which the majority of landowners desperately want and have pleaded with the government to get on with and achieve. The phone calls to my office have been very much in support of this legislation from landholders.

Mr Brinkworth's name has been raised. It is important the house understands some of the concerns we have with Mr Brinkworth and his activities.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You are not going to say something bad about my mate Tom?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I will give some facts. In relation to drain construction, Mr Brinkworth's Mandina Bypass drain was constructed without authorisation. It severed a wildlife corridor linking areas of vegetation held under heritage agreement. When Mr Brinkworth constructed the Taunta Hut drain, the Native Vegetation Council and the South-Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board went out of their way to design a system for him and had it approved in principle. He then refused to lodge an application, ignored the design and cut through native vegetation. His drain construction activities have created major problems with some of the major roads.

Mr Brinkworth has constructed drains on proposed drainage alignments across his properties, forcing the government to negotiate outside the competitive tendering process. This occurred in relation to the Holt Park drain, the northern outlet drain and the Water Valley drain. Mr Brinkworth has shown disregard for environmental outcomes in his construction activities. For example, he has not stockpiled topsoil for reuse when he constructed the northern outlet drain. He cleared 100 hectares of land along the northern outlet drain alignment before a native vegetation management plan could be agreed. Mr Brinkworth has made strategic land purchases at the junctions of all proposed government drains, thus preventing or pre-empting drain construction and denying benefit to upstream neighbours. Some of Mr Brinkworth's privately constructed drains have discharged on to other people's properties, causing nuisance.

In response to the member for Stuart, there are eight native vegetation breaches by Mr Brinkworth that are presently under review and prosecutions are being launched. Mr Brinkworth has sought to circumvent prosecutions under the Native Vegetation Act by offering the government access to land to build drains if the government would drop investigation into his breaches of the act. If we were to follow that, we would be acting contrary to our own laws. Mr Brinkworth has been prosecuted in the past for assaulting an authorised officer under the Native Vegetation Act. Mr Brinkworth also has a past criminal conviction against his name for unauthorised native vegetation clearance. I would not have read out those statements, except for the fact that members opposite raised

Mr Brinkworth's name and, in particular, said he had been protected by officers who were not prepared to take him on. My officers are prepared to take on Mr Brinkworth or anyone in this state who breaches the legislation.

This bill is about trying to get this drain sorted out, to try to get an important piece of infrastructure in the South-East constructed so that the landowners in that area get the benefits that they so desperately want, and so that the local environment is protected. I thank all members for their contribution to the debate.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have had is that the commonwealth is satisfied with the arrangements that we have in place, but it is always up to them to change their mind. I hope they are. It would be tragic if they were not satisfied, because the reality is that if we do not get the powers to get ahead with this drain I believe the scheme will collapse, and that will be in no-one's interest.

Having said those words, I thank the opposition very much. I particularly want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support. I think he has shown true leadership. It would have been easy for him to have said, 'Look, this is draconian legislation. The Minister for the Environment is a Robert Mugabi,' and he could have gone up and down the countryside having a go at us. It would have meant that the collapse of the scheme, but he could have made some political points. However, he did not do that. He had the guts to go into his own party room and support this. I am very grateful to him and to the Hon. Caroline Schaefer for their support, and also the member for Unley, who is the shadow minister for water resources.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member for MacKillop is not supporting the legislation, Deputy Leader. But I must say that his contribution was measured, and the honourable member is obviously well informed about the facts of the case. So, I am not critical of him for having a different position because I know he is arguing the case as he genuinely believes it.

In conclusion, I thank the officers of my department, particularly Mr Roger Wickes, who developed the legislation, and parliamentary counsel for constructing it in a relatively short period of time.

Bill read a second time.

Mr BRINDAL: The opposition indicates that it will have no questions to ask in the committee stage.

The SPEAKER: Before the house proceeds to the third reading, can I say that from my position I hope that it does not defer the drainage works in the South-East which would have—should it be so that they are deferred—disastrous consequences in no small measure for an ever-increasing area of land that becomes salinised in consequence of the drains not being constructed.

The land settlement of the South-East is an egg that has been scrambled and cannot be unscrambled, other than by the application of this technology. What happens in the Lower South-East is different to what happens farther north. The minister has taken the advice available to him. The opposition has made its position on the question clear. There is no member voicing their dissent on the matter.

I am apprehensive about the constitutionality of the measure. Though more than the wish for expedition for the drainage system to be completed, it is not appropriate for me to comment, because I do not have sufficient knowledge of

either the law or of the science that might be relevant in this context. All parties need to remember that it is the public interest they should seek to serve, not their own political agendas.

The opposition having indicated that it has no wish to take the bill into committee, I invite any other member of the house to indicate their wish for the bill to go into committee. Should it be their wish to do so, it is their right for that to happen. There being no member intending to do so, I call on the minister, who may choose to move that the bill now be read a third time.

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

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I would very briefly like to speak to the third reading.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, and I guarantee that I will not be any longer than last time. Mr Speaker, you just said that nobody voiced disapproval. I just want to put on the record that in fact I did say no to the vote at the second reading, as did the member for Stuart. May I just say that the way this bill is at this point, notwithstanding the fact that the opposition in the other place did put in some measures to water down the vesting of the land in the minister with no compensation, I have very severe reservations. The commonwealth will be unable, even if it was willing, to be a party to this particular project if the minister uses those powers that the house is about to give him.

I believe that the commonwealth will be unable to be a funding partner. I have sought advice on that matter, and I do not have the definitive advice to hand at this stage. But, that is my belief. My preliminary advice was along those lines, and I really lament that this measure that this power that the house is about to give the minister may indeed frustrate this project even more than the minister believes it has been frustrated already.

I hope that that is not the case, but I have severe concerns that that may well be the case and, as I said in the second reading, I am sure the minister and his advisers should go back and read section 51C of the Constitution.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I think it is 51C. In any event, I am sure that the Attorney will be able to find the area in the federal Constitution which provides—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes—‘just and due terms’. The Attorney know what I am talking about. As I have indicated, I certainly want this project to proceed to its end, and I believe there are a number of ways in which that can be achieved without this legislation. I hope the minister takes some very sound advice on that point.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HANSARD, INSERTED MATERIAL

The SPEAKER: Earlier today the member for Fisher sought and was granted leave to insert statistical information in *Hansard*. At the time, some concerns were expressed by way of a point of order and, subsequently, by way of a matter of privilege being raised, as I understand the proceedings that followed from that time about the matter.

I have since examined the statistical information and, whilst it offends itself against the long-standing rules made

by Speaker McRae about the amount of such information a member may insert, it does not offend by great measure. Whilst also it is arguable that there are other problems of a procedural nature relating to insertion of the information by leave, I nonetheless have contemplated the consequences of the actions that have been taken in the house.

Given that the information was supplied to the member for Fisher in answer to a question he asked during the Estimates Committees, it may have been more appropriate for it to have been tabled by me as Speaker during the routine business today. Such would have otherwise been the case had it not already been incorporated in the record by leave. However, given that that is so, I therefore deem it to have been so tabled.

TERRORISM (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council’s amendments.

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

That the Legislative Council’s amendments be agreed to.

With a heavy heart, I accept the amendments of the other place.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The opposition notes the government’s acceptance of the amendments made in the other place. The opposition is aware of the government’s concerns regarding the constitutionality of the propositions put by the federal government and we note their concerns with the referral bill, but we recognise that the government has seen fit to agree with the commonwealth and that the bill will proceed as originally tabled in this house. We think that that is the most expedient way to ensure that the problems of terrorism are appropriately dealt with.

In agreeing to the amendments made by the Upper House, and on reflection, we think that in relation to future matters relating to this issue of terrorism—many of which were flagged in the agreement between the states and the commonwealth, particularly in regard to the changes planned for the Standing Advisory Committee on Commonwealth-State Cooperation for Protection Against Violence (SAC-PAV), its reconstitution as the National Counter-Terrorism Committee and other initiatives planned in that agreement which may impact on the state’s ability to respond to a terrorist incident and which may impact on South Australia Police, their role, and on any offences and subsequent action related to any offences that might occur within the context of a terrorist incident—there is a need for the opposition and the government to consult informally and thoroughly before bringing matters into the house so that we can proceed in a bipartisan way with the commonwealth’s initiatives to tighten up the nation’s ability to respond to a terrorist incident. We support the amendments proposed by the Upper House.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Monday 17 February 2003 at 2 p.m.

These are the last few moments of the sitting for this year. As leader of government business, I would like to take the opportunity to thank all those who make parliament work for

us: yourself, Mr Speaker, your staff, the Deputy Clerk, the table officers and the attendants. I want to thank the committee staff, all the support services staff, Hansard, the library staff, catering and, my favourite, the cellarmaster. I thank the Finance Manager and staff; the building services staff; the government publishers; Parliamentary Counsel, who do a very difficult job; police security; drivers; electorate officers; ministerial staff; and anyone else I have not thought of.

In particular, I thank Susie Duggin in my office, who has managed government business very well; and the whips and their staff, who have done a difficult job this year. My hearty thanks to all of them. I would like to take the opportunity to wish them and the people in this house a very merry Christmas. It is appropriate to reflect very briefly at this time on those matters that draw us together, rather than those that divide us. It is appropriate to reflect that, despite some of the things we hear about politicians not being well regarded, the vast majority of people who are elected to this place are genuine and honourable people who desire to serve the state. We simply have very different views about how we can further the state.

It is appropriate to recognise that, particularly in what has been a difficult year in the world. I wish all the members and yourself, Sir, a very merry Christmas. I look forward to seeing us all hale and well in the new year. I will not go further: I apologise most humbly if there is anyone I have not thanked. My own chief of staff has just entered: I thank her most fully for the very difficult job she has done. I would also like to recognise my partner Tania and all the partners of members in this place for the time that they forgo with us. Finally, Sir, a very merry Christmas to all.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the adjournment of the house until 17 February and support the remarks of the Minister for Government Enterprises. It has been a busy year, a year of some change in terms of procedures in the house. With the new government, we have had for the first time a four-day sitting week. My personal assessment is that the four-day sitting week is not working effectively. For the extra day, you get very little additional legislation through, and I say that as someone who has seen a bit of this place. It is certainly a matter that the government might like to look at.

It is the end of the year, and I would like to support the minister in thanking everyone for what they have done over the past year, in particular other members of parliament and their personal staff and spouses. I thank the catering staff; the Hansard staff; the Clerks of this chamber, the support staff of this chamber and those who support us outside the immediate chamber, the House of Assembly. I thank the library staff and the Parliamentary Network Support Group. Increasingly, we are all coming to appreciate the support they give us in terms of our computer systems. I also thank other support staff, including the caretakers in this house.

Often we do not appreciate the fact that we go home and the caretakers are here 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I and other members, I know, appreciate the care and attention that all these staff give. In talking about the caretakers I would like to formally acknowledge the tremendous service that Clarry Nixon has given to this house. Clarry has served this house in a quiet, efficient and dedicated way for many years. In particular, I would like to draw to the attention of the house—and I am sure pass on the thanks of other members—the superb service given to the parliament by Clarry.

I thank all those people, and wish them a happy and holy Christmas and a happy New Year. I guess it is a period when all of us would hope to have some relaxation and some break. I wish everyone a relaxing period as they do that and, for those who will be travelling, also a safe journey. I include the telephone service people in that as well. I thank all those people who sit here, often in remote corners of this place, and carry on their work in a very efficient way perhaps without getting the recognition they deserve. Indeed, that is what this occasion is about—to thank them all. I wish everyone a happy and holy Christmas, and I look to seeing everyone on 17 February next year.

The SPEAKER: I add my own thanks to those of the minister and the Deputy Leader, speaking on behalf of other members. I, too, have very much appreciated the work that has been done to enable the institution of parliament to function properly by those other people upon whom we all rely to ensure that the reason parliament exists, to serve the public interest, is well served.

It has been a different kind of year for me. It is the kind of year I have not often experienced, certainly not for a good while. I look forward to a better year next year, at a personal level. I know the amount of work that is done by the table officers, though I do not know it completely. Without them, in its role, this chamber could not and would not function; neither would the parliamentary committees, and the servants whom they have, in the course of doing their work for the committee in the public interest.

Both speakers have mentioned people such as the parliamentary support network; those who work as caretakers; those who work in the Catering Division and in the Library; and those looking after the plant that keeps this place functional and clean and habitable: as well as those in Hansard who record what is said here for the benefit of the public who may wish to refer to it—and that includes those of us who are honoured and privileged to be members of the place for the duration of the time that we are here.

I, too, note that, during the course of the year, some members of the support staff have left. They have left in good standing, and their service is properly recognised, as it should be. It is a unique institution. Those of us who work here understand that. Whether we were elected to this place or serve it by way of our vocation, we recognise its uniqueness. During this coming year, honourable members will have the opportunity to contemplate the way in which that uniqueness might better find expression in the role and function and purpose of parliament where it should be, if it is not now, supreme in that, whilst the people are sovereign, they delegate their authority under the current structure of the Constitution to the institution of parliament to make law on their behalf and to see that government that makes policy within the framework of that law properly administers the affairs of state and policy. Without it, few people really understand what sort of hell hole they would live in. Churchill said that parliamentary democracy is the worst kind of all government, except all those others that have been tried from time to time—or at least words to that effect.

It is a view that I hold very strongly and one with which most, if not all, of the people who work here agree, though the way in which it is to be delivered, of course, is the substance of the parliament and, indeed, implied by the very word itself that it must be resolved one way or the other. Let us do it decently by debate, discussion and determination of policy to find the way forward. Let us set a good example to

the rest of the community in doing it. I am sure that we do and that we will continue to improve on that and thereby make the society in which we live a better one tomorrow than it was yesterday.

May I say for those members who share my beliefs, may God give you and yours a blessed Christmas and a more prosperous, healthy and happy 2003. Thank you all for your cooperation during the course of the year.

Motion carried.

At 6.30 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 17 February 2003 at 2 p.m.

Corrigendum:

Page 1833, column 2, line 43—For '2000' read '2002'.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday 4 December 2002****QUESTION ON NOTICE****WILDERNESS PROTECTION AREAS**

27. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What individual parcels of land make up the 80 000 hectares expected to be added to the wilderness areas under the reserve system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The figure is based on the expectation that at least two of the areas recommended by the Wilderness Advisory Committee for proclamation as wilderness protection areas in the reports released for public consultation on the southern Eyre Peninsula and central Eyre Peninsula will be finalised in 2002-03.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES

106. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Was an elasticity coefficient of demand of 0.2 used in the calculation of the estimated number of

passengers to use public transport and what is his justification for the use of this figure?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: In 2002-03, the Passenger Transport Board has estimated a 1 per cent increase in patronage on Adelaide Metro public transport services.

In generating a patronage estimate, the Passenger Transport board considers many factors that may affect future demand. This includes the underlying patronage trend and changes to fares or services.

Other factors, which are not identified at the time an estimate is generated, may also affect demand in the future, such as changes in the price of substitute transport.

A price elasticity of demand of 0.2 is generally used by the PTB to estimate the impact that a change in Adelaide Metro public transport fares will have on patronage in the short-term. That is, the average impact of a 1 per cent increase in the price of fares is a 0.2 per cent decline in estimated patronage, assuming there is no change in any other variable that may impact upon patronage. The price elasticity of 0.2 has been determined by an internal empirical study using time-series regression analysis.

In generating the patronage estimate for 2002-03, the July 2002 average 4.2 per cent increase in public transport fares was taken into account along with other factors likely to affect future demand.

