

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 February 2003

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such) took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That this house calls upon the federal Leader of the Opposition to inform the South Australian public where the federal Labor Party intends to store more than 2 000 cubic metres of radioactive waste which was first stored in an old hangar at Woomera in 1994 by the former Labor government.

I move this motion calling on the federal Labor Leader, Simon Crean, to come clean with the South Australian public—and, indeed, the Australian public—and tell us what the federal Labor opposition's plan is for the storage of Australia's radioactive waste, because the whole of Australia should know that it was the now federal Labor Leader, the Hon. Simon Crean (the then federal Minister for Science and Primary Industries), who, in 1991, started the process within Australia to find a central storage facility for Australia's radioactive waste.

It was Simon Crean, as the then federal energy minister, who wrote to the various state governments of Australia saying that there was a pressing and urgent need for Australia to develop a centralised storage facility for radioactive waste. The federal leader of the Labor Party has had 12 years to reach a view and to tell the Australian people where he is going to store radioactive waste—12 years! And what do we get from federal Labor? We get a policy that says, 'We won't put it in a state that doesn't want it.' Everyone in Australia knows that no state will put up their hand and say, 'We'll have it.' In fact, it was Mr Crean and the Labor government that approached the Northern Territory in 1991 on that exact question, and the Northern Territory said, 'No, we won't have it.'

On the basis of that, Mr Crean then wrote to every state government saying, 'We need to establish national facilities for the storage of radioactive waste, but don't worry about it, because we will keep the site surveys secret between the commonwealth and the state government. We will keep the site surveys secret; let's not tell the public what we are doing about radioactive waste. Let's keep it secret between the commonwealth and the state government.'

After 12 years Mr Crean has the opportunity to come out and say to Australia what he is going to do with the radioactive waste. The reason I point the finger at Mr Crean is that in 1994 the Keating government trucked 10 000 drums, or 2 030 cubic metres—or 200 truckloads, if that is an easier description to understand—of radioactive waste to an old hangar in Woomera. Not a purpose-built facility: not a facility designed to meet international safety standards; but trucked it across Australia and put it in an old hangar at Woomera. And that waste is still there. 2 030 cubic metres is still there.

If Mr Crean is to be believed in saying that no state will be forced to take the radioactive waste, and if Mr Rann is to be believed when he says that the state does not want it here, then it is logical that Mr Crean should tell Mr Rann where Mr Crean will move it if he ever becomes prime minister. Because I bet Mr Crean is not saying to Queensland or New South Wales or Victoria that he is going to move it there. I bet he is not saying that to the other Labor governments:

'Wink, wink, nudge, nudge: don't worry, we'll move it to New South Wales, Queensland or Victoria.' I do not think so.

In 1994, when the radioactive waste was moved to Woomera, the quote in the *Advertiser* was, 'It will remain there until the national repository is built.' If it was the view of the then federal Labor government in 1994 that it was going to remain in the old hangar at Woomera until the national repository was built, I think it is fair that the Australian public judge that comment to mean that the federal Labor leader had every intention of putting it in the national repository—wherever it is. So, I call on Mr Crean to tell the Australian public where a federal Labor government, if ever elected, will store Australia's radioactive waste.

The other point that the parliament needs to understand is that the 2 030 cubic metres of radioactive waste sitting in the old hangar at Woomera is just under 60 per cent of Australia's radioactive waste. The then minister for energy, Senator Cook, was involved in the process to develop centralised facilities, having authorised the transport of 2 030 cubic metres of radioactive waste, or 60 per cent of Australia's radioactive waste, to Woomera in 1994 under the federal Labor government, saying that that waste would stay there until the repository was built. The federal Labor Party and the state Labor Party would now have us believe that we are not going to use it. Well, ho, ho, ho. I do not think anyone actually believes that.

What we need is for Mr Crean to come out and be honest with Australia and say, 'We are going to put it at Woomera.' That is what Mr Crean should come out and say, because no-one believes the policy that they are not going to put it in a state if a state does not want it. Given that we have Labor governments in Western Australia, South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, New South Wales and Tasmania—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The winners!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Attorney says they are the winners. The winners should come out and say which state wants it. They should support Mr Crean and say which state wants it. There are Labor state governments everywhere: they are not even going to play politics with it. They are all on the same side: they are all Mr Crean's mates—except those who are leaking to the *Australian* about his leadership. They are all his mates. So, maybe Mr Beattie will come out and say, 'Hey, Simon, put it here: put it in Queensland.' I do not think so. Maybe Bob Carr in the middle of the state election will say, 'Put it in New South Wales.' I do not think so. Maybe the ever-popular Steve Bracks will say, 'Put it in Victoria.' I do not think so. And do you know why I do not think so? I do not think so because Mr Crean set up the process. It was Mr Crean who wrote to all the state governments saying, 'We need centralised facilities.' It was Crean who wrote saying, 'Don't worry, we will keep it a secret. Don't worry, we won't tell the people about it.' Imagine writing this:

The site assessment studies in each state will be treated as confidential to that state and the commonwealth.

You can imagine what would happen if John Howard, David Kemp, Peter McGauran or Nick Minchin had said that, or kept things secret about the national repository. This exercise has been 10 years in the making, and the current federal government has been very public about it. It is saying that under Mr Crean's process—eight years later under Crean's process—Australian scientists have told us that Woomera is Australia's safest and best place. So, is Mr Crean really saying that we will not store radioactive waste in Australia's safest and best place? Is he really saying that in 1991, as

minister, he thought it was pressing and urgent but we are now not going to store it in Australia's safest place?

Crean should come out and tell South Australia and Australia where they are going to store it, because parliament deserves to know before it votes on certain legislation in the other place. What is Labor's plan for radioactive waste? It is one thing for the state Labor Party to say that it does not want the waste here but, if Crean always intended and intends to put the waste at Woomera, let parliament know that and stop hiding behind this false policy of 'We will not put it anywhere that a state government does not want it.' We all know that that is the policy of a federal opposition that simply cannot be implemented. The question needs to go to Crean: if every state says they do not want it—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Mr Crean.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Mr Crean—

Mr Brokenshire: Or Simple Simon.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Or Simple Simon, as the member for Mawson quite rightly points out.

The SPEAKER: Order! Epithets of any kind as they relate to any member of any parliament are unparliamentary and, notwithstanding the factual nature or otherwise of such epithets, it is inappropriate for members to reflect on other duly elected members of parliament in that way.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I withdraw the comment, Mr Speaker. So, Mr Crean writes to all the Labor governments and states:

I am seeking the cooperation of your government in a process intended to result in the identification of one or more sites in Australia which would be highly suitable for shallow ground burial or short-lived radio-nucleide waste.

That is a letter to the then minister for health, the Hon. Don Hopgood. Dr Hopgood wrote back—this is a Labor government that has always, if you believe the rhetoric, opposed a centralised facility for radioactive waste—as the then deputy premier, to the Hon. Simon Crean basically saying that South Australian government officials have participated from the outset in the collaborative development of proposals for national radioactive waste facilities through the commonwealth/state consultative committee, and they took part in the desk top study in 1996 to identify broad areas of Australia which are likely to contain sites to satisfy international atomic energy agencies' criteria for the siting of a low level radioactive waste repository. The letter goes on and nominates Mrs Jill Fitch as the contact officer for the work to go ahead between the commonwealth and state governments.

Mr Brokenshire: What date is this one?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This was October 1991. So, the record shows that the Labor government has been at the very heart of developing the process. The then state Labor government under John Bannon and Don Hopgood, as deputy, signed off on the whole process. Simon Crean signed off and, indeed, initiated the whole process. He signed off on the whole process.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Did he sign it?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: He signed it—on the whole process. So, I put to the parliament that we should call on Mr Crean to tell South Australia and Australia whether the federal opposition is not intending to use the proposed facility, wherever it is sited (and it looks as though it will be at Woomera) and, if that facility is not used, I have a very simple question: where will it be placed? If Mr Crean says that every state will build its own facility, do we really believe that?

Let us consider the South Australian situation. Do we really believe a state government which is saying that it is cash-strapped for all good causes (the Autism Association, for example, which has had a budget cut) and that it cannot afford to fund hospitals or schools after the federal government has spent \$5 million, \$6 million or \$7 million building a facility at Woomera, if that is where it will be? Do we believe that the state government will turn around and say, 'We don't want to use that one. We're going to build our own. We're going to take money out of schools, hospitals and roads, and we're going to build our own'? I do not believe that for one minute.

The Labor Party, particularly Mr Crean, needs to come out and say to the Australian people what it will do with radioactive waste. If the waste will not be placed into a central storage facility, why did Mr Crean write a letter talking about:

... the pressing need for national disposal facilities for radioactive waste produced in Australia.

The letter continues:

I am sure you will appreciate that there is an urgent need to progress this matter and that study of potential suitable sites should commence as soon as possible.

So, the Labor Party's hands are all over this. I simply ask Mr Crean where he would store Australia's radioactive waste were he ever to win government in Canberra. To pick up your 1972 theme, Mr Crean, where? After 12 years, don't you think it is time?

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I am pleased to be able to support the honourable member for Davenport in his motion, because it is time for parliament, for the community and, I believe, for the media to send a message about the issues and the facts surrounding the debate relating to the storage of low-level nuclear and radioactive waste. It is a serious issue, and I think all members of parliament, and the community at large, agree with that.

Sadly, this issue is being used as a political game, as a cosmetic, plastic skin covering the lack of substance, real direction and decision making by both the state government in South Australia, the federal Labor Party and, clearly (as my colleague has said), the federal Leader of the Opposition.

It is interesting to reflect for a moment that in 1991, when the Hon. Don Hopgood signed the letter that has been quoted in the parliament, the present Premier was a cabinet minister in the South Australian Labor government. I for one, who, back then, had a real interest in politics in this state that was growing every day, cannot recall either the Premier, or indeed any member of the South Australian Labor Party in 1991, opposing the proposal from the then federal Labor government. I stand to be corrected, because there may be some media information somewhere, but I cannot recall it. The shadow minister has been highlighting the support that the then Labor government in South Australia gave to the proposal, but suddenly now it is not the right move.

I received an interesting email this week from a well-educated constituent of mine who, in summary, stated that it is about time the government and the parliament stopped playing games on a really important issue and that we want to get this low-level radioactive waste out of our streets and suburbs in the metropolitan area.

We appreciate the contribution nuclear science has made to saving lives and giving people whose health has been adversely affected a better quality of life. My constituent said

in his email that he had a lot to do with this matter as he worked on nuclear ships in the United Kingdom. He said that more radioactive waves are emitted from a plane when flying—particularly planes on international routes—than would be emitted from a dump, given the way the repository will be built. That is just one example. Indeed, this parliament emits an enormous number of radioactive waves all the time as it is built using granite. However, no-one is worrying about that. We all work in this place, accept that and get on with our lives, because it is low-level radioactivity. It is just a real pity that it has become such a political issue. Yet in places like my own electorate—and this will be the case pretty well with every suburb when the Minister for Environment and Heritage finally tells the community where low-level radioactive waste is stored at present—and in pretty well every part of the metropolitan area and in some parts of the country, this stuff is already there. It is a far greater risk if stored in places where it is not managed properly and not stored to world's best practice than it would be at Woomera.

As my colleague has said, if the federal Leader of the Opposition wants to maintain that position federally, he should show some real leadership and not bounce all over the place as we see this government doing on a day-to-day basis. Sooner or later—and it might take another 12 months—the community will wake up to some of the points made by the member for Mitchell. I listened with a great deal of interest to what the member had to say when he spoke the truth about the lack of substance, real direction, strategy and real policy this government has. At the moment, it is all cosmetic with the government. It is about what front page story it can get today and about how it can scaremonger when it comes to any decision of the federal government.

Over time the community will wake up to this state government. Of course, it has already woken up to the federal Labor Party. We have seen Mr Crean's antics in recent times in a desperate political grab to maintain his position as leader and, sadly, that is not helping something that should not now be a political debate in this country. Of course, we need to get the facts out to our community. We need to know where a credible opposition would put low-level radioactive waste. We are not talking about high-level radioactive waste here, as members of the community often think. The facts regarding that are often manipulated and twisted. Of course, when we were in government, efforts were put forward—real efforts, not just media grabs and media releases—to ensure that high-level radioactive waste was not a problem in South Australia.

I am pleased that, together with our party, my colleague the member for Davenport has shown the foresight to raise the bar on this debate. Hopefully, during debate on this motion, we will start to get some direction from Simon Crean as federal Leader of the Opposition regarding what he would do with this waste if he were ever to become Prime Minister of Australia. I would also like to know—and this ties in on every aspect—what the Labor government in South Australia intends to do with its waste responsibilities for radioactive and nuclear waste. All we have heard about until now is talk about spending money on a referendum—money that would be far better spent in the Mawson electorate on building the Willunga Primary School, for a start. The money was already there but members opposite pulled the pin on that project. We have a school that is bursting at the seams in growth, and we do not have the dollars available. Rather than have the referendum, perhaps they could put back some of that elective surgery they have cancelled, because they do not have the

budgets to be able to look after the health of the South Australian community as they said they would.

The stories are starting to come through thick and fast in my electorate, and I am sure to my colleagues, on just how bad the health system is. People involved in education are saying to me that the Education Department is rudderless, and good educators are at their wits' end as to the sort of direction they will get and where the real money will come from for an increase in the education budget. Rather than the federal government and the state government playing around with political antics on an important decision such as this, let us see them show some real substance for the first time. Let us see them get rid of the cosmetic image that the member for Mitchell said they develop every night ready for the media the next day. Let us not see them get on the radio at night and brief one radio announcer, in particular, ready for the morning programs. Let us see members of the government come out and show some real leadership and actually tell the South Australian community what the federal Labor Party's and the state Labor government's positions are when it comes to getting serious about protecting long term the interests of our women and children.

From time to time I have seen them as individual members protest when it comes to issues such as phone towers near schools yet, while they oppose a phone tower next to a school, they are prepared to allow a dental surgery, doctor's surgery or a place where you get x-rays taken to be located right next to a school in a regional area. They are happy for it to stay there unaudited and without any management and, as a result, put a complete region or district of this state at risk. That is absolutely outrageous.

Members opposite must realise that they have been in government for a year, and government, Mr Speaker, as you well know and point out regularly, is about leadership, decision making and accepting responsibility. Members opposite are not in opposition any longer, and they should not be playing political games and misleading the South Australian community. I call on the federal Leader of the Opposition, the Australian Labor Party and this state Labor government to show guts and leadership, and, for once, show substance, and tell us what they would do with the low level radioactive and nuclear waste in South Australia and, from a federal perspective, in Australia.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I am very pleased to stand in this place to support the member for Davenport, and I thank him very much for moving this motion. I congratulate him on the way in which he presented it because he spoke with a lot of compassion and conviction. I think he raised some poignant and important points. We should realise and understand that 60 per cent of Australia's radioactive waste is already here: it is already in South Australia. Who put it here? I hope we can put this motion to the test today, because I cannot see how the government—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: —particularly the Attorney-General—can refute it. Some 60 per cent of Australia's waste, that is, 2 030 cubic metres of it, is already here in a hangar. I bet the hangar is not too choice—perhaps I should take a photograph of it.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It's there. I cannot believe the hypocrisy and total nonsense of the whole debate the Premier has been putting up of late in relation to the carry-on about the federal government. It is already here, and it is not adequately stored.

We have heard this story ad nauseam. I am amazed that the media—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second and last time today, the member for Schubert has the call. I am trying to ensure that I can hear what he is saying.

Mr VENNING: Thank you, sir, for your protection. I cannot believe responsible, adult people in this state can leave the situation as it is, where the radioactive waste is stored all over our lovely city, in electorates in the country and even in the Barossa Valley. It is stored where it is being used. It is just put away in the best way they can. Surely a purpose-built and properly designed repository in the right area—that is the Outback—is the best place for this. I understand that we are but one of the states. However, because every state is a Labor state, this has become a political football—passing around the poison—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr VENNING: That is right, the parcel. Someone has to end up with it. I ask members to look at Australia. Do members expect them to store it in Tasmania which has high rainfall? Of course not. Do members expect them to store it in Victoria which also has a high rainfall? Of course not. There is hardly any available space in New South Wales and Queensland. It comes back to three states: the Northern Territory, South Australia and Western Australia—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The Northern Territory is not a state.

Mr VENNING: A territory and two states. I stand corrected by the Attorney-General. I am pleased he is listening. I hope he is taking it in because, over the years, I have heard many utterances from the other side, and the member for Florey and the member for Mitchell are passionate about this issue. However, I have not heard much from the Attorney-General on this subject in the last couple of years. I will be very interested to hear what he has to say and also the member for West Torrens, because the member for West Torrens was waxing lyrical at one of his own meetings which a relative of mine attended. It was reported to me that the member for West Torrens was not exactly supportive of the Premier's line.

I respect the Attorney-General—he is a man of great wisdom and a lot of integrity and honesty—and I hope that his silence is by design because he does not have the courage to say what he really feels about this matter. We all know that this is an absolute nonsense because the waste is already there and it was put there by a Labor government. This motion today is a very good motion. It is to the point when it asks Mr Crean: 'What will you do with this waste, because, after all, you put it here?' Where is the Premier's credibility on this matter because he waxes lyrical at every opportunity when he says, 'No radioactive dump in South Australia,' but the Premier does not say what happens to 60 per cent of Australia's waste that is already here. He does not say, 'It is there flapping around in the breeze.' It is also stored across the state.

This debate has been going on for two or three years, and, in total, probably about 14 years—it has been there for 12 years. I cannot understand where we are going with this. I cannot understand how the intelligent scribes in our state and our country, the media—the electronic and print media—cannot see through the political charade that this is—the political gain and political nonsense—and write some cold, hard facts. This stuff is there. No-one disputes it at all. It is stored there. Who put it there? I wish we had more respon-

sible and honest reporting of this fact. People say, 'No nuclear dump for South Australia'—it is already there. I hope that someone will have the courage to write an intelligent and honest article and bring the Australian people into the loop with honest commentary.

I have heard comments on this matter by so many people over the last two or three years. As I said before, we have had the conservationists coming out regularly on the matter, we have had the political writers and the politicians, and in particular I mention the member for Mitchell, the member for Florey and the member for Giles, but I say again that I have not heard any comments from the Attorney-General. Maybe there is some hope that some members in the government ranks have an honest point of view and basically have commonsense and will not pass the political bone around forever. I say to the parliament, 'Let us be responsible. Let us be adult people. Let us assess what is the current situation—that is, it is here and we know who put it there.' Please, we must have some commonsense. It must be stored in Australia because it is our waste. It does not matter whether we are South Australians, Victorians or Tasmanians: it is Australia's waste, so it must be stored here in Australia. We must choose the best part in Australia to store that waste. As I said earlier, South Australia is one of two states and territories that are, obviously, in the front row to store the waste. I am sick of the political antics. The only proper thing to do—if this thing goes on—is to put the new repository at Cameron's Corner. You know where that is, sir—where the three states join.

So, a third of it would then be in South Australia, a third of it in Queensland and a third of it in the Northern Territory. That would be a nonsense, to locate it there purely because it would not then all be located in our state simply because that is where the border is drawn. This whole argument is almost as absurd as that. Let us stop playing stupid games with this very important issue. As I said, this material is all over the state, even in my wonderful electorate of Schubert. I commend the member for Davenport for this motion. I hope that members can vote on it today. I think that we should because it is very straightforward. I know that there are members opposite who would agree with this. I hope that they have the courage to back the member for Davenport because I am certainly going to.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Last night we heard in this place for three hours some very eloquent speeches on the problems in Iraq and about weapons of mass destruction. What are we getting from this government? We are getting weapons of mass distraction. Over and again it is putting out more spin than an electron around an atom. There is no openness and honesty that was promised by this government. It is acting on fear and greed, fear and ignorance, every time. Members have heard it said so many times that it was not a Liberal government but a Labor government that shifted 2 000 drums up to Woomera.

I think that, the other morning on ABC radio, the deputy mayor of Port Augusta said that some of these drums were leaking as they went through Port Augusta. That is an absolutely despicable way to treat the people of Australia and South Australia: keeping them in the dark, manipulating them all the time. Just as sure as a nuclear bomb is a weapon, words are weapons. We are seeing weapons of mass distraction, and we do not want that any more. We saw the populism politics of dandy Don back in the 1960s and 1970s. We are seeing the same thing now. One has to look only at some of

the literature and the books that were written at that time about what happened then.

We do not have media Mike; we have got rerun Rann. It is the same thing over and again. We need people to be open and honest. What have we seen? We have seen the member for Mitchell, who might be green but, I tell you what, he is no cabbage. He knows what is going on over there. He knows about the mass destruction that is going on in the Labor Party. Members on the other side of the chamber are going to self-destruct. You can be secretive and manipulative for only so long. This government needs to do what it said in the election campaign: be open and honest, instead of this fear and ignorance.

We have no high level nuclear waste in Australia. High level nuclear waste is produced from nuclear reactors that are producing power, and it is also in nuclear weapons. We have no high level nuclear waste in Australia. We have low and intermediate level waste. I attended a two-week course at the University of South Australia's summer school to learn Pitjantjatjara. I met a lady there who had been demonstrating at Woomera. She got into me about the Liberal policies on nuclear waste. I did remind her, though, that in the morning session we had been talking about the need for interpreters who spoke Pitjantjatjara.

One reason we need those interpreters is that an Aboriginal man with cancer who was brought to the Royal Adelaide Hospital needed to be treated with radiotherapy. What are we going to do with the waste from that radiotherapy? How many doses of radiotherapy are used around Australia every year? Where are we going to put them?

Mr Venning: Every day.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Every day, as the member for Schubert says. Where are we going to put them? Are we going to leave them distributed around the countryside as they are now? I think that this government does not even know where they are. It is doing an audit, but that will not be completed for a number of months. This government really needs to get on top of the situation, not just spin, and not just do what it thinks is popular. We really need to do what is best for the people of South Australia.

Let me say again: 2 000 leaky drums were brought into South Australia with no public consultation. They were just put in an inadequate facility at Woomera. We need a central repository, not a dump. I will never use the word 'dump' publicly, the way the Labor Party is using it, to describe what is going on in South Australia. They are dumping on South Australia. We have rubbish dumps; we have nuclear repositories. There was a tag on my office sign the other day that read, 'South Australia: The Nuclear Dump State'. Who uses those words? The Labor Party does, not I. I will not use that word 'dump' in that context.

I ask the government to be honest, real and, above all, open with the people of South Australia. It must admit its record. What we need to do is go back, learn from the past and look to the future, but stop dumping on the state. It is important that people are dealt with as intelligent people. We saw 100 000 people here on the weekend wearing their heart on their sleeve, showing their true feelings. We need to make sure that we respect those feelings and treat them as thinking, worthwhile individuals. We should not treat them like mushrooms, keeping them in the dark and feeding them rubbish.

The Premier says that over 90 per cent of people in South Australia say no to a nuclear repository in South Australia. Of course you would say no if you were given an option of:

do you want your leg cut off or left on? That is the option. What we are getting from this government is not the truth. It is not giving people the truth so they can make informed decisions. You have to make informed decisions on anything that will affect so many people. It is okay to have the theatre in here, with open discussion for three hours on the world situation. However, the sad part is that we will not make one iota of difference. There was nothing in the paper on that today. What we will do is waste this parliament's valuable time as the government concentrates on lots of window dressing and shifting of the deck chairs.

This ship was cruising very nicely until 9 March last year, but what is happening now? We have a captain who fancies himself as the supreme navigator, and we have a Treasurer about whom I would be a bit concerned if he was a ship's purser. As for the officers on the foredeck, I really do worry about their ability to command and control. Certainly the crew down in the galley and the engine room, the real workers, are worried about the course on which this front bench, the officers of this crew, are steering the ship.

It is very important that we come back to reality. We should not just have a crash course in political opportunism. The people of South Australia deserve better, and, for the sake of the people of South Australia, the government should be open and honest. It should be true to itself and the people of South Australia. This is so important, but members opposite sit there and laugh at the very important points I am making. They just show a complete lack of concern for the genuine fears of average South Australians.

If they were as open and honest, compassionate and caring as they claim to be, they would not be using these weapons of mass distraction. They would be going out, being open and honest, and laying it on the table so that people can make informed judgments, not having to worry every day about what will happen next. What will happen in the Middle East is enough of a concern without our having to worry about what is happening in our own backyard. People are concerned about health, education, and law and order. We hear platitudes, but that is all we hear. It is just rhetoric. We hear nothing worthwhile.

It would be nice to see some real objective planning on behalf of this government. What we have is just subjective statements: we have no real leadership. I ask the front bench opposite to be honest, to have a plan and a position of where they want South Australia to be, because I know where I will be in March 2006—and that is on the government benches.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): It is with pleasure that I rise to support this important motion. The shadow spokesperson has indicated his intention to bring a number of important motions on this subject before the house. I congratulate him for that because, as my colleague the member for Morphett just pointed out, this government is not a government for all the people of South Australia: it is not interested in doing the right thing by South Australians, it is not interested in keeping the economy going and jobs growing; all it is interested in is sitting on that side of the house with the perks of office and doing whatever it can, dishonestly, to maintain itself on that side of the house.

I will take this opportunity to remind the house once again of a former member of the government who had the courage to say publicly what he thought of the direction in which this government was going, and he withdrew himself from the government benches and now sits on the crossbench. I refer, of course, to the member for Mitchell. The only piece of

honesty that has come from the government benches in the last 12 months came from the member for Mitchell. He is sick and tired of the Premier and his frontbench colleagues playing a game of media manipulation and not addressing the fundamental problems of this state.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The Attorney does not want to hear this because he knows what is going on. In his portfolio area he has to wear this nonsense about being tough on law and order. The only thing that this government has done on law and order is that it has window-dressed—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS:—the law and order debate by overturning twice a recommendation of the Parole Board. He has not changed the policy and he has not instructed the Parole Board on what a new policy might be. It is the Premier who runs out and makes all these announcements, but it is the Attorney-General who has to balance the budget in his portfolio. As I asked the Attorney-General the other day in the corridor, where is he going to build the new gaol?

But, sir, I digress. As the member for Morphet said, members opposite started when they were in opposition and they have continued in government to run down and talk down South Australia. They have talked down every institution we have. They talked down the National Wine Centre, and now we have the Treasurer, the hero—I expect him to come in here shortly wearing his underpants on the outside of his trousers, because the Treasurer, the hero, has saved us from every evil known to man. His efforts include the resurrection of the Wine Centre, which he almost single-handedly destroyed. I say almost single-handedly, because he—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will come back to the substance of the motion, which is not about the Wine Centre.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir, it is about—and I think this is very important—people talking down South Australia. This morning, I picked up the *Australian*, a well-respected journal that goes right across this nation, and I was concerned to read, as almost everyone else in this nation would have read this morning, that there are two sites in my home town of Millicent containing low level radioactive material.

I was aware that radioactive material was housed in Millicent, and I am aware that it is housed in a huge number of other places around the state. I am also aware that 60 per cent of the radioactive waste that is stored in Australia is stored at Woomera. It was transported across South Australia by a federal Labor government and it was installed in an old hangar in very poor condition in Woomera. Almost 10 years later, it is still there in old leaky 44 gallon drums with the material being able to run out onto the floor of the hangar at any time.

All these people who are dumping on South Australia will stand here with all the rhetoric in the world, but not one of them will say what they will do. That is what this motion does. It calls on the federal Leader of the Opposition to make a statement about what he would do if, god forbid, he happened to win an election and lead a government in the federal parliament.

The Premier here in South Australia continually dumps on South Australia, and I referred to those other areas where he and his front bench colleagues dump on other institutions in South Australia, just to illustrate that this is not an isolated incident. They are prepared to run down many fine institu-

tions in South Australia and much of the fine work that has been done to rebuild the economy after the mess that they left in this state in the late 1980s and early 1990s. They are prepared to run all these things down through their rhetoric and sophistry for base political gain.

As I said a few moments ago, the only bit of honesty that has come from those benches was expressed by the member for Mitchell, when he highlighted that this is what this government is all about. It is about media manipulation. It is about looking good and doing absolutely nothing. I would call on those members sitting on the other side—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brokenshire): Order! Honourable members know that members, when they are speaking, should be heard in silence. Government members will have their right to debate this in the near future. So, please give the honourable member the respect that the other side must give you.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you for your protection, sir. There are at least two members (and the Attorney now is in deep conversation and obviously no longer interjecting, not that it upsets me) who have been sitting there and who have had many opportunities this morning to stand and tell the house exactly what they think about this motion and exactly what they think should happen. Member after member from this side of the house has come to their feet this morning to support this motion. However, not one member from the Labor Party has the guts to stand up and say what they think Mr Crean should do with it. Not one of them has the guts to say, 'I'm concerned about this in my neighbourhood,' be it out at Salisbury, on North Terrace, all over the city or in our country towns. Not one of them is prepared to stand up and say 'I am concerned about this.' Not one of them is prepared to say what they honestly believe: that this should all be moved to the safest place we can find. They are all prepared to dump on South Australia, yet in the next breath they say that we are not Australians, and that everyone else should look after their own waste, because we are not a nation—we are just South Australians—yet they continually dump on South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do not expect members to defy the chair's ruling.

Mr WILLIAMS: I note from the clock that my time is about to expire, and I invite those members opposite who have been mostly interested in addressing the chamber on this matter to take their turn, rise to their feet and tell us what they and their government would do, and offer their advice to Mr Crean as to what he should do.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): I move:

That this house congratulates all Country Fire Service volunteers and staff and other government agency personnel for their willingness, dedication and professionalism in answering the call for assistance from Victoria during the recent bushfire disasters.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to move the motion that this house congratulate all Country Fire Service volunteers and staff and other government agency personnel for their willingness, dedication and professionalism in answering the calls of South Australia's needs for the protection of life and property and also, in the last couple of months, in answering

the calls of our neighbouring state of Victoria. Not only did they answer the calls but, as I have learned from debriefings since the volunteers arrived home, they did an outstanding job. That information came not from their own mouths but from the Victorian fire authority and other volunteers and officials who were trying to combat what has clearly been a devastating bushfire situation in Victoria, following the tragic bushfires at about the same time in Canberra.

As I have said often in this house and I want to repeat, one of the biggest privileges I have had so far in my time in parliament is to have been Minister for Emergency Services, and now carrying on as shadow minister for emergency services. It is a magnificent portfolio area. People go out of their way, day and night, whenever the pager goes off, to put whatever they have happening to one side to go and protect our lives and our properties. The South Australian Country Fire Service sent 575 Country Fire Service volunteers to Victoria from across South Australia; the South Australian Country Fire Service sent 18 staff; and it was pleasing that 42 personnel from the National Parks and Wildlife Service and two from the State Emergency Service went to assist.

The State Emergency Service is also a wonderful service. It has 5 000 dedicated volunteers. Their roles are different from that of a Country Fire Service officer, of course, and so they should be. I thought only the other day when I was witnessing some work by the SES that it would generally be almost impossible for the Country Fire Service to do all their own work and also the search and rescue work, abseiling work, going down mine shafts, and assisting police searching for evidence around a crime scene, etc. It is good to see the close working relationship between the SES and the CFS. Two officers from the SES also went to Victoria.

The other important thing I want to do is acknowledge those who did not go, because I know that a lot of people put up their hands to go and assist in Victoria, just as they did when I was minister and was involved in deploying volunteers to New South Wales during the previous Christmas-New Year period. We need to acknowledge those volunteers who stayed home, because we need people in our own brigades in our own regions to look after South Australian property and life that need to be protected, and I put on the public record my appreciation of everybody who is a member of the CFS.

Recently in the house we talked about leadership, and two leaders I want to acknowledge particularly are Vince Monterola, the Country Fire Service Chief Executive Officer, and Euan Ferguson. Clearly, whilst the appointments were made by the board, I was minister at the time. I was advised of those appointments and the recommendations of the board, and I had no problem in supporting them whatsoever. When I look back, a couple of years after those appointments, it is amazing to see the great work and the difference that Vince Monterola and Euan Ferguson have made. They carried on from committed people, such as Stuart Ellis, who also did a good job. I am proud to have my appreciation on the public record, and I know that I speak on behalf of every member of the opposition when I talk about their wonderful leadership.

Vince was a volunteer himself. It is very important in an organisation of approximately 17 000 volunteers that people at the top understand exactly what a volunteer is all about. Volunteers are extremely special people, and you need to understand that and put in extra effort to leadership, support, management, development and assistance to volunteers. Euan Ferguson, whom I know that the Country Fire Authority was

very disappointed to lose, has become a great asset to the South Australian Country Fire Service.

I also acknowledge the support of the families of Vince Monterola and Euan Ferguson, and I noticed both their spouses when I was at the Ash Wednesday 20th anniversary memorial service at the weekend, and I have seen them at many functions supporting their husbands. I also acknowledge the support of the spouses and partners of the volunteers and the paid staff who went to Victoria and who had to take up extra work at home to allow them to leave and do their job.

I particularly acknowledge my own brigade captain, Henny Dowsett. Henny was the first woman to become a CFS captain, and she has done a magnificent job at Mount Compass. I talk to her regularly about our own brigade and how things are going. She went over to Victoria with a number of people from our own home brigade. When she got back, she said that, whilst there is always more to be done (I am the first to acknowledge that) with respect to training, support, equipment and so on, South Australia can hold its head very proudly in respect of its equipment, training and professionalism compared to what she saw whilst in Victoria, and that is not a reflection at all on Victoria's volunteers.

The efforts over several years to pay off the \$13 million debt that was left as a legacy to the CFS, to work hard to roll out the extra capital works that were needed and to see that extra training and so on that has occurred in the CFS is auguring well for the South Australian community in the goals of the CFS to protect life and property. Of course, that does not mean for one minute that we do not have to do more, and it does not mean that I am not concerned, as indeed are the CFS volunteers, about the current lack of rollout of capital works. I hope that we will see that turn around in the near future. In my role as shadow minister, I will certainly be supporting every effort to obtain increased capital works, particularly fire trucks and stations, into the CFS regions as soon as possible.

I know that the money is there: it is a matter of seeing that money spent so that that equipment is delivered. It does not matter how good the commitment of the volunteers or how well trained they are, if they do not have the best equipment and if it is not replaced and upgraded regularly, it is very difficult for them to do the work that we ask of them as the South Australian community.

The Victorian fires were interesting with respect to where we are with prevention. We still have to be very careful, and we have become too complacent in South Australian in relation to bushfire prevention. Having said that, after the planning and the work that has been done, I hope that we will not see drastic fire situations as often across our state as we have in New South Wales, Victoria and, of course, Canberra. We must have a major focus on bushfire prevention, and it should be proactive rather than reactive.

With regard to human life and the impact of people losing their property, only yesterday I heard Kym Bonython talk about his experiences during World War II, particularly defending Australia in Darwin. He acknowledged that he lost his records in the Ash Wednesday bushfires 20 years ago, and they can never be replaced. We must learn from Ash Wednesday and ensure that we put far more effort into supporting the CFS in relation to bushfire prevention.

I was told this morning about the CFS. A volunteer in their own area of Mylor was actively going around capitalising on the community safety programs that we developed some years ago. This constituent was saying how beneficial that

was and how much he admired that volunteer, who was meeting on a monthly basis with his immediate community members to ensure that they were well prepared and were prepared early; that they knew what to pack; how to organise their own property when it came to sprinklers and what type of equipment they needed if there was a fire. It was important for these people to know whether they would stay on, or leave, their property before a fire ever came to them and, most importantly, that they knew what their neighbours were going to do and how their neighbours' firefighting equipment worked. They had a good understanding of all their community. That is what we need to learn right across Australia so that hopefully we do not see again loss of life and what can only really be described as equivalent to an atomic bomb when it comes to the recent devastation in places like Victoria.

There will be challenges for the CFS in the future, as with any other organisation. South Australia has an ageing population, and we must ensure that we are recruiting, encouraging and developing our younger people so that they come through the Country Fire Service, allowing us to maintain the volunteer numbers that we already have.

In the South-East, there are massive plantings of blue gums. So, instead of having five families farming in an area and being able to access volunteers from those five families, a corporate body comes in, buys up the five farms, with those homes often not even being lived in. All of a sudden, you can go from having enough volunteers—and, therefore, protection for that community—to bringing into a region highly flammable woods and forest industries, at the same time as community members leave that area. I know that that has put more pressure and demand on some of those volunteers.

I also know that there is an enormous workload and pressure in the senior levels such as the deputy group officers, the group officers, the captains, the secretaries and the administration officers. As hard as I tried when I was minister (and I would be confident that the same would be happening with the current minister), I could not stop the paper warfare, because that is a part of reality today. Where possible, it is imperative that the authorities have a look at how they can lighten the load for volunteers, because it is pretty difficult to train people and maintain equipment so that those persons can be called out at a minute's notice, and it is not good for them then to be bogged down continually by more and more paperwork. I offer my absolute bipartisan support to assist this government in any way so that it can see a reduction in the paper trail that just seems to make life more and more difficult for the volunteers.

In conclusion, as I said, I am very pleased to be able to move this motion. I thank most sincerely and genuinely each and every volunteer and the paid staff member of the Country Fire Service and the other services, namely, NPWS and the SES. On this occasion, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service did not deploy, as volunteers, any officers to Victoria but in New South Wales it did. This is an enormous effort by people who are highly committed to all those services, and not only to the services but also to the protection of life and property. I am pleased that at the commemoration of Ash Wednesday, too, members of SAMFS, who had a big part to play also in Ash Wednesday, came to the service and were greeted very warmly by members of the CFS. That is something that I and others in this house have always tried to encourage, and I hope to see further friendship, a working ethos and positive development by those agencies.

I know other members of the chamber will be pleased to support this motion. I hope we do not have to stand here next year to move a similar motion, because, as I said, the lessons should have been learned about prevention. Let us hope we can get our act together over the next 12 months across Australia, remembering that at times, no matter how much work we do on prevention, in drought years, when there is quite a high fuel load and low moisture levels, we will see these sorts of inferno situations.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I support the motion. I congratulate members of country and metropolitan fire services on willingly travelling interstate to assist with fighting the bushfires there. I am particularly proud that Region 6, the Country Fire Service region that covers my electorate, provided more volunteer firefighters than any other region. Considering our small population base, that is a magnificent effort. It is proof, once again, of the absolutely tremendous community spirit of the West Coast people. The interstate call for assistance came at a time of high risk locally, when the danger of bushfires in our own region was extreme. Those who remained bore a greater burden in ensuring that the properties and homes of their colleagues were kept safe. The families and businesses of the volunteers also bore a share of the sacrifice. Families, of course, had the worry that their loved ones might be injured. The possibility of death through being caught in a situation from which there is no escape is always present in the mind in such circumstances.

Some 95 volunteers, some of whom did two tours of duty, and three staff members from Eyre Peninsula answered the call for help. The staff members were Region 6 Regional Commander, Neil Ellis, and Sonia Post and Simon Vogel, and the names of those who went is like a roll call of Eyre Peninsula towns and districts. The volunteers and the fire brigades include:

- Waddikee: Phil Harradine and Leon Joyce
- Lincoln: Peter Smart, Rob Chambers, David Bryant, Steve Else, Xandra Porter, Andrew Brown and Greg Napier
- Tumby Bay: Gene Holliday, Brad Holliday, Mathew Bawden, Stephen Nankivell, Troy Holliday, Quentin Russ, Paul Southon, Donald Bawden, Brett Pitman, Michael Butler, Michael Kroemer and Chris Daniell
- Rudall: Mel Wegner, Barry Lovegrove, Graham Phelps and Michael Dennis
- Wharminda: Kieran Masters, John Masters and Gavin Masters
- Wangary: Terry Rowsell and Steve Nettle
- Cowell: Brian Young, Brian Mullan, Larry Young, Lindsay Carmody, Kym Hanson and Christopher Low. Christopher is a student of Cowell's aquaculture course and a former Young Citizen of the Year for Naracoorte
- Cummins: Terry Vigar, Russell Branson and Julie Ophoff
- North Shields: Glen Doughty, Jeff Poole and Shaun Kurovec
- Greenpatch: Barry Hetherington, Ken Pobke and Gordon Lakin
- Coffin Bay: Ben Jarmyn, Michael Terrell, William Philip, Zach Pepworth, Michael Armstrong and Michael Bowyer
- White Flat: Kym Eagle, Doug Clarke and Darren Mead
- Wudinna: David Simpson, Craig Jericho, David Greatbatch and Shane Rigden
- Mount Wedge: Ian Penna
- Elliston: Graham Meyers
- Cleve: Shaun Irrang

- Mount Hope: Thomas Millard
- Nunjikompta: Daryl Lawrie and Bradley Ross
- Poochera: Peter Fleming
- Gum Flat: Trent Harris, Michael Evans, John Flavel and Colin Dickson
- Ungarra: David Liddicoat and Roger Pepworth
- Mangalo: Steven Roberts and Darren Crettenden
- Ceduna: Rick McKay, Justin Woolford and Mark Hewitson
- Yeelanna: Greg Hurrell
- Karkoo: Michael Agnew
- Far West National Parks and Wildlife Service: Brett Dalzell
- Kapinnie: Kym Kenny
- Tooligie Hill: Michael Agars and Brett Pearce
- Mount Dampier: Kym Tree
- Port Neill: Darren Aitchison and Michale Aitchison
- Lock: Michael Zerk
- Sheringa: Shayne Hastie
- Salt Creek: Mark Carmody; and
- Yallunda Flat: David Whait and John Haagmans.

The first three contingents from Eyre Peninsula served in Tallangatta Valley and Dartmouth on the northern side of the Alps, while the fourth and fifth contingents worked around Sale and Orbost on the southern side of the Alps.

Mr Ellis said that it was a huge logistical effort to get people interstate and back to Port Lincoln, and the cooperation of the airlines and charter aircraft was greatly appreciated. He said that their aircraft was unable to land at Albury because of poor visibility, so the firefighters were disembarked at Melbourne Airport and bussed to the fire area. Visibility was between 500 metres and one kilometre at the most. The main task of the volunteers was to protect property and ensure that back-burns were completed and fire perimeters blacked out. Our people crewed Country Fire Authority vehicles. Mr Ellis praised the morale of the volunteers which was always high, despite the long hours they put in, the tediousness of the job and their tiredness.

He was based at Corryong on the incident management team which was looking after a fire edge of some 203 kilometres—and that was just a small part of the total perimeter. The bushfires were burning in terrain even more rugged than the Flinders Ranges. The fires, which were started by lightning strikes, were small to begin with but built into the massive fires that burnt in excess of one million hectares. Mr Rob Chambers, one of the volunteers who did two tours of duty, said that the firefighters on the scene were flat out and all were physically tired. He said that it was good to be able to relieve them so that they could get some rest, and then carry on again when South Australians came home. He said that the whole affected area was so large and the effort was so big that sometimes those in charge did not know where all the firefighters were, so it was an extremely worrying and intense time.

He said that the relief crews cleaned up around houses and did property protection. Mr Haagmans of Yallunda Flat said that it was a real privilege to be there and that it was satisfying to be able to give someone a hand. The people really appreciated it. He said that the weather was mild while he was at the fire and his team mainly undertook back-burning. Nevertheless, visibility was limited to about 500 metres and masks were worn all the time to cope with the smoke. He understood that, after his team returned to South Australia, the people whom they had helped were so relieved that they made a contribution to the Country Fire Service in South

Australia, a contribution which was then re-donated to the Victorian Bushfire Appeal.

These are mostly volunteers we are talking about—men and women who do not get paid for being firefighters but who do it for the love of their communities so that those communities are kept safe. The hours given up in training, the self-discipline needed and the willingness to sacrifice self for the good of others are all characteristics that are part of the Country Fire Service. They are also a part of the Anzac tradition that has made Australia the great nation that it is. Seldom are these attributes mentioned. Volunteering and community service are an integral part of the fabric of rural living. I would like to see the day when volunteering and service above self are equally strong in metropolitan and city areas. I commend the motion.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I support this motion and commend the member for Mawson for bringing it to the house. Fortunately, Australia is a country that does not suffer from the natural disasters which occur in other parts of the world. The one natural disaster that is consistent across our nation is bushfires and the threat of bushfires. On occasions in a former life I was involved in preparing to fight fires and the fighting of them. One of the issues which needs to be stressed is the great working relationship which exists between volunteers and paid personnel. It is a relationship on which I know our minister, our government, and indeed all people within the emergency services sector work consistently toward.

Paid personnel cannot do their job efficiently without the volunteer personnel, namely, the people who give up their time to protect life and property and make our lives safer than would otherwise be the case. It goes hand in hand with the fact that volunteers cannot do their job effectively without the support of paid personnel. Both groups rely on each other. Volunteers rely on paid personnel and paid personnel rely on volunteers. I know that it is a great pleasure for South Australian firefighters in both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service to be able to assist fellow firefighters who are in need at any time. On numerous occasions we have seen contingents of South Australians from both services travel to other states to help communities that are in desperate need, and that will continue. I believe that one issue on which the various emergency services ministers in this country need to focus, and which should be conducted under the auspices of the federal government, is a process by which those emergency services can be better coordinated in times of need.

Whilst no-one can fault the efforts of the people who volunteer their services to attend such incidents, I think that we can make significant improvement with respect to the coordination, command and control and the manner by which those crews who go interstate to assist are activated. I have been a strong believer for a long period that, given the fact that we do suffer greatly from bushfires (the likes of which we have seen in most recent times) on a regular basis, processes should be put in place to ensure that we have, ready to activate at any point, crack crews that can be deployed in the very initial stages of such incidents.

I believe that that will assist. That applies not only to bushfires but also to any emergency situation, whether that be other public disasters such as the attacks which we have seen recently around the world and which, fortunately, have not reached our shores and, hopefully, will never reach our shores. I believe that emergency services personnel should

be formed into crews and coordinated by a central agency. The crews supplied by the various states could be activated by the flick of a button at any point to be deployed throughout Australia in very short time to attend to any of the needs that might be required by any state.

We know that, given the fact that we are required to send people to other states to volunteer, the available resources in any particular state, given the circumstances that might be confronted by a state's emergency services personnel, is usually lacking in sufficient numbers to be able to confront such emergencies. We need to help each other. We know that people are willing to do that. I commend and congratulate the people who travel interstate to assist in those emergencies. I just believe that measures can be activated at an early stage through crews that are specifically trained to confront those emergencies.

As we know, the later the crews get to emergency situations the more difficult it becomes to contain and combat bushfires or any form of emergency. So, timing is of the essence. I know that we did have a long debate last night about Iraq, but some of our energies with respect to our emergency services personnel, military or otherwise, can be spent in preparation or preplanning for circumstances that we know exist in Australia, such as bushfires and other such disasters.

It pleases me every time I see people from South Australia and other states going to the assistance of people in need. What makes this country such a great place in which to live is the willingness of people to help others in need. With those few words, I commend the member for Mawson's motion to the house.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to support the member for Mawson, the shadow minister, on this matter and thank him very much for bringing it up. I certainly congratulate all CFS volunteers and staff and other government personnel for their willingness and professionalism in answering the call for assistance from Victoria during the recent bushfire disasters. We know this is not the first time that these people have answered the call to go to Victoria. It is very fitting that we are debating this motion at this time, as it is 20 years plus a couple of days since the worst fire disaster to ever hit South Australia, and I refer to Ash Wednesday. The Victorians could not come to help us on that day because they had similar disasters themselves.

I am certainly very mindful of how these people get a phone call from the group captain or whatever of their brigade, down tools, make sacrifices by cancelling family commitments, and just go. It is all very well for us to note that they do that, but they do that at great personal cost. Their employers also share that cost. I wonder whether at some time in the future the state will have to consider some sort of assistance to employers who often allow their employees to answer the call to go to fires, particularly in circumstances like this when these people are away for a week at a time. We should not forget those employers who allow their people to answer the call to fight these fires. We know that most of them are self-employed, and most just leave their property in the hands of their immediate family.

I noted the 575 CFS volunteers who went, with the 18 CFS staff, as well as the National Parks and Wildlife people and members of the SES. The member for Flinders read out a list of people from her electorate who went to Victoria. I do not have a list, but I know that several volunteers went from brigades in my electorate, particularly from the Barossa

Valley. The two that come to mind are the Angaston brigade, a very smart and efficient group, and also Nuriootpa, which sent senior staff as well as firefighters. We also sent units from our area. We were involved at every level, starting with the grassroots town and community level, to assist our Victoria counterparts. Again I say that I have nothing but admiration for our SES and CFS volunteers.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! People in the gallery will not engage in conversations with members in the house.

Mr VENNING: I regret the issue that I feel I had to raise in this place yesterday. I thought long and hard about that, but the issue was raised with me by constituents who attended the fire at Eden Valley. I also made several phone calls in relation to that. I note the minister's personal explanation late last night. Unknown to anybody, even the minister, the landowner had been charged. I make no further comment about that, other than to say that, as a landowner, I have some sympathy with him. It was an unintended result of a farm task.

Angle grinders, as the member for Stuart would know, are a most deceptive and quite dangerous farm tool. Sparks can travel up to 30 metres and light combustible material. The sparks are in fact small pieces of molten metal. Not only can they light anything like a bag hanging on a wall or a piece of straw but also they can destroy car windscreens. These red-hot beads melt the glass. I have used these things, and they are dangerous. I do not want to cast aspersions on this person, because he did what a lot of other people do, but he was not very wise on the day—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Oh, sorry, I was a bit too keen.

Mr VENNING: I don't know what happened there. I think somebody is having a go at me from above! It was an accident. This person chose to use one of these things in a bad place on a bad day. I know that what he did a lot of farmers could be accused of doing—this was an inadvertent mistake—but, in relation to the other accusation of a cover-up ('hush-up' was the word used), I note the minister's explanation last night. Yes, there is a doubt. By the time the instruction got down to the men holding the hose, it could have been quite different from the instruction that was given to, say, the chief executive in Adelaide.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Maybe, I'm not saying; I don't know. However, the word I got from half a dozen constituents who were at the fire is that they were told not to raise this matter—to keep it under their hat—because the person involved was of a high profile. So, it could have been misconstrued.

Another fact emerges that I wish to put on the record. The CFS web site, as the member for Mawson would know, is very good: it is very active. It is regularly updated, and details of all the fires and the record of activities are put on the web site within a day of the event occurring. However, there is nothing on this web site—and I had this printed out to prove it—that refers to the fire at Eden Valley on 9 December. I do not know whether that is an oversight. People know that I am not a naturally nasty person, but this is one of the reasons why I raised this matter: I was curious to know why it was not listed on the web site.

I say again that I have no malice and I bear no ill will towards the people involved, but I am very aware that none of us is any different from anyone else. We have to face our responsibilities, particularly if we commit a misdemeanour. This was an incident where some members of our community

felt, rightly or wrongly, that someone was getting preferential treatment. The matter has been aired now, the minister has responded, and as far as I am concerned the issue is closed. However, I am aware of the saying, 'Let him who is without sin throw the first stone.' I am a farmer, and we have been farming for four generations. Over that time we have had fires, but lately the Premier's strong comments about tackling arsonists has brought this into focus, because I believe the person involved in this would not have been charged two or three years ago. However, it is now a more important issue.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I, too, take great pleasure in supporting the motion of the shadow minister for emergency services. I congratulate those members who have already spoken to this motion, and I also congratulate all the volunteers. At times like this it is important that we offer our congratulations and heartfelt thanks to the employers who support the volunteers, because if they did not give volunteers time off from their place of employment to fight fires and attend other incidents they would not be able to carry out the very important work that they do on behalf of all of us.

I represent an area which has a sad record of fire, particularly in recent history. Last Sunday, I attended at the regional CFS headquarters in Naracoorte a special memorial service which was conducted by the CFS in memory of all those who lost their lives working for the benefit of others. The service was conducted by the Reverend John Follett, a pastor in Millicent at the time of the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfires. He was a chaplain for the local CFS at that time, and I think he still maintains that role. He is no longer in the South-East, but he came down to Naracoorte especially to conduct this service. It was a very moving service because he had a close relationship with the suffering that occurred on both 16 February 1983 in the Lower South-East and in the days following when he counselled many people, including CFS volunteers and victims of the bushfires.

We were also honoured on that day with the presence of Euan Ferguson, Chief Officer of the CFS, and I would like to express my thanks to the CFS hierarchy in general for attending that function at Naracoorte. I know that Euan Ferguson then travelled back from Naracoorte to Adelaide, which is quite a drive, to attend a similar service at Mount Lofty later that day. I was a little disturbed when the Premier spoke about Ash Wednesday in the house earlier in the week but failed to mention anything about the devastation of that event in the South-East, where half the 28 lives lost in South Australia on that day were lost and the property damage was incredibly significant, much more substantial than what occurred here in the Adelaide Hills.

Be that as it may, this motion is really about saying congratulations to our CFS personnel and volunteers, not just for the work that they do here in South Australia but also by volunteering and taking extended time off from their employment and, probably more importantly, from their families, to travel interstate to help other Australians, whether it be recently in Victoria or in recent years in New South Wales. I was interested to speak to one CFS volunteer from Padthaway on Sunday afternoon when he was attending the service at Naracoorte. He told me that he has been interstate on three occasions now, twice to New South Wales and more recently to Victoria, fighting bushfires with crews from South Australia and from other states helping.

People like that, who are willing to give up time not just once but on two or three occasions over the years need to be

congratulated, encouraged and supported. Not only are they doing very fine work for our friends and the citizens of our nation in other states but they are also developing very valuable experience that they are able to bring back here to South Australia, which will be put to very good use in the unfortunate case when we next experience severe bushfires in this state. I say 'when' because I feel quite confident that, even with our best efforts, we will face severe bushfires in the future. Unfortunately, there are only a limited number of things we can do about that, which brings me to my next point.

I think that it is time we became realistic about the way we manage our environment. And we do need to manage the environment. There are some in our community who say that we should manage our national parks by never going near them, leaving them to nature; by standing back and not entering them or utilising them for any activities and staying right out of them. I think it is a nonsense to say that we can manage our national parks like that. I do not believe that that is the way our national parks were managed by nature in the first instance. People might say that is a strange thing to say but, in nature, bushfire was an integral part of the Australian landscape. We have reduced the number of natural bushfires, and it might be argued that we should let bushfires go when they are in a national park.

But that, again, does not reflect nature, because our national parks are now only very small pockets compared to what the landscape of this state was in the time when it was being looked after by nature and by the indigenous peoples of this country. We have no choice but to manage, to try to reflect what nature intended or the way nature managed those areas before we interfered. The impact of a bushfire on a small national park could be absolutely devastating, because there would then be no nursery for either flora or fauna to reinhabit that area in the case of a very hot burn. Also, we have introduced many feral animals—cats, foxes, rabbits, etc., which have devastated our native fauna, and we have introduced many pest plant species which have taken over and out-competed a lot of our native flora.

So, for us to say that management of our national parks should be at arm's length and should be a minimalist approach I think is absolute nonsense. I think we should be very proactive in the way we manage our national parks and, when national parks are near heavily populated areas, I think we have to be extremely proactive. I have always argued that we should carry out prescribed burning—or cool burning or mosaic burning, as various people refer to it—at the right time of the year—in autumn and in winter—to reduce fuel loads. We should be doing that particularly in the Adelaide Hills, the Hills Face Zone and other areas where we have heavy populations, otherwise we will once again suffer a disaster such as the one we suffered in 1983 and the one more recently suffered in New South Wales and Victoria.

I therefore think it is opportune for us to once again reflect on the absolutely essential and important work that our CFS volunteers do, and also reflect on what we as a parliament might do to assist that work. I think one of the things that this parliament needs to do to assist our volunteers and, indeed, to protect them is to look at the way we manage native vegetation in this state and recognise that the way that native vegetation has been managed in recent times bears very little resemblance to the way nature managed that same vegetation before white man came to inhabit this state.

Once again, I congratulate the member for Mawson on bringing this matter to the attention of the house and add my

hearty congratulations not only to all those who have been involved in the CFS here in South Australia but also, particularly, those who have given up their time to travel interstate.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I move:

That this house requests the government to prepare and publish a report assessing how entry by the Commonwealth of Australia into a free trade agreement with the United States of America would affect consumers, farmers, industry and culture in South Australia.

The reason I move this motion is that talks are imminent in relation to a proposed free trade deal between the nations of Australia and the US. I will say something about the strategic background and then reveal some of the concerns that I have and some of the specific implications for South Australian farmers and other aspects of the South Australian economy. First, I make the general comment that we are talking about what is technically called an integration agreement as defined in the World Trade Organisation rules. We are talking about a trade agreement which is exclusive to the two countries. This flies in the face of the multilateral trade dealings that have been the core of our policy for many years. So, there is a trend to strategic unilateralism, and I raise the doubt that this will be a good thing for Australia.

As to the timeliness of the motion, it has been reported publicly that a team of about 40 officials from the US is scheduled to visit Australia for the first round of talks in March, that is, next month. Essentially, the negotiations will be led on the Australian side by negotiators from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

The times we live in recall earlier times when we looked to Britain for protection and preference. Indeed, a policy known as 'imperial preference' was created by Britain in the earlier part of this century, whereby the members of the Empire Club were able to get together and trade beneficially to the exclusion of those who were not in the commonwealth empire. That was a policy that persisted in Australia well into the Menzies era.

It seems that the approach of Prime Minister John Howard is reminiscent of the approach taken by Australian leaders in those earlier times. It cuts against what we have been trying to achieve with various Asian nations over decades. However, the foreign policy response to Asian nations during the period of the Howard government has, essentially, been a failure. We have put more people offside in Asia in the last few years than we have for decades. Whereas in the 1980s and early 1990s efforts were made to create trade deals with China, Japan, Indonesia, Singapore, and so on, all of that has fallen into question because of the foreign policy responses of the Howard government. To make matters worse, it seems that the nation is now considering a bilateral deal with the United States that will exclude those Asian nations.

It is not just I who raises these concerns. I will give the parliament a short sample of some of the public concerns that have been raised. For example, Ann Capling in the *Canberra Times* on 18 March 2002 stated:

The simple fact of the matter is that there are no sound reasons for Australia to seek a free trade agreement with the US, and there are plenty of reasons against it. A bilateral agreement with the US would seriously undermine Australia's longstanding commitment to multilateralism and its central norm of non-discrimination. Any small

gains that may come from an agreement with the US would be dwarfed by the economic and political costs to Australia.

The commentator Hugh Mackay in the *Sydney Morning Herald* dated 23 November said:

Given the free trade agreement overtures now being made, there appears to be some danger that Australia will be drawn into a deal that, implicitly at least, not only puts military conditions on our trading arrangements but also challenges our right to retain control over our own economic destiny.

At this point, I interpose that it is ironic that we have Prime Minister John Howard, having won the last election on the rubric that, 'We will decide who comes to this country and in what manner they come here,' promoting a deal which, essentially, gives up Australia's right to decide who trades here and how products come to Australia. However, in case those commentators are perceived as left wing or irrelevant, let me add also some comments from Alan Mitchell, who wrote in the *Financial Review* on 13 November 2002:

Free trade agreements do not necessarily benefit their members. Australia would do better by unilaterally abolishing its remaining trade barriers against everyone, then any free trade agreement we would negotiate with the US would be a cherry on the cake.

So, even someone coming from the perspective that free trade is a good thing has serious doubts about whether bilateral agreement with the United States is warranted. John Quiggin, an economist, wrote in the *Financial Review* of 31 March 2003:

There is well-based scepticism about whether the Americans will give enough ground on agricultural subsidies to make a bilateral deal worthwhile. But at least in the policy circles that count, there has been little disagreement with the idea that, in principle, such a deal must be beneficial. In reality, there is every reason for doubt.

I move on to some specific items that will undoubtedly be addressed by any such free trade agreement. How could the United States benefit from a free trade agreement with Australia? For example, one of the items on the agenda is the lifting of quarantine bans on United States farm produce. Currently, Australia is very careful about the chicken, pork, feed corn, apples, citrus fruits and stone fruits imported from the United States. We need to be very careful about what we import into Australia not only from a food standard point of view but also in terms of our agricultural and livestock assets. That is one of the items that would be placed in question.

Secondly, the United States would seek removal of the export monopolies currently in place in the form of producer-owned boards. For example, it would be the end of the Australian Wheat Corporation—at least as a one-stop shop for the export of wheat. Similar arguments apply to barley, rice and sugar. It means that United States wholesalers would be able to come to Australia, buy wheat here and export it if they could get a better deal selling it in another country than they could as a result of buying United States wheat. That might sound good, but it does mean a radical change in the way that wheat is currently marketed, and it could well mean an undercutting of current prices which our own South Australian farmers get for their wheat and barley.

Our current foreign investment review board would have to be scrapped or at least would have to provide exemptions for United States investments. In colloquial terms, that means selling off the farm. Members would remember the public furore a couple of years ago when there was talk of Woodside Petroleum being purchased by European interests. That same public debate would have to take place virtually every week as cashed up United States investors came to pick the eyes out of Australian companies. We would thereby not only lose

control of those companies but of the products that are currently made in Australia.

There are huge implications for the South Australian Film Corporation and, indeed, all Australian television and film production. Currently, there is a 55 per cent minimum rule for free to air television, and a 10 per cent rule for pay television drama channels. That would be scrapped. It means that the United States could import even more junk soap operas to be forced upon the Australian public—and I mean forced because there is such little choice when one watches the television in the evening. It means that Australian culture itself would be further under threat.

Finally, I give the example of tariffs being removed. Removing tariffs on all United States goods may mean devastation for our car industry. That would mean very significant job losses in Australia, particularly in my own electorate of Mitchell because, of course, Mitsubishi Tonsley is based there. There are other examples I do not have time to go into. Suffice to say that the pharmaceutical benefits scheme that currently regulates and effectively lowers the price of pharmaceutical goods for our pensioners and our sick people would be scrapped.

The US corporations would not stand for it. There are a number of important implications that this proposed US free trade agreement will have for South Australians—for ordinary consumers, farmers and industry, as well, particularly for our culture and those who help to produce culture in South Australia. We need a South Australian assessment of the impact of the free trade agreement. No-one is better placed than the South Australian Department of Industry and Trade to do that, perhaps in conjunction with other agencies. I should point out that a report was prepared and published last year by the consultancy ACIL, but the federal government, which received the report, has sat on it. The bureaucrats did not like what the report said, so they have been keeping it secret. That only gives rise to even greater concern.

I pose the question whether the Australian Labor Party can be relied upon to save Australians from the negative impacts of such a trade agreement. I have been to only one national conference of the Australian Labor Party. I went there as a delegate a couple of years ago. One of the most significant debates was whether, essentially, the Labor Party's policy in terms of international trade should be one of fair trade or free trade. The right-wingers in the Labor Party won the argument. The economic rationalists, who support the policies of the right within the Labor Party, won that argument, and the notion of fair trade was scrapped from federal Labor policy. Actually, I have no faith whatsoever that the Labor Party can save Australians—farmers, consumers and those involved in culture, that is, theatre and film making—from the effects of such an agreement.

Finally, I ask all members to consider what this proposed free trade agreement might mean for their own constituents, whether they be farmers, consumers or people working in the arts or in industry. I suggest that it is very timely indeed for such a report to be prepared. We need it now; we need it this year, at least, because by this time next year such a free trade agreement could be in place. We need to know now what it means for South Australians so that we can play a role in lobbying the federal government before it signs off on any national deal which locks in negative implications for South Australians.

Time expired.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES GAMES

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I move:

That this house congratulates the organising committee and the participants of the inaugural Police and Emergency Services Games held last year as part of the lead-up to the World Police and Fire Games to be held in Adelaide in 2007.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion. The inaugural, to become biennial, South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games were held between 8 and 17 November 2002, and I congratulate the organising committee on the opening of the games. It is my recollection that the Police Commissioner himself chaired the organising committee, which also comprised five other executive officers. I was very pleased to see these games held in South Australia last year.

To go back in history, when I had the privilege of being police minister, together with my colleague the Minister for Tourism and the cabinet, we put in two bids—unfortunately, the first one was not successful, but the second one was—for the World Police and Fire Games. The World Police and Fire Games will now be held in South Australia in 2007. The World Police and Fire Games has the biggest participation in the world next to the Olympic Games, and in fact are bigger than the Commonwealth Games. It was an enormous coup for South Australia. I looked at it on many fronts and why I supported it as police and emergency services minister was that, first, it helped us economically; secondly, it helped to place us on the international map again—and in a small state such as South Australia we need to promote our state as much as we possibly can—and, thirdly, it was an opportunity to lift the image, albeit a very good image, of the police and emergency services and the empathy and the general ethos of the police and emergency services in South Australia.

Leading up to that and as an initiative of the organising committee—and I commend the commissioner and other executive officers for their foresight in this initiative—it was decided to hold biennial Police and Emergency Services Games within South Australia. The purpose of the games was to promote a healthy lifestyle and team work and to foster partnerships between the emergency services organisations. The games were a multi-sport event which allowed for competition in both individual and team sports, and a very large cross-section of games was contested. I do not have the time now to name them all, but I summarise by saying that 30 different events were contested in 2002.

The Country Fire Service and State Emergency Services have been conducting yearly competitions and they included those in the South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games. What we saw, together with the six core agencies, was an opportunity to bring other members and employees of other emergency services agencies and associations into the South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games. South Australia Police had 393 competitors; the South Australia Metropolitan Fire Service had 113 competitors; the CFS had 50 competitors; the South Australian Ambulance Service had 35 competitors; and 46 competitors came from the South Australian Emergency Services.

We also had participation from Australian Customs Services, the Australian Federal Police Emergency Services Administration Unit, the Royal Australian Air Force Military Police, the Royal Australian Army Military Police, the Department for Correctional Services, Primary Industries SA, Airport Rescue and Fire, and seven competitors from the Special Constables of the South Australia Police. There were four competitors from St John Ambulance, one from Surf

Lifesaving SA, two competitors, interestingly enough, from the Office of the Sheriff of South Australia and three competitors from Transport SA. Obviously all those agencies work in support of the core agencies of police, Metropolitan Fire Service, Country Fire Service and SES.

In total, we saw 728 competitors from South Australia compete in those games. These competitors entered, would members believe, 1 631 different events. Participation in the games was open to employees and for some agencies volunteers were involved in law enforcement or emergency response. As I have already indicated, in South Australia this is the first games that full-time and volunteer members of emergency services organisations could compete together in a dedicated multi-sport event. That is something that I in my position now as shadow minister still strongly encourage, as I did during my time as minister.

What also happened as a result of the successful bid for the 2007 World Police and Fire Games is that, very soon after Adelaide secured the 2007 games, we secured the 2005 Australia and New Zealand Police Games. These are both world-class events, which will assist in the preparation for the world-class event of the 2007 World Police and Fire Games. In fact, in 2004 we will again see the South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games. As I said, in 2005 we will see the Australia and New Zealand Police Games, and then in 2006 we will see the South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games.

That will culminate with the World Police and Fire Games in 2007 and then in 2008 and then biannually these other police and emergency services games will continue. I hope that, by having had the biannual events and the opportunity of competing against New Zealand and other states of Australia in 2005, when we do have the elite events in 2007 we will be able to take most of the gold, silver and bronze medals. I believe that we would have had so much training and that the competitors would have had such a good feel for what it is like to compete at the elite level that it augurs well.

As shadow minister I attended with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services when he opened the games on 8 November at the Metropolitan Fire Service headquarters, and I was pleased to see so much support from a wide cross-section of agencies at that opening. These games do not just happen; a lot of hard work is done behind the scenes. I have seen the leadership over several years now, not only from the Police Commissioner but also from other chief executive officers in terms of taking on extra activities. One could argue that that is not necessarily their core work, but it is what I describe as value-added work by them in terms of their leadership, which allows for further development and positive growth in their particular agencies.

We have often seen South Australia Police and Metropolitan Fire Service personnel do quite well when they have competed internationally in Australian Rules football, but giving men and women across those agencies an opportunity to show people just how good they are at their individual sports is something that, as I said, helps to put South Australia on the national and now the international map. Of course, the other benefit is that fitness is paramount. In fact, if we were prepared to work hard enough out of hours, it would probably be good if members of parliament could form another agency and join in these games.

I think it is fair to say that most of us could improve our fitness, but the hours we work and the way in which we work does not promote fitness. It is probably not imperative to being a good politician but, certainly, with respect to being

a police officer or an emergency services officer fitness is paramount. If you can raise the opportunities for competition and reward through these games you will also encourage better fitness within the agencies and, hopefully, it will stop injury and also assist in terms of WorkCover claims, something that has a negative impact on any agency's budget. I look forward to watching the growth and development of the South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games.

I also very much look forward to attending the Australia and New Zealand Police Games in 2005 and in 2007 the World Police and Fire Games. Certainly, over the last three or four decades most people have not had the opportunity to observe the magnitude of sports, competition and elite athletes in our own facilities. As I said, events will range across about 30 different sports events. I want to touch on another issue with respect to these World Police and Fire Games, that is, the issue of infrastructure. One problem in bidding for games, such as the World Police and Fire Games, is convincing the officials who come from across the globe to make an assessment about where the games are to be held and whether or not we have enough infrastructure to be able properly to hold the games. That is where infrastructure development assisted—and I acknowledge the work of the present government when it was last in government for building the velodrome.

I also want to put on the record the fact that facilities like the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium were of great assistance to a successful bid for the World Police and Fire Games. There has been a lot of hoo-ha (that is one way to describe the situation) surrounding the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. I did not hear any accolades for the money generated through the lead-up games to the Olympic Games for South Australia on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. I have always said it was most unfortunate that it was the challenge that stopped the Rams from setting up their headquarters down there, which was obviously another initiative behind the stadium.

But that stadium is fully paid for, and it is there to encourage young people to aspire towards playing at the highest level of soccer. Young South Australians who aspire to AFL football have the opportunity to go onto a magnificent stadium like Football Park. We need to have young people who aspire to top level soccer to have the feel of going onto pitches such as the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium.

However, the point I want to raise is that that stadium is there for another 50 or 60 years and, as a result of the World Police and Fire Games, the total cost of upgrading the stadium, together with the costs of running the events leading up to the Olympic Games a couple of years ago, and notwithstanding the offset of that by virtue of the millions of dollars that was already generated for the South Australian economy through the soccer games leading up to the Olympics, the Police World and Fire Games alone will generate an estimated \$30 million, which is exactly the same amount as the total amount of money spent in not only upgrading the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium but in actually putting on the Olympic Games events, which did return quite a good profit to South Australia. We will see an absolute net profit, estimated, of \$30 million from the World Police and Fire Games.

Whilst I am not saying that everything was spot on with regard to that project, and I can certainly point to projects that any government builds with overruns, and we can see it already with this government, albeit it is not building a lot of capital works projects at the moment, the fact remains that infrastructure development must run parallel to economic development to equal guaranteed sustainable job opportuni-

ties not only for young people but also for the overall South Australian work force. Unless you have capital works being developed on a regular, systematic and well-planned way in a state, your state will sooner or later go backwards.

I hope this government realises that and that we see some investment in capital works, particularly when we see some worrying signals on the horizon when it comes to the economy in South Australia and those big construction companies having the opportunity to create additional jobs through government expenditure, whilst at the same time being able to guarantee improved facilities for South Australians so we can feel just as proud of our state when we drive around it, as with those states where governments—and I am talking about Labor governments—that are actually spending on capital works.

In conclusion, I commend the steering committee, and all the men and women involved in the South Australia Police and Emergency Services Games, and I look forward also to the World Police and Fire Games.

Time expired.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I commend the member for putting the motion. I think it is an outstanding motion of great significance to those who have an involvement in and a commitment to the tourism industry in this state. The Police and Emergency Services Games and the World Police and Fire Games to be held in 2007 will be an absolutely outstanding fillip to hotel proprietors, restaurants, tour operators, and to all those involved in the transportation of tourists, including people like the Sea Link to Kangaroo Island, bus companies and taxi drivers. The whole lot will benefit enormously from this fabulous event which was attracted to this state by the former Liberal government and which gleefully and thankfully the current Labor government has not so far slashed in its slash and burn approach to government expenditure—in particular, the \$16 million that it whipped out of tourism. Unless you attract these events, you will not stimulate the tourism industry and the economy adequately. Good examples of such events are the Tour Down Under and the Clipsal 500, both initiatives of the former government; the Encounter 2002 celebration, which was also organised by the former government; and the highly successful Year of the Outback, which again was an initiative of the former Liberal government.

This brings me to a very important point, because the World Police and Fire Games is about tourism and promoting opportunities for this state. The Year of the Outback was also about tourism opportunities and promoting South Australia. The two go together, because the people who come here to enjoy the World Police and Fire Games will want to have a look at South Australia. They will want to go to the Outback and Kangaroo Island and see what South Australia has to offer. That is why I am particularly pleased to note that the Minister for Tourism announced in a media release today that she is going to spend some money on promoting the Outback. At the South Australian Museum, she announced that there will be a 2003 Flinders Ranges and Outback Visitor Guide, a Coober Pedy Visitor Guide and a Torrens Track brochure as well as a calendar of events for the Outback.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! I understand that the Member for Waite has issues with our current minister, but the motion refers to the Police and Emergency Services Games.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I take your point, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member will return to the motion.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The motion congratulates the organising committee and all those involved in the World Police and Fire Games to be held in 2007. If you will bear with me, sir, I note that in terms of consistency it has been the practice of the chair to allow some latitude. The motion is really about tourism, and major events. It is about the World Police and Fire Games, but I am touching on the related benefits that flow from visitors to these games. I make the point that they will want to see South Australia. They will want to visit the Barossa Valley, the sights of Adelaide and the Outback. So, this is very relevant to this motion.

I note that the chair has given latitude to all members in the chamber, and I am sure that he will extend that latitude to me because, unless you have the right array of offerings, people who come to see the World Police and Fire Games will have nothing else to do. The whole point of having these events is so that visitors can have a look at South Australia before and after. I am sure you take my point, Mr Acting Speaker. That is why I congratulate the government on announcing today that it is releasing these guides. If people want to visit the World Police and Fire Games we will have the chance to benefit from it, if it is continued, but there is no point in having the World Police and Fire Games and bringing people here and producing these glossy brochures if you do not maintain our roads, if you cut \$16 million from road maintenance—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I think the member is clearly defying your ruling and is stretching the debate. I am just waiting for him to bring New Zealand into it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, but I understand that the member is getting back to the substance of the motion.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am getting back to the substance of the motion, sir. I am getting back to the issue of visitors to South Australia linked to the World Police and Fire Games in 2007 and the preliminary events that build up to that. This motion, to me, is about tourism and about the South Australian economy. I object to the efforts by the government to interrupt my contribution, because it is relevant to the motion. The motion is about tourism. The government is attempting to interfere with my contribution by raising spurious points of order. You cannot attract people to major events such as the World Police and Fire Games unless you are offering other tourism opportunities, and it is a joke to promote South Australia as a tourism destination linked to these games if you then allow the tourism infrastructure to fall apart.

You must maintain the tourism infrastructure in the state if you are to sustain the visitor numbers you will get from events such as the World Police and Fire Games. This thing is bigger than the Commonwealth Games. Where will people go? They will go and see road wreckage. They will go into the outback after they have been to the games and they will see roads left in total disarray by a systematic range of cuts by this government to rural and outback infrastructure. Not only that but it is spurious to talk about the World Police and Fire Games and attracting visitors here when the opposition is getting leaked information that the government is actually cutting its funding to the outback. It is actually cutting its funding to future outback activities on the ground. Where will these visitors go after they have been to the World Police and Fire Games?

The opposition is getting information that no decisions are being made about the outback; that key people involved in organising the 2002 event that was such a stunning success are leaving the state because, although there are lots of glossy brochures and horseplay, there is no real money. So, where will the tourists go after they have been to the games?

Mr SNELLING: On a point of order, the motion being debated is quite specific in congratulating the organising committee and participants of the police and emergency services games. The member for Waite is attempting to draw into the debate matters beyond the realm of this motion. You, sir, have directed the member for Waite to return to the motion, and he has defied your ruling.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask the member for Waite to link his remarks to the motion in order to congratulate the organising committee of the inaugural police games.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, sir. I take your guidance and direction, but I am, and have been consistently, relating my remarks to the fact that this event, the World Police and Fire Games, is about getting tourists to the state. The member for Playford is trying to interrupt my address because he is a bit prickly and uncomfortable with some criticism. I do congratulate the committee. It will be wonderful having all these people here. But is it not sad that this government has nothing more to offer than what the former government had to offer on major events? Is it not sad that they are not investing in the outback and in creating any future Year of the Outback opportunity other than to announce today that they are releasing some glossy brochures so that people can head to the outback where the roads are in chaos and disarray, and where they are slashing and burning?

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

SUPPLY BILL

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

PARLIAMENT, MEMBERS' ACCESS

The SPEAKER: I have to report to the house that several honourable members have come to me during the course of yesterday and again prior to—and during this last 20 minutes of—the sittings of the house today and reported that their access to the parliament has again been impeded. For that, I apologise to the house. I assure the house that the matter will be raised and dealt with at the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee meeting next Monday and that access to the house from the facilities provided in the Festival Centre car park will be regular and available following that meeting. Honourable members and ministers need be in no doubt whatever that I will defend the ancient privileges and rights of the parliament, particularly in relation to unimpeded access to this place, and that, in spite of the misunderstanding, ignorance or whatever other reason there may be for the difficulties they have experienced, the matter will be resolved in a way which is acceptable to the parliament and in line with what the people expect that we as their elected representatives may be entitled to.

SCHOOLS, MAINTENANCE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Today I have announced a new \$12 million plan to improve the standard of South Australia's schools and preschools. The state government will be providing funds and more assistance to schools to address the most urgent maintenance priorities, in particular outstanding occupational, health safety and welfare requirements. This assistance will come in the form of managing projects within the Department of Education and Children's Services on behalf of schools, streamlined processes within government and between agencies and assistance to schools with financial management of projects. This is not aimed at altering local decisions and control. It is designed to better support schools and preschools focus on their core business—the education and care of children—rather than expecting school leaders to be accountants and project managers. The aim is also to achieve better value for money for individual schools and preschools.

This new approach is designed to ensure that the most urgent priorities in schools are addressed in a maintenance backlog that has grown over many years to \$271 million. Amounts provided to individual schools in the past for maintenance have sometimes been too small to address the urgent tasks, so either less urgent tasks have been tackled or schools have saved the money towards a bigger project. All school and preschool communities have developed asset management plans during the past five years, rating their facilities against a benchmark standard of condition, capacity and suitability. These plans will be used to determine works that need to be done.

A team of senior officers and asset management advisers from the education department will work with schools and preschools to help them identify their most urgent works and get the project scheduled and under way. Funding provided to schools will be based on the priorities of their identified projects. The investment into schools' maintenance represents an extra \$2 million injection this year and is in addition to the \$17 million over three years to upgrade the worst toilets, classrooms, administration areas and playgrounds in the state. This is also on top of nearly \$15 million provided to schools and preschools for urgent repairs this year through their global budgets, \$2.5 million in 2003 for painting and repairs and \$1 million this year to improve security at more than 50 schools.

The government is not only putting in more money but it will also be supporting schools to spend money they are holding for maintenance. There is some \$34 million in school bank accounts for maintenance works. Some of that is being held to pay bills for this work, but there are also significant funds that have not been spent from past years' allocations. This government wants to ensure that money being invested in school facilities is being spent today to benefit today's children. The state government will continue to address unexpected and unforeseen projects through the risk management fund.

QUESTION TIME

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Is the Premier aware that the previous Labor government of which he was a senior cabinet member received a recommendation from the uranium advisory committee in 1990 to fully support—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS:—the establishment of a national repository for radioactive waste because of reported deaths from the improper disposal of radioactive waste sources? The Uranium Advisory Committee report to the former Labor government stated as follows:

In South Australia there is no centralised facility for the storage and disposal of unwanted sealed sources and so they are stored by the user. Their radioactivity is too high for them to be disposed of by the user. Because of accidental exposures and deaths, which have resulted from the improper disposal of radioactive sources, it is important that sealed sources be managed with considerable care. Therefore, the committee recommends full support from South Australia—probably through the Health Commission—for the establishment of a national repository for the final disposal of sealed radioactive sources.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am very pleased, once again, because we went through this a couple of days ago. Let me just make this very clear to the honourable member. He supports a national radioactive waste dump being located in South Australia. The Liberals in this state support everyone else's nuclear waste being dumped in South Australia. We do not. In 1992, former Labor Premier Lynn Arnold said that we would fight a nuclear waste dump in South Australia; we have done so and are continuing to do so. However, at the time, the honourable member's esteemed colleague Michael Armitage said that he was right behind us. Did he not? He said, over his dead body, or words to that effect—something like that.

At that stage the Liberal Party in South Australia supported our opposition to a nuclear waste dump. The difference is that you guys change your mind. You are up to your ears in it. You want to turn South Australia into a nuclear waste dump and we do not, and that is the choice.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Premier that I was not involved in that decision; and that the Premier, should he be referring to the opposition, needs to be reminded, it seems to me then, that his remarks must be addressed to the chair and to them as third persons.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sorry, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is the Premier aware that some three years after the first recommendation from the Uranium Advisory Committee to support fully the development of a centralised storage facility for radioactive waste because of fear of deaths, the then government received another recommendation in 1993 supporting the development of a centralised storage facility for radioactive waste because of concerns about radioactive waste which existed or would be produced in South Australia and for which there was still no approved long-term management strategy in place, and, 'During the past three years progress on that matter had been minimal'?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Once again we have made our policy position clear. At the last election we went to the people saying that we would fight any plans by a federal

government to turn South Australia into a nuclear waste dump, and there is a bit of consistency here.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, hang on; there is consistency here. In 1992 Lynn Arnold said that he would not tolerate South Australia's being the dumping ground for nuclear waste, and 10 years later we are consistently opposing it. The fact is that you are all wriggling because the people of this state do not want the nuclear waste from New South Wales and Victoria dumped on our land—you do. For some bizarre reason, the Liberal opposition—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sorry, sir. For some reason the Liberal opposition in this state wants South Australia to be the dumping ground for nuclear waste from Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Hobart, Perth and Darwin. Well, we do not. We are going to be consistent. We are going to fight it every step of the way.

GAS SHORTAGE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Energy. What further information can the minister provide on the gas shortage that occurred from 25 to 28 January?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): We'll all be laughing at you in a moment. It gives me great pleasure to answer this question because of what I thought was a rather odd question asked by the member for Bright yesterday. I think it would be instructive for everyone in the chamber to turn to the relevant page of *Hansard* and read what the member for Bright said in his question and explanation. The gist of it was that he alleged that the Deputy Premier when acting as energy minister unnecessarily raised the possibility of blackouts and electricity rationing, and that this was—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, I refer you to those words: that this was inconsistent with the advice of departmental bureaucrats or public servants, I think he said. This was his claim but, of course, he did not offer much evidence for it. Perhaps the member for Bright would enjoy a more fruitful career were he to enter his questions for the Booker Prize rather than ask them in this place, because that is the appropriate award for fiction.

Let me explain. There are two sets of officers responsible for advice in these circumstances. In terms of gas restrictions: Jim Hallion of PIRSA, mines and energy, and the technical regulator with Energy SA. In terms of the electricity restrictions in response to the matter particularly raised by the member for Bright we of course rely on the advice of the Electricity Planning Council. First, I would like to acquaint the house with the advice from the people responsible for the gas issue. I am happy to table this document and the chronology which shows that, from memory yesterday, the Deputy Premier got a 'very well done' for his answer. This document states:

With reference to the recent gas supply interruption and a question asked in parliament. . . I advise that the Office of the Technical Regulator provided advice to the Acting Minister for Energy. . . This advice was not in conflict with the public statements made by the Acting Minister for Energy. The Office of the Technical Regulator liaised with and advised the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council of the seriousness of the gas supply interruption and its likely flow-on effects to electricity generation.

The document states further:

The Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council advised the Acting Minister on matters related to the electricity supply during the emergency.

Given that those were the people giving the advice, I sought their advice, because I was not here. I will relate the relevant section. Again, I am happy to table the document. I am sure that the member for Bright will not call for it, but I am happy if he does. The document states:

Gas restrictions—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Table the whole document.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will table the whole document. There is no problem with that. There is no docket. This document was created specifically in answer to the question raised yesterday, because it was such a peculiar allegation. The relevant parts of the document state:

By Monday 27 January, it was evident to the Planning Council that the Wednesday afternoon electricity peak could not be met unless the Santos Moomba plant soon came back on line trouble free. Discussions with the acting minister on Monday afternoon concluded that the Planning Council and other involved government agencies would need to take preparations in the event that electricity restrictions would be required on Wednesday 29 January until the gas supply was fully restored and stabilised. In my view as the jurisdictional 'responsible officer' for electricity emergency management, this was the best course of prudent risk management. I also advised NEMMCO of the possibility of restrictions should gas supply resumption not occur.

I am not sure which public servant the member for Bright was talking about who did not agree with that advice. Maybe it was the tea lady or the cleaner, but it certainly was not the people responsible for advising the acting minister for energy on electricity restrictions. I will go on.

Mr Brindal: You already have.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I'm surprised that you're trying to protect your mate; that's not something that you do very often. The document continues:

Over the evening of Monday and the early part of Tuesday gas production was progressively restored. On Tuesday morning, given the status of gas supply, in my role of responsible officer I then determined not to proceed with recommendations to the government for electricity restrictions starting on Wednesday. Subsequently on the Wednesday—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Oh!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Don't say 'Oh'. The comment was made on Monday night. This exactly and entirely supports the acting minister and shows what a work of fiction the question from the shadow minister is. The document continues:

Subsequently on the Wednesday EPIC started to experience pipeline compressor failures that created a new gas supply problem for the peak of that afternoon. It was uncertain for most of the day as to whether gas supplies were still going to be adequate for the peak. Finally late on Wednesday [night] all major gas supply issues began to dissipate, but the experiences of the event display just how precarious—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You really do not learn, do you. Let me give you just the summary. It states:

In summary South Australia experienced a major crisis in gas supply with subsequently major risks to gas-based electricity generation. In my view responsible preparatory actions were taken regarding quite plausible scenarios where the imposition of emergency electricity restrictions would have been necessary.

This demonstrates that there was not even the faintest shred of truth in the question raised yesterday. The member for Bright is to opposition what Equatorial Guinea is to Olympic swimming: he is Eric the Eel of energy!

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister for Government Enterprises appears to be quoting from a government dispatch, and I ask that you order, as you consistently have, that it be tabled.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Unley knows that the minister has said that he will table that document at the conclusion of his answer. To that extent, the member for Unley must pay better attention. Minister, have you finished your reply?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will just say this, sir: in future, when the member for Bright brings a question to this place, we will be scrutinising it very carefully to see that he did not dream it up the night before.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Will the minister confirm that Crown Law has advised the government that the proposal to ban the transport of low level waste into South Australia can be overridden by the commonwealth? A leaked copy of Crown Law advice suggests that the attempt to ban the transport of radioactive waste through South Australia can be overridden by the commonwealth. It states:

Should it be passed, the bill will only have effect to the extent that it is not consistent with the law of the commonwealth. Section 109 of the Commonwealth Constitution provides:

When a law of a state is inconsistent with the law of the commonwealth, the latter shall prevail and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid.

The advice goes on:

The bill prohibits the importation of nuclear waste for the delivery to a nuclear waste storage facility. This office has previously provided advice on the issue of whether the state parliament can legislate to prohibit transport of nuclear waste in the state. I attach a copy of that advice.

The conclusion of that advice may be summarised as follows: the state law, if the commonwealth had issued a licence for the transportation of radioactive material pursuant to the provisions of the commonwealth act, operates to prohibit such transportation.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Davenport for his question. It is interesting that the shadow minister, once again, is acting as the chief agent for the federal government's plans to put nuclear waste in our state. He has continued to be an apologist for the federal government on this issue. I find it strange that a shadow minister for the environment should act in such a way.

The shadow minister raised the question of legal advice. The government has had a variety of opinions given to it as to what its legal position might be, and I would like to go through some of the issues with the parliament. In the Legislative Council, we have a measure which would seek to make it illegal for the commonwealth government to establish a dump in South Australia, and we also seek to make it illegal for it to transport such waste to that dump. An oral opinion was expressed to the government that there may be—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Oral?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Do you understand what that means? Do you have trouble with the word 'oral'? It is obviously an oral fixation that the member for Davenport has! The government received advice from a variety of quarters about what its legal options might be, and the position was put to us that, while the commonwealth government has the

constitutional power to bring waste into our state, it may not necessarily have the legislative systems in place to use that power.

We have certainly sought some advice on that. I have to say, though, that subsequent to that advice I have sought written, up-to-date advice on this issue, and I am informed that it is the opinion of crown law that the commonwealth, as a necessary follow-on from that original power to establish a dump in South Australia—and there is no doubt as to its power in relation to that—would also have the power to bring that waste into the state. Crown law has expressed that opinion, and I am not saying it is a wrong opinion, but there are a variety of opinions in relation to this.

All I can say to the house is that, if the legislation that is before the upper house is finally passed through that chamber today, our party, our government, will do whatever it can within legal limits to stop that dump being placed in our state. If the member for Davenport wishes to continue to be an apologist for the federal government on this issue, good luck to him.

CATS

Mr RAU (Enfield): I have a question without notice to the Minister for Environment and Conservation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Why such a remark would cause any member of this place to fall about in mirth is something they ought to reflect upon and contemplate what the public will otherwise think of them. The member for Enfield has the call.

Mr RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question without notice to the Minister for Environment is: following the review of dog management laws, will he now review the management of cats in South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): As it happens, the government does have a position in relation to this matter. I think that the member for Davenport called on me over the Christmas break, desperately seeking a headline, to now undertake a review of cat management laws in South Australia. I was delighted to take his advice, as I am on many things, and I have announced today that the government will be reviewing the cat legislation.

There will be a three-month period of opportunity for members of the public to write to me on their views about what issues should be addressed by such a review. At the end of that three-month period, I will develop a paper to go out for further consultation. I would say that the issues that we want to get some advice on would be the relationship between cats and wildlife. There is a particular problem, as most members would know, because feral cats have quite a significant impact on the survival of small mammals and birds, and there are many thousands of feral cats in South Australia which have been breeding for generations.

Dr McFetridge: Millions.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Millions, as the member for Morphett says. There are also issues to do with amenity, nuisance and the welfare of cats. We want to go through a fairly gentle process of consultation. In the initial stages, we will be talking to the RSPCA, councils, various groups that have an interest in this and the general public, and at the end of that period we will produce a paper that will allow detailed consideration of this important issue.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house if any agency recommended the establishment of a low level radioactive waste repository?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I think the simple answer is that, yes, there have been agencies. The federal government's ARPANSA and other commonwealth agencies—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: State agency.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, you didn't say that; that's why I asked you to repeat the question. The question was, 'has any agency. . .'. Yes, there are commonwealth agencies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am unaware of any state agency which has made such a recommendation.

SUBMARINE CORPORATION

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry and Investment. What steps has the government taken to secure the continued operations of the Australian Submarine Corporation as well as other major defence contracts for the state?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Industry and Investment): When we came to office we identified naval shipbuilding and, in particular, the future of the Submarine Corporation—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, a Labor government delivered the submarines to South Australia, member for Waite, but never mind that. We decided that securing the future of the Submarine Corporation was particularly important for our state, but equally as important, and in many cases building on the excellent base that we had with the submarines, would be to extend the Submarine Corporation, if we could, into a more substantive contribution to naval shipbuilding in Australia.

In November last year the Premier formally announced that South Australia would bid to become the Australian centre for naval shipbuilding. Currently, the Australian naval ships are built and serviced in shipyards around Australia from Victoria to Western Australia to New South Wales and some other parts of Australia. The Howard government, the federal Liberal government, is currently considering a major rationalisation of Australian naval shipbuilding as proposed in the defence white paper. We took that initiative on the back of that defence white paper, and serious planning, as I said, began early last year. Estimates are that there are projects worth in excess of \$10 billion available over 15 years. That would be the air warfare destroyers and amphibious and supply ship construction.

As part of the government's strategy for securing this project for this state, on the 4th of this month the Premier announced the establishment of the Defence Industry Advisory Board. Again, we were bringing together, like we have done with the Economic Development Board, some of the best people that we could obtain to assist the government in driving this project forward.

It was announced that we were very fortunate to secure some outstanding experts in their various fields. The chair is Vice Admiral (retired) David Shackleton, the former chief of the Royal Australian Navy; former Liberal defence minister Ian McLachlan; and Dr John White, the chief executive

officer of Global Renewables Limited and former chief executive officer Transfield Defence Systems. I am sure the member for Waite would be familiar with Dr John White as somebody who was instrumental in the construction of the ANZAC ship projects here in Australia and one of the most outstanding defence shipbuilders in the nation. There is Mr Jim Duncan, who would be known to many, former lieutenant commander in the Royal Australian Navy. He played a major role in helping the Bannon Labor government win the submarine contract for this state in the 1980s. Also, there is Mr Robert Champion de Crespigny, Chair of the Economic Development Board, together with Dr Roger Sexton the chief executive of the Office of Economic Development.

The Defence Industry Advisory Board's first project will be assisting the Economic Development Board and the state government to secure Osborne as a location of consolidated naval shipbuilding. The Australian Submarine Corporation is Australia's newest, best equipped construction yard with considerable room for expansion and houses the strongest concentration of naval design, engineering, construction and logistics expertise built up to support the Collins class submarine.

The work of this board will also look beyond just shipbuilding and will look at other major defence contracts, and, again, there is one that I know the member for Waite is particularly keen on. It will also assist the government to secure work where possible with the joint strike fighter project, as well as combat and other high end systems for the replacement ships for the Navy's guided missile destroyers. Mr Speaker, this outstanding initiative by a government stands ready to bring in the best of the best from the private sector and from other parts of the community to help us drive our economic development plans into the future and to provide a robust, growing economy with great job opportunities for our community over the course of the next decade and beyond.

ANHECA

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Will the minister now retract and correct the statement she made in parliament on Tuesday in debate on the Health Complaints Bill concerning the position of the Australian Nursing Homes and Extended Care Association called ANHECA? During the debate, I said that ANHECA wanted aged care facilities excluded from the legislation. The minister responded, saying:

This is not what is said in letters to me.

On 20 October last year, an email was sent to the minister from the Executive Officer of ANHECA which stated that 'ANHECA SA would prefer a specific exclusion,' which was the amendment moved by the opposition. ANHECA has faxed a letter to the Minister for Health today, saying that the minister has misrepresented its position.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I am pleased to answer the question. Of course, the shadow minister failed to say the other things that ANHECA said in its letter to me. It is true that I received a letter from it today in relation to its position on a particular part of the Health and Community Services Complaints Bill. It is important that members of the house understand that, in relation to that piece of legislation, views were held right across the spectrum

of providers and consumers on a whole lot of matters. In this letter sent to me today, ANHECA certainly said that its preferred position was one thing. It also said in that letter:

We were happy that a compromise was reached with you and therefore wrote to thank you. This was a significant shift from Labor's position in opposition and we felt that this was a good outcome.

MEDICAL SPECIALISTS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health explain her claim that several medical specialists in Mount Gambier have completed their contract negotiations, and will she name the specialists who have? There is major dispute between the government and medical specialists at Mount Gambier over cuts to surgery. In a letter to the member for Enfield on 31 January 2003, the Minister for Health stated that 'several medical specialists have completed their negotiations' for new contracts. I have letters from the medical specialists in Mount Gambier which show that none of the medical specialists have completed their negotiations, nor have they signed new contracts.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I was waiting for this question, because this was one of the issues that the shadow minister spent some of his time stirring up in the week preceding parliament. Last Tuesday, fresh from being done over on the ABC that morning, the deputy leader was exposed as having under his watch 19 separate sporadic outbreaks of Legionella, on none of which he issued a public health warning. Fresh from being completely caught out on the radio program, he raced to the airport, jumped on a plane, made a lightning visit to Mount Gambier for two or three hours to stir up trouble and then jumped back on the plane and returned to Adelaide to leave behind the issues that he had stirred up. The wrecker and the spoiler left the issues for the people in Mount Gambier to solve.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My question is very specific, and I want a specific answer from the minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister for Health will come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As I was saying, the people in Mount Gambier, the regional board, the Chief Executive of the hospital and my ministerial colleague the member for Mount Gambier have been working assiduously to get a resolution to a range of longstanding issues about medical specialists in the Mount Gambier region. In relation to the question that the—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Yes, I am coming to the specific answer to the question—

The SPEAKER: I ask the minister to go straight to that matter that is the substance of the inquiry.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Certainly, sir. All specialists are involved and have been invited to become involved in negotiations in relation to their contracts and their work as resident specialists in Mount Gambier. In particular, I would like to talk about some very important developments in relation to physicians. A replacement physician has been signed up and has commenced work. This is a very important new addition to resident specialists in the Mount Gambier region. Negotiations are currently occurring with Flinders University and Flinders Medical Centre for an additional physician. I must say that those two positions have never

been part of the contingent of medical specialists in Mount Gambier.

As well as that, in relation to obstetrics and gynaecology, one replacement has been recruited and that person started six months ahead of when they needed to start and I understand that they are currently working very successfully in the area. We now have three obstetric and gynaecology specialists working within the region. As well as that, the region is still actively recruiting for another position, and I understand and have been informed that an interest from South Africa has been shown in this position. In relation to the other positions, members need to understand that contracts for the other specialists generally do not run out until June. We have several months essentially in which to go through the process of signing up these people.

I want to say that people are working assiduously on this matter in the South-East and they have been doing so for some months. I make it clear to the house again, as I have on a number of other occasions, that the problems at Mount Gambier are longstanding. They have not just arisen in recent months. I have explained to the house previously that, when the current government came to power, the Mount Gambier Hospital had a cumulative debt of \$4.34 million. The government agreed to waive the debt of its contract—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order again, and it relates to standing order 98. I am still specifically waiting for the names of the doctors who have signed these contracts as claimed by the minister. The minister has not answered that part of the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of the order.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I cannot give the actual names of the physicians—

The SPEAKER: I thank the minister for her answer.

The Hon. L. STEVENS:—but, as soon as I possibly can, I am very happy to provide the shadow minister with the names of the specialists who have signed up.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is directed to the Minister for Transport. In recent times, how has the state performed in terms of road safety?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for West Torrens for his question and his ongoing interest in this area. It is with concern that I provide the house with information about South Australia's road safety performance in 2002. South Australia is now the worst performing state on a per capita basis. A few quick facts clearly demonstrate this: a fatality rate for 2002 that is the highest of any state; the worst fatality rate performance for six years in regional South Australia; and an increasing proportion of drivers and motorcycle riders killed with a blood alcohol reading of .05 or more, with last year's result the highest since 1994.

There are limits to the capacity of government to reduce road trauma. However, a responsible government cannot regard last year's performance, or the past 10 years' performance, as being acceptable. In particular, I draw the parliament's attention to two factors: first, the increasing contribution of alcohol to the fatality rate and its correlation with the nation's most relaxed drink-driving penalties; and, secondly, the fact that the majority of deaths on our rural roads are country people, who comprised 71 per cent of rural fatalities last year. The government's road safety package has

been criticised for discriminating against regional South Australia.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The package is discriminatory but not against country people: rather, it positively seeks out dangerous and irresponsible drivers who use and abuse our roads. The government's first initiative came in last year's budget when we redistributed the transport investment budget to make our roads safer.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mackillop to order for the second time.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Our second response was a range of reforms, the most recent of which I announced last week being a default urban speed limit of 50 km/h effective from 1 March this year. Shortly, I will be announcing a number of further important road safety initiatives with immediate effect. These further non-legislative initiatives represent an initial response to the state's abysmal performance in 2002. There will be more, in particular our education program. South Australia's appalling road safety performance is an issue that transcends party politics.

The parliament has a duty to do all it can to remove the trauma of death and serious injury that affects so many South Australians and their families. Road safety is an issue for every road user in this state, and each of us must be accountable and take responsibility for that.

INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation provide the house with an update on the proposed restructure for integrated natural resource management, with particular reference to time lines for implementing the new regional structures and the consultation process that will be undertaken to establish the subregional structures?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Chaffey for this important question, and I acknowledge her great interest in this issue and the assistance she has been able to provide both to me and to my officers in the development of the papers and the approaches that we have so far. The government intends to release a draft bill for consultation about late autumn, and I am expecting to be able to introduce a bill into this place early in the spring session. As soon as that bill passes through this place, I will be appointing the new natural resource management (NRM) boards and the council immediately after that process; so, I think that should occur towards the end of the spring period.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As soon as we can get it through this place we will do it. The regional NRM boards, which will then be in place, will determine subregional approaches that need to be undertaken. I would expect that they would consult pretty extensively with their local communities about what sort of structures are required at a subregional level and who ought to be involved. Consultation has been taking place in relation to the overall structure. There have been a number of public meetings, some of which I have attended and at which a lot of interesting questions were asked and many good comments made.

We will continue to go through as much consultation as required. We are certainly consulting with all the key stakeholders. I understand that, from conversations with the member for Chaffey, there is a considerable amount of concern at the subregional level amongst LAP officers, for example, and groups associated with delivering integrated natural resource management programs on the ground. Many of them, of course, are funded under national programs. Obviously, the state cannot be responsible for replacing those funding arrangements, but it is our very strong intention to work as closely as we can with those people to make sure that their great expertise is not lost to our community.

I acknowledge the fantastic work that has been done through many of those LAP programs. We have some very good and talented young people—many of whom are young women—involved in those programs, and it would be pretty distressing if they were to be lost.

DISCOVER THE UNWINDING ROADS CAMPAIGN

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism—and I hope the member for Waite listens. How effective has the new \$5 million tourism advertising campaign Discover the Unwinding Roads been since it was launched in November last year?

Members interjecting:

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): Before I respond to the member for Waite, I remind members opposite that there is a large delegation from the Woodville High School present, and I think it would be appropriate if they behaved properly. The member for Giles is one member of this house who understands that tourism means business. She has spent a considerable amount of time with me travelling around regional South Australia. Her electorate includes some of our most iconic destinations, including the Head of the Bight, Coober Pedy and of course her own home town, which I might say is the world capital honeymoon destination for amorous cuttlefish.

The Unwinding Roads program is one of the important planks of the new tourism plan, which recognises that, increasingly, South Australia depends on interstate tourism for economic advantage. It is true to say that, currently, tourism tends to be closer to home, and there is an increase in interstate and intrastate tourism. This campaign has been launched in such a way that it will be directed towards the most likely markets for our destinations. It has been determined that 70 per cent of our tourists come from New South Wales and Victoria. This state attracts 358 000 visitors per year who (on average) stay for seven nights. Tapping into this market will be an important way of increasing employment and generating wealth in regional and rural South Australia. Our aim is that by the year 2006 we will have created 3 200 new jobs. The campaign includes two new commercials being screened around Australia in more than 300 cinemas as well as on television, and a 152-page tour guide will show step-by-step routes not only within South Australia but linking with those interstate capitals from which the largest number of tourists arise.

In the first nine weeks of the campaign we distributed 160 000 of these Unwinding Roads brochures to addresses gained from our own mailing list and particularly as a result of advertising. This has resulted in an additional 30 000 people for our database. Requests for these books

have come increasingly from web and internet applications, and this accords with our own market research which shows that many of our tourists are web enabled and likely to own a home computer. More than \$250 000 worth of editorial coverage for the new campaign has been generated in the *Sun Herald* and the *AFTA Traveller* magazine, and in March the Qantas in-flight magazine will have a 24-page feature on South Australia, the largest ever feature for a single state, while *Vogue Entertaining and Travel* and *Vogue Living* will showcase the Flinders Ranges and the Clare Valley in their March-April edition. I believe that this push to advertise South Australia as the prime drive market for Australia will have an increasing impact during the coming months because of the situation in international tourism.

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is directed to the Premier and Minister for the Arts. What are the latest developments in regard to the Adelaide International Film Festival?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): The member for Norwood has put out a newsletter which I received in my letterbox headed 'Vini Ciccarello MP—our local member for Norwood'. It states:

Norwood has become South Australia's film and multimedia capital. There are now 59 movie-related businesses operating in and around Norwood. We have film, TV and video productions along with special effects, animation and post production facilities. A number of these businesses have national and global reputations.

Then the member for Norwood goes on to reveal publicly that she has asked the Premier to relocate the South Australian Film Corporation to the Norwood area because that is where the film industry began. That is an interesting idea, and I will take that on board. As I understand it, the South Australian Film Corporation's Hendon studio's lease expires next year, so that is an idea worth considering.

An honourable member: Norrywood!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'Norrywood,' someone said. I am delighted to inform the house that the Adelaide International Film Festival, opening on 28 February and running until 7 March, is set to make a significant contribution to the cultural life of South Australia, and I will be making a series of arts and film announcements over the next couple of weeks.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You want to be invited to the spaghetti western? There is a film called *The Good, The Bad and The Ugly*, and I invite all members to join me on that night. The Minister for Tourism, the member for Norwood and I will serve spaghetti after the event and we will ask the public to judge who are the good, the bad and the ugly.

Thanks to an incredibly hard-working festival team—headed, of course, by Katrina Sedgwick, whose performance in running the Fringe Festival I know delighted members opposite—this exciting festival is about to be born, and I think it is very innovative. The 2003 Adelaide International Film Festival contains a total of 127 films, ranging from feature films to short documentaries and animations. Work from 30 countries will be shown over the eight days of the festival. There are 13 world premieres, 36 Australian films (five of which are Australian premieres) and 15 South Australian films. I know that the honourable member for Waite is a great supporter of the Adelaide International Film Festival. That is right, is it not?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Providing it is funded.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I promise you it will be funded. You will be pleased to know that highlights will include *My Voyage to Italy (Il mio viaggio in Italia)* by Martin Scorsese; Mario Andreacchio's *Paradise Found*, the story of Paul Gaugin, starring Keifer Sutherland and Natassja Kinski; Ken Loach's *Sweet Sixteen*; and the documentary *Marlene Dietrich: Her Own Song*.

The honourable member asked which film I am in. Unfortunately, I have to inform the house that the world premiere of the film which is called *The Honourable Wally Norman*, which stars H.G. Nelson, Brian Dawe and myself will occur in September-October of this year, and every single member will be encouraged to attend. I hope for a more substantial role, maybe a romantic lead, on another occasion. There is also a new media and games strand to ensure that cutting technology is represented within the festival.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Minister for Emergency Services apparently also wants to be a romantic lead. On Sunday 2 March, I will also be presenting the film festival's first Don Dunstan Award in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the Australian film industry. Also, over the eight days of the festival a number of invited film makers will share their experiences and thoughts on the film industry, initiating debates and discussions with their audiences. I can also announce today here in this house that South Australia has won the bid for the right to be the home of the Australian International Documentary Conference. The conference will be held in South Australia every two years concurrently with the Adelaide International Film Festival. This means that, at the time of the film festival, around 500 documentary makers will meet in Adelaide to screen, debate with and inform each other on the state of documentary making around the world.

In alternate years, the documentary conference will be held in other cities of Australia. It will be held in our city of Adelaide every two years, every time we have the Adelaide International Film Festival. The conference is the major event representing the interests of documentary makers, producers and academics, and will focus on both the industrial and academic aspects of documentary production.

There is no doubt that hosting the event greatly increases the capacity for local film makers to get involved. In 2003, the number of South Australian film makers attending the Byron Bay conference will be around 30. In 1999, when it was held in Adelaide, approximately 150 participants were delegates from our state.

We have been making a series of announcements in recent weeks but, returning to the member's question, I also inform the house that there will be free deckchair cinema in the East End parklands. There will also be a celebration to honour the 30th anniversary of the South Australian Film Corporation, and, in addition to the nights of spaghetti westerns, there will also be a horror sleepover, to which members opposite will be invited.

MINISTER FOR TRADE AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Treasurer explain why he has undermined the responsibility and the authority of the Minister for Trade and Regional Development? A confidential memo circulated within the department has been leaked to the opposition. It states:

Please note that the Minister for Industry and Investment (Kevin Foley) has advised arrangements for the ministerial relationships of the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade. The principal arrangements to note are:

1. The Minister for Trade and Regional Development (Rory McEwen) will be responsible for the day-to-day ministerial dealings with the department. This means that minister McEwen will effectively function as our minister. It is not intended that there be any gazetted change and therefore, technically, minister Foley will remain our formal minister.

2. The Minister for Industry and Investment is to be copied in on any communications of significance from DBMT to minister McEwen. Executive directors have been asked to ensure this happens and exercise judgment as to what constitutes a significant communication.

3. Industry Investment Attraction Fund approvals in excess of \$50 000 now require the joint sign off of both ministers.

You have nobbled him, minister!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Industry and Investment): I have to say congratulations to the member for Waite because that is the funniest question I have had in 12 months in this job. I am the Minister for Industry and Investment. We have a Minister for Trade and Regional Development and we have a Minister for Small Business. All those ministers are serviced by the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade. What I have said is that it would be eminently appropriate, given my responsibilities with the budget and the Office of Economic Development, for one of my colleagues to take over the day-to-day responsibility for the department. So what?

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Attorney-General. What has so far been achieved in the advancement of the Constitutional Convention?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Fourteen country meetings to discuss the constitutional change have been held this month. You, Mr Speaker, and I have attended all of them, and the Hon. Ron Roberts and the Hon. Robert Lawson have attended most of them. At Kingscote 29 attended; at Mount Gambier 97; at Keith 40; at Murray Bridge 115; at Loxton 37; at Clare 44; at Port Pirie 22 (most disappointing); at Port Augusta 44; at Ceduna 39 (a big roll-up from a sparsely populated area, and people travelled many kilometres to get there); Port Lincoln 37; Kimba 36 (a most encouraging roll-up and an outstanding meeting); Whyalla 30 (disappointing); Coober Pedy 38 (that is 2 per cent of the electoral roll there); and Minlaton 69 (a great attendance for a Saturday night).

On 23 January you, Mr Speaker, launched a 50 page discussion paper written by a panel of eight experts—Dr Clem McIntyre, who has been most helpful on the road show; Associate Professor Peter Howell; the Hon. Len King; the Hon. Trevor Griffin, defender of the upper house; Dr Geoffrey Partington; Professor Judith Sloan; Dr Jenny Stock; and my old law lecturer Dr Geoffrey Walker.

The discussion paper is so lucid it ought to be a text for teaching high school students about our political system. The discussion paper canvasses the arguments for and against the many changes proposed. One of the constant themes of the country meetings has been the caution with which most Australians approach constitutional change. They are right to be cautious: the current proposals are trying to return authority to voters, unlike most proposals for constitutional change with which Australians have been faced.

A man at the Loxton meeting told us, 'I love living in this democracy, and all it needs is a bit of tweaking.' I thank

country people from local government for their interest in our deliberations and their contribution to discussions. Those who attended our country meetings are worried that a cut to the number of MPs would result in country electorates much bigger in area and that the capacity of country MPs to have personal contact with their constituents might be reduced.

Although there is some enthusiasm for the initiative and referendum proposal, especially in Murray Bridge, people at our country meetings worried that pressure groups could prevail in a referendum and that unrealistic proposals or conflicting proposals might win a majority. As one would expect, those civic minded people who took the trouble to attend the meetings were not much in favour of a process of randomly selecting the Constitutional Convention delegates because it would give them a chance of being selected that was merely equal to those of their fellow citizens who did not attend the meetings. I am most grateful to the staff of the Constitutional Convention secretariat for their preparations and to the Lions Ladies and Lionesses for the delicious fare they served after our meetings.

It seems to me that the great majority of participants have headed home from the meetings pleased with the information provided and the opportunity to have a say. A number of them have risen at the end of the meetings to thank the Speaker for giving them a chance to talk with their neighbours and with members of parliament about a topic that is important to them.

The SPEAKER: And I can add to that. Whereas the original compact signed by both the Hon. Rob Kerin and the Hon. Dean Brown, as well as the Hon. Mike Rann in the presence of other now ministers of the Labor Party, contained statements about reform which were explicit in their purview, it has been decided by the parliament, through the parliamentary steering committee, to re-throw those propositions in the form of five questions and, in the process of doing so, in selecting a panel of experts, compel them to address the re-throw rather than the original substance. That to me personally has been distressing, as has been the fact that at these meetings the amount of time available is approximately equal to each of the often four speakers being, in the main, certainly less than 15 minutes and often less than 10 minutes.

In my own case, in order to explain what motivated me to draft the compact in the first place, it leaves me with no time whatever to explain what it might achieve if they were to contemplate the reforms I have proposed. However, I make the observation, then, that the people at the meetings have not been provided with any background notes or information, let alone a copy of the compact and the provisions which were included in it to contemplate. They merely received the interpretation placed upon the re-throw of five questions provided by the panel of experts in the excellent discussion paper which they prepared in response to that re-throw. Moreover, that being so, what the public is contemplating is hardly reacting to the propositions contained in the compact, and those several hundred people who have written to me over many years—greater numbers in more recent times—tell me that what they had hoped might be under discussion is not being discussed. Notwithstanding that, the process is worthwhile.

The numbers of people who have attended these meetings, with very minimal outlays being made in advertising them, has confounded the critics and silenced the cynics that the process was unworthy of attention or even participation. To my mind then, the Attorney-General and the government are to be commended for at least providing the public with that

much opportunity and, in so far as it is possible, the Constitutional Convention date will be as soon as can be arranged. It now appears that it may not be on the second weekend in June but on some later weekend, since there is no sufficient time to do all that has to be done between now and that date in order to get the Constitutional Convention properly convened, that is, in consequence of the logistics meeting I had with Mr Geoff Halsey and other people this morning in the Constitutional Convention office.

All honourable members who have attended, both members of this house and the other house, I thank for their participation and their servility in the manner in which they have conducted themselves. In particular, I thank the member for Goyder, who went to great pains to ensure that the people in his electorate knew that the meeting was on. I look forward during the next two weeks to the meetings which will be held in the metropolitan area, publicity about which, whilst modest in advertising costs, will nonetheless appear in both the Messenger newspapers and in the daily press. I thank honourable members for the opportunity.

MUNDULLA YELLOWS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation explain to the house why, having ceased to fund the research into Mundulla yellows at the University of Adelaide almost 12 months ago, his department threatens the university over intellectual property to which his department has no rights? A team at the Waite Institute has been studying the Mundulla yellows disease for a number of years and was partially funded by the state in this ongoing research in March 2001 and April 2002. The team continues to maintain its experiments and observations, yet I am informed that it was recently confronted by officers from the minister's department demanding all documents pertaining to the total body of research, even though the pertinent reports on the state funded research had been provided.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I am not aware of the details to which the honourable member referred. Clearly, the government has invested a lot to try to get a resolution. We now have a new team conducting the research. If the former team is not prepared to pass over the information that has been produced, we will have to keep talking to them. I will get a report for the honourable member and let him know exactly what is going on.

SCHOOLS, MOUNT BARKER SOUTH PRIMARY

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. In order to substantiate the government's commitment to openness and accountability, will the minister explain to the house why she banned me from attending a meeting of a delegation from the Mount Barker South Primary School held on Wednesday 5 February, a delegation which I assisted to convene? On 18 December 2002, I wrote to the minister requesting that she meet with representatives of the Mount Barker South Primary School to discuss the issue of the recategorisation of the index for disadvantage. My office was sequentially advised that a meeting was set for Wednesday 5 February with the school's Principal and the governing council Chairperson. My clear expectation—and that of the governing school council Chairperson—was that I, as the

local member who requested the meeting, was to attend. Two days prior to the meeting, the Chairperson of the governing council was advised by staff in the minister's office that the minister did not want me to attend.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Kavel—and I do not doubt the veracity of his remarks—has reported accurately to the house, then a most serious breach of parliamentary privilege has occurred. The minister's staff should have been briefed at the time they were appointed that delegations arranged through members' officers must be accompanied by that member and, indeed, it is impertinent and bad mannered for ministers to meet delegations from members' electorates without advising the member and inviting the member to participate in that delegation. For a member to be banned from participating is a matter which I take personally take very seriously if indeed it occurred.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The facts have not been presented quite accurately by the member for Kavel. The meeting between the particular school council Chairperson and the Principal of the school was not arranged through his office. I invited the Chairperson to meet with me in response to a piece of correspondence that she or maybe the principal—no, she—sent to me, and I personally rang her myself and invited her to come to my office. So, it is not accurate for the member to say that it was arranged through his office.

Mr Goldsworthy: I assisted it.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: How? There was no meeting until I personally rang the Chairperson of the council and invited her.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I personally rang the Chairperson of the council and invited her to meet with me. Clearly, this appears to me—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Can I finish?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: My purpose in ringing the chair of the school council and agreeing to her request for me to consider the issue that it was putting to me was to say, 'Yes I will meet with you.' That was not arranged through the honourable member's office, and I did meet with the Chairperson of the school council, and the Principal was there, as well as another parent representative from that school. Action was taken out of that meeting, about which I believe—at least at the time of the meeting—they were very pleased. For the member to say that it was arranged through his office was not correct at all.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege and ask that in view of the question asked by the member for Kavel and the obvious disputation between the two members on this matter—and, sir, with your important insight into this matter—you carefully examine the matter, ask both members and rule whether there has been a prima facie breach of privilege so that a privileges committee of this house might be established, if necessary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will undertake to review the correspondence and such other evidence as there may be to see whether such is the case and report back to the house at the earliest opportunity.

STATE PROTECTION SECURITY BRANCH

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Is the Treasurer yet able to advise the house if the South Australia Police have received an additional \$300 000 funding for the development of the State Protection Security Branch? On 5 December, following statements by a radio announcer on 5AA on the previous Sunday evening regarding efforts to secure capital for the development of the State Protection Security Branch, I asked the Treasurer to confirm the provision of \$300 000 of state funding for South Australia Police. The Treasurer replied:

I am happy to get the honourable member an answer and provide it to him at the earliest opportunity.

At this stage I have received no reply.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I apologise to the member for Mawson. I will follow up that after question time and expedite an answer as quickly as we can.

HOSPITALS, MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What facilities are included in the upgraded emergency department of the Modbury Public Hospital; and how will they benefit patients and staff at the hospital?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I acknowledge and thank the honourable member for her constant support for the Modbury Public Hospital. Last Sunday, together with the other members in the area, I must admit—the member for Torrens and the member for Wright—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: —and don't forget the member for Newland. How could I forget the member for Newland? Last Sunday, I had the pleasure of opening the \$1.4 million Modbury Hospital Emergency Department redevelopment, marking the completion of the hospital's recent redevelopment costing over \$10 million. The emergency department consists of 14 treatment cubicles, which includes a fully equipped paediatric room and psychiatric assessment room, two fully equipped resuscitation bays and six short-stay observation beds. It was 30 years to the day on Sunday since the then Premier Don Dunstan officially opened the Modbury Hospital. The \$10.1 million three year redevelopment project included upgrading the central sterilising department, operating theatres, maternity section and a redeveloped emergency department.

The \$1.4 million emergency department redevelopment now reflects a more user-friendly facility, providing improved patient privacy, better observation by medical and nursing staff, a more efficient flow of patients through the department and significantly improved security. The emergency department treats up to 200 patients in a day, placing heavy demands on staff. The upgraded facilities will help staff to meet the needs of their patients. The Modbury Hospital has now been serving the people of the north-east for 30 years and it has a guaranteed future under this government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask that you examine statements made in this house by the Minister for Health concerning matters I raised in question time today to determine whether there is a prima facie case that the Minister for Health has misled the parliament.

The SPEAKER: I will examine the material provided to me by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Minister for Health relevant to the questions asked by him and the answers provided by her. The chair, in the same way as I have undertaken to the member for Unley, will provide a response to the house at the earliest possible opportunity, but I am confident that response will not come later this day.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Order! It is with some considerable diffidence that I rise to advise the house of yet another matter of privilege which relates to me, and by way of background information tell the house that members will be aware that the law, as it authorises and empowers police, provides that under general search warrants police may, without notice, search any citizens, or indeed corporate or business premises, under the provisions of a general search warrant. That being so, they may in the course of such search seize whatever it is that they are pleased to seize to enable them to continue their inquiries and investigations into whatever matter it is that attracts their attention in the belief that a crime may have been committed and that such crime needs to be investigated.

This was the case in my own instance as member for Hammond and raids were conducted on a number of business premises, including that of my accountant. Examination of that material, as all members will now know, was found to contain no evidence of an offence and no charges have been laid, and advice has been made public to that effect, namely, that I am not to be charged. I as member for Hammond and as a citizen was told that the inquiries were completed, and all papers taken into police possession were returned to those people from whom they were seized.

I now find in another matter in the courts—and I am careful about how I raise this matter—that an application has been made in the Supreme Court for the police to disgorge the evidence which they have from the documents they possess, even though they had assured me they had returned all those documents. I now find to my dismay that they have not just a few documents but, to quote the counsel acting for the police, thousands of documents, and that, whilst they oppose the application, His Honour Justice Perry has ordered that they be transferred, allowing the argument to be put by counsel for me, or other parties to the proposition, to be heard on a date some time soon.

It has not been possible for me to take explicit advice in the short time available to me since this information came to my attention during lunchtime today. However, that time will expire before the parliament sits again and the question of privilege is quite simple. Members must know that privilege is not mine or theirs individually to give away: it belongs to the institution of parliament and the public whom we represent. The reason for the sensitivity is quite simply that in those files are matters quite unrelated to my personal business or any matters in dispute in the Supreme Court, but details of costs and connections between me and my constituents, which I have refused to give to a court on a previous occasion, to my great cost because they are privileged.

Members should reflect for a moment that parliament is the superior court, not designed to try matters but to argue the benefit in the public interest of the existing law or a change

to that law, as well as to ensure that, according to law, matters of policy are properly administered by the Public Service. With that in mind, it is my intention to take advice from senior law officers at the disposal of the parliament, namely, the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General, and more particularly to leave, upon instructing the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, the discretion as to whether, in consultation between himself and the Clerk, parliament should be represented in these proceedings to them, so that they may choose, of their own discretion, to instruct counsel to appear to argue the question of privilege.

I think that any other course of action on my part would be irresponsible. It annoys me intensely to find myself in these circumstances, and if any member has a different view to what I have explained in the brief background that I have given, especially the gravamen of the situation, I would be pleased if they would see me personally about that before parliament rises today and otherwise hand write me a short note to the contrary of what I propose to do. The house will note grievances. The deputy leader.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

HOSPITALS, FUNDING

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to grieve on the issue of funding for our hospitals in this state and, in particular, to highlight the sort of dilemma that some of those hospitals are now facing as a result of cuts in funds. I have recently had the opportunity to visit a number of the country hospitals in particular, and I am dismayed to find that those hospitals have had their funds cut this year compared to a stand-still level of activity. These hospitals are now in the process of having to find out where to cut services that will impact on health care within South Australia. This is particularly relevant because, at present, the state and territory health ministers are negotiating a new Australian health-care agreement.

In fact, I understand that our health minister is flying interstate later today to be a part of those discussions. I am concerned, though, as to whether or not she will tell other governments with which she meets whether she has told the commonwealth government of the proposed cuts in funding for health within South Australia. We have already heard, from evidence given to this parliament by way of question, that \$104 million will be cut from the health budgets over the next four years, and that starts from this current year. I am dismayed to find that two hospitals I visited were having their budgets cut by between 2 per cent and 3 per cent in terms of stand-still activity done last year.

When I asked the reasons why, I was told that they had not been fully compensated or fully funded for wage increases and, therefore, the hospitals must take money out of other services to pay for wage increases. Secondly, the hospitals have been instructed in some cases to increase their level of nursing staff but they have been instructed to do so without any extra funding. Again, they have had to cut services to pay for those extra staff. I found that there are two hospitals in the state—what I would call medium size to larger country hospitals—where, in fact, their budgets have been cut by \$490 000, which represents a cut of about 12 per cent by those hospitals.

I know that the specialists at Mount Gambier (and this is the whole basis of the dispute at Mount Gambier with the

medical specialists) have been told to cut their surgery by 25 per cent, that is, compared to what they did last year. That is a massive cut in terms of surgical work, and can only adversely impact on the health care of the people of Mount Gambier. I was interested to read that a Dr Senior from Mount Gambier said, 'It needs more money at Mount Gambier,' and the Department of Human Services Chief Executive, Mr Jim Birch, said that a line had been drawn and no more money was available. He also said, 'Whatever happens in Mount Gambier will have implications across the state.' Mr Birch told the public meeting at Mount Gambier last Thursday night:

If I went to Whyalla, if I went to Port Augusta, if I went to Port Pirie, if I went to every regional city in this state I would get the same picture, that is, a significant cut in surgical work having to be carried out.

This is unacceptable. We hear our health minister saying that she needs more commonwealth money for health services, yet here she is cutting \$104 million out of health. Here she is cutting services. She has not compensated the hospitals this year for full salary increases, or for the extra staff. As the representative of one hospital said to me, they have never had it as tough as they have at present. Clearly, throughout the state we have a very unsatisfactory situation in our hospitals. I challenge the minister to tell us exactly where she has made the cuts to meet the \$104 million she is now required to do by Treasury.

Time expired.

PARLIAMENT, SITTINGS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): On Tuesday this week the members of this house had to endure the most significant absurdity of its present practices: the late night sitting. The house sat until two in the morning to dispatch an important piece of government legislation. It was not the decision to complete the task of dealing with the legislation that is at issue, it is that the existing practices of this house are such that the house too frequently sits into the late evening and early morning hours. Besides the debilitating impact these sittings have on the health and family life of members and support staff, one would have to question seriously the logic of dealing with the most demanding stage of legislation when members are at their lowest physical ebb.

The practice defies logic and diminishes the public standing of this house and the parliament. Here is a body, a house of this parliament, given the task by the people of this state to govern in its best interests, itself engaged in a practice of self-management that would not be tolerated in the wider community. The practice of late-night sittings flows from the sitting times established when this chamber was illuminated by gaslight; a time when parliamentarians were not paid and could give over only their afternoons and evenings to the matters of state. We have now moved through an entire century in which politicians have been paid and the demands of outside employment are no longer a consideration in the determination of sitting hours. Yet we still persist with this anachronistic practice whereby this house slips into the serious business of a day at a time when even the most driven of private sector executives have closed the office door for the day. In the 12 months I have been in this place I have not met one member of this house, from either the government or opposition ranks, who has anything but disdain for the practice of late-night sittings.

The attitude of the staff who support our activities is the same. Yesterday morning, I shared the back lift with a woman who looked physically ill as a result of sleep deprivation. I believe that, as parliamentarians (especially members of the Labor Party), we are in gross dereliction of our duties when we inflict these working conditions on the people employed in this building. Some will be content with the current practice, just as there are some—not necessarily within this parliament—whose idea of a good time is a session of self-flagellation with a birch whip. In the latter case, it is self-inflicted abuse; in the former, it is abuse we inflict on ourselves and others.

What can be done? This month the House of Representatives took its first tentative step to avoid late night sittings by ending dinner breaks. I say 'tentative' because the House of Commons has gone even further with changes that it introduced last month. In adopting changes recommended by the appropriately named Select Committee on Modernisation of the House of Commons, that house will not sit beyond 7 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. This change has been achieved by having the Commons sit from 11.30 a.m. and not 2 p.m. on these days.

The select committee report points out that there is nothing sacrosanct about the sitting times of the house and that they have changed over history to accommodate shifts in social custom and business practice. It also stresses that parliament must join other modern workplaces in seeking to ensure that its working practices allow people a healthier work-life balance.

Evidence given to the select committee by the Equal Opportunities Commission was also cited as a reason for change. The commission observed in its evidence:

While recognising the unique responsibilities MPs carry, it is unhelpful in engaging voters in the democratic process if the impression is given that becoming an MP is incompatible with family responsibilities.

I could add 'and working in any supporting role in the parliament'. The Commons reforms are those which I will seek to have this house implement. This is an objective which I will pursue with great vigour.

FREEHOLD LEASES

Mr VENNING (Schubert): In the 12½ years in which I have been in this place I have always promoted the need to encourage farmers and land managers to freehold their leases if they ever got the opportunity. In fact, the issue of Crown leases featured in my maiden speech in July 1990. I believe that if a leaseholder (whether it be perpetual, Crown or miscellaneous) wishes to change to freehold that wish should be accommodated to the best of the state's ability. I do not believe that, in the end, the government should hold any land titles other than for those sites on which its own facilities are built.

When the Liberal Party came into government in 1993, the member for Stuart assisted me in highlighting the need for change. We illustrated to ministers Wotton, Kotz and Evans the need to make the ability to freehold lease land much easier. The former government opened up perpetual leases for freehold, with the next obvious step being to include Crown and miscellaneous leases and eventually to move into the interim lands—and that is what we did. It is so disappointing that the opportunity to clear up the issue three or four years ago has now been lost. Not only that but we now have to suffer the consequences of poor policy making by a govern-

ment and a minister who are out of touch with the South Australian community and their leaseholders.

Adding to the dilemma is the failure of the select committee to do anything that could remedy the problem. The members of the committee, particularly those with obvious interest in leasehold property (such as the member for Chaffey), I believe should have done better and held their ground. This committee was established in an attempt to lessen the financial blow that Minister Hill's increased prices would have on South Australian landholders. However, there has been no dramatic change. Minister Hill's plan to rob the state's primary sector of huge amounts of money is still in place, as is his government's total lack of respect for the rural sector.

Mr Speaker, I know that you would agree with me. I am frustrated by the fact that this issue, which could have been cleaned up three or four years ago, is now being mishandled by a government that is ignorant of the needs of rural South Australians, and I wonder whether it really worries about it. I appreciate having had an audience with the minister on this matter. I cannot see any reason why, in the long term, all lands (including pastoral leases) should not be able to be freeholded. We would need to pass legislation to do that, and I flag to this house that in my remaining years in this place I will work towards that end.

The most important thing is that people who own their land look after it, because it is obvious that if they own their land totally with unalienable rights they will look after it much better because the value of it is theirs and it will be passed down to their families. I hope that Minister Hill, the government and all concerned will put together a package that is affordable.

I agree with this government and the former government that the handling of small leases is out of control, because the cost of administering them is more than the revenue collected from them. I support the government in that respect, but to enable the freeholding process you cannot now charge people who paid for this land at an open auction (with the term 'perpetual lease' written on the bottom line) sums such as \$30 000 to \$40 000 to freehold them. You wonder why there is public resistance.

Not a week goes by without my getting four or five letters from people both within and outside my electorate (including the electorate of Hammond) complaining about how inequitable this is, as they decided when we were in government not to freehold their land because they were given the option to keep on paying the small rental or the \$1 500 fee that we had in place at the time. If they had known back then that that would increase to \$6 000 or that they would have to pay a \$300 administration fee every year, they would have decided otherwise, but now they have no choice.

I hope we can work through this. We were to debate the select committee's report this week but we have not, and I am concerned about that. This is one of the most important issues for me as a rural MP. I am declaring my interest because I own land. All my land is freehold apart from a small bit that has native title. I am very concerned about this issue. I know that I can count on your support, Mr Speaker, and hopefully that of the government as well.

DRAINAGE, WESTERN SUBURBS

Mr CAICA (Colton): I rise on a matter of great concern to many people in South Australia, particularly those in the western suburbs. Unless measures are put in place to resolve

the issues that I raise today and which collectively need to be worked out by all levels of government (local, state and federal), there will be major problems for the residents whom I and the member for West Torrens represent. Today we are enjoying a rain event. I think most people in South Australia would be enjoying it. This is not a one in five, 20 or 100 years event; given the drought to which we have been subjected it is safe to say that it is probably a one in six months event. As I said, most people would be enjoying it, but not some residents of the western suburbs (particularly in Glenelg North) whose houses are suffering from flood problems.

Significant problems have been identified for some time with a flood plain in that area, which does not have the capacity to dispose of that water or to have it retained further upstream. In essence, it is a disaster waiting to happen. I am pleased to report that this government is putting in measures to address flood mitigation in those areas through a memorandum of understanding between all parties. It has worked out an agenda item on flood mitigation for the local government ministers forum which will be given high priority, and the government has also recently enacted stormwater management plans which promote the design of principles for new developments to minimise stormwater run-off.

However, at this point in time I believe there is a difficulty with respect to the Adelaide Airport. For years we have been told that buildings should not be erected on the Adelaide Airport site. It is now in private hands and an abundance of buildings are being erected there. The problem with this is that it is still federal land, and the private owners and the builders are not subject to the planning laws to which you and I and all South Australian citizens would be subject. Although there is no requirement for those people to address stormwater problems, they are contributing to the problem by virtue of the fact that rainwater will run off the buildings that are being constructed. It is a serious issue and needs to be addressed. Recently, in the *Sunday Mail*, the member for Hindmarsh, Chris Gallus—who was, I believe, reported on fairly faithfully the other day by the member for West Torrens—was reported as saying:

This is a problem for both the state and local government, and they have not been responsible in their duties and in addressing these problems. They have known about them for some time.

I say that she is contributing to some of the problems that have existed, that is, the buck-passing that has occurred in the past. She and the federal government need to admit that it is a whole-of-government problem that needs to be resolved, and it can only be resolved by ensuring that people take collective responsibility for what is a whole-of-community problem. I urge Chris Gallus and the federal government to take on board those comments and to ensure that they play the role that they can play in resolving what is a serious issue not just for the people of the western suburbs but for other people throughout South Australia. It is a problem that needs to be worked out collectively.

As I said earlier, I am particularly pleased by a number of matters being addressed by the Minister for Urban Development and Planning and the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Environment and Conservation who are collectively working towards solving these problems. On numerous occasions, difficulties associated with stormwater management have been brought before the Public Works Committee. We know they exist, but it is something that we all have to work together to resolve. Minister Hill has promoted a debate about floodwater being harvested and

reused, and I also congratulate the West Torrens council on its work with respect to a document that it produced called 'A Vision for the Reuse of Waste Water'.

I highlight again that I believe that the comments of Ms Gallus and, indeed, the attitudes of the Adelaide Airport representatives under the control of federal law have been less than helpful in resolving this problem. They should not contribute to the passing of the buck that has occurred in the past. It is not any single council's responsibility and it is not any single state government's responsibility: it is the responsibility of all levels of government to ensure that the development that has occurred over many years is continued in such a way that we recognise the problems and resolve them and ensure that everyone is able to live properly.

MUNDULLA YELLOWS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Today I rise to speak about the tree disease Mundulla yellows, which was first discovered by Geoff Cotton near the township of Mundulla in my electorate more than 20 years ago. One of the concerns that plagued Geoff Cotton for many years was that he could not get anybody to take notice and could not get anybody to take up the cause to try to find out what was causing the death of redgums (*eucalyptus camaldulensis*) in the Mundulla area. Being an apiarist, Geoff was aware that this disease had spread over a wide area and was affecting not only the eucalypt species but also other native species as well.

I have been endeavouring to get funds put into research of this disease since at least 1988 and, after many representations to both the state and federal ministers over the last five years, a small amount—and I emphasise 'small amount' because it is really a paltry amount—has flowed into some research to try to find out what is causing this disease and how we may prevent it spreading further. A small team at the Waite Institute, which is a world-renowned institute in plant biology, has been researching this disease for a number of years now. I have been to visit the laboratories and talk to the scientists involved in this research, and I have seen their outdoor and glasshouse specimens. They have been monitoring for at least five years the transfer of this disease from plant to plant and how these plants handle the disease.

In March 2001 a grant of about \$150 000—in fact, I think it was a little less than that—was made to that research team to continue that work, and the team reported later that year. The department was not very happy with the direction in which the work was going and stopped the funding at that point. Some out-of-contract funding was granted early last year to carry on further work but the funding ceased and the researchers were told to stop their work. Indeed, the original grant of \$100 000 has never been paid and, in fact, I am told that around \$50 000 is still owing to the University of Adelaide for the work that it has completed on behalf of the Department for Environment and Heritage and Environment Australia.

A workshop was held in April last year in Adelaide to assess the work being done at the Waite Institute on this disease, and I am reliably informed that that review workshop unanimously endorsed the work being carried out at the Waite Institute as a top priority. However, the minister and the department chose not to continue funding that particular project and called for tenders and expressions of interest from other institutions to carry out that work and receive the grants.

That tender was called on 6 July last year. I was advised shortly afterwards that, in fact, the grant would be given to the Institute for Horticultural Development at Knoxfield in Victoria, and I made representations to the minister that I thought it was wrong for the minister to send this research funding out of South Australia when very good work and very good progress was being made at the Waite Institute. Notwithstanding that, Knoxfield in Victoria won that tender, and the minister announced that in the house earlier this week. I will speak about some of the things in the minister's statement. He said:

Institutions known to possess the required facilities and expertise were also contacted directly to provide expressions of interest to the tender.

The institute at Knoxfield—and I understand that that was the only one contacted by the department—was contacted because they did not want to compete in this tender: they knew of the work being done at the Waite Institute and also knew that it was proceeding very well, and they did not want to tender against that. They were pressured by the minister's department to tender for this grant. The minister also said that when the tenders closed on 28 October site visits occurred to assess the tenderers. Nobody attended the Waite Institute. Nobody from the department attended the Waite Institute at any time, either when they were carrying out the earlier contract or when assessing the tender from the minister which closed on 28 October.

Time expired.

IRAQ

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Members last night put on the record Saddam Hussein's systematic human rights violations and genocide, and I will not labour the point. I doubt that anyone here doubts that Saddam's regime is murderous, nor do I think that any members here seriously question Saddam's possession of weapons of mass destruction: it is a matter of record. Indeed, the United Nations weapons inspections team's purpose was not to discover if Iraq had weapons of mass destruction but to verify that they had been destroyed as promised at the conclusion of the Gulf War.

But it is a legitimate question to ask: why Iraq, when so many other nations systematically abuse human rights and possess weapons of mass destruction? The answer, as Kym Beazley gave in federal parliament, is simple: Iraq alone has been an aggressor against other nations, using weapons of mass destruction to do so, and has used weapons of mass destruction against its own people. Iraq used mustard gas in its invasion of Iran in the 1980s and used nerve gas on a civilian population to quash a Kurdish uprising. Any members who doubt either Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction or Saddam's eagerness to use them need only view the footage of dead Kurdish mothers clutching their dead children in a vain effort to somehow shield them from the invisible cloud of nerve gas descending over their village.

Remember, also, that Iraq launched missiles against Israel during the Gulf War in a desperate and calculated attempt to broaden the conflict. Saddam is in a league of his own. He is on a quest: a quest to create a new Babylon, to be a latter day Nebuchadnezzar and to forge a pan-Arab superstate over the bodies of Kurds, Shiite Muslims and Jews. Hence his invasion of Iran and his desperate bid to seize Saudi Arabia's oil reserves via Kuwait. No other nation presents so great a

threat to international order. That is the difference and that is the reason for the focus on Iraq.

The member for Colton asked, quite perceptively, why now? Why suddenly turn our attentions to Iraq when the international community has for so long turned a blind eye to Saddam's flouting of the United Nations? The answer is simple: September 11. As Kim Beazley explained to the federal parliament earlier this month, the United States:

... now views just about anything internationally of a military nature through the prism of a potential terrorist attack on the United States.

George Bush, quite rightly, does not want to have it said of him in the event of a terrorist attack that he did not do everything he could to prevent weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists. The most likely way that could happen would be via a rogue state, and Iraq is the prime candidate.

Finally, I want to correct the notion that Israel is just as much in breach of the United Nations by flouting its resolutions. This is an argument that I have heard often, and again I draw upon Kim Beazley's contribution to the House of Representatives earlier this month. Mr Beazley is far more learned in these matters than I am. He explained that the resolutions on Iraq are under chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter. Such resolutions deal with acts of aggression of one state against another. They demand action; that is, they are not mere statements of principle. Flouting such resolutions is a serious breach and is a challenge to the authority of the UN.

Chapter 6 resolutions, such as resolution 242 calling for Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories, are quite different in nature. They are statements of principle designed to help the process of peace and have corresponding obligations on the other party or parties to a conflict. Hence, resolution 242 also states that Israel should have secure and recognised borders and that the call to withdraw is dependent upon that being the case. This is not just an exercise in sophistry. The resolutions of the UN regarding Israel are different in their very nature to those against Iraq. We must also remember that Israel is in the occupied territories because of an invasion.

ROXBY DOWNS SPILL

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I table a ministerial statement on a spill at Roxby Downs made by the Minister for Mineral Resources Development in another place on 19 February.

CODE OF CONDUCT

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

That it is the opinion of this house that a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report no later than 1 October 2003, upon the adoption of a code of conduct for all members of parliament, and in doing so consider:

(a) a code of conduct for all members of parliament, addressing—

- (i) the integrity of parliament;
- (ii) the primacy of the public interest over the furthering of private interests;
- (iii) disclosure of interest;
- (iv) conflict of interest;

- (v) independence of action (including bribery, gifts and personal benefits, sponsored travel/accommodation, paid advocacy);
- (vi) use of entitlements and public resources;
- (vii) honesty to parliament and the public;
- (viii) proper relations with ministers and the Public Service;
- (ix) confidentiality of information;
- (x) appropriate use of information and inside information;
- (xi) government contracts; and
- (xii) duties as a member of parliament;

(b) a procedure for enforcement of the code by parliament that ensures effective investigation and adjudication of complaints, is impartially administered and protects members who are the subject of an allegation in a similar way to a court or professional disciplinary body;

(c) an appropriate method by which parliament should adopt a code (for example, by legislation, resolution, standing order or any other method), taking into consideration how best to engender knowledge and understanding of it by the public as well as by members;

(d) the relationship between the code and statutory requirements for disclosure of members' financial interests; and

(e) an introductory and continuing ethical and constitutional education program for members, having regard to—

- (i) the discussion paper and draft code of conduct for members of parliament prepared by the Legislative Review Committee in 1996;
- (ii) standards of conduct required of public servants by the Public Sector Management Act 1995;
- (iii) the way other jurisdictions (including the United Kingdom and Canada) have developed codes of conduct and draft codes of conduct for members of parliament, enforcement procedures, advisory services for members, introductory and continuing legal education programs and informing the public about the code and its enforcement; and
- (iv) written submissions from members of the public and from persons with expertise in the areas under report;

and in the event of a joint committee being appointed, that the House of Assembly be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

The state government believes that every South Australian parliamentarian should be subject to a rigorous new code of conduct. Before we formed government, this was a major plank in our commitment to South Australians for a more honest and accountable government. We have formulated a 10-point plan to improve honesty and accountability across government because we want to restore honesty and propriety to the processes of government in South Australia.

It is true to say that, in the past eight years, standards of public administration suffered in this state, particularly prior to the last election. That had to be turned around for the sake of this parliament and for democracy in this state. Last July I introduced a package of legislative amendments known as the honesty and accountability in government series of bills. That package was the beginning of the process of ensuring the highest standards of honesty, accountability and transparency in government in this state enshrined in the law of this state.

I also announced the introduction of a tough, comprehensive new code of conduct for ministers. The new ministerial code of conduct recognises that ministers are in a position of trust, bestowed on them by the people and parliament of South Australia. It recognises that ministers are responsible for decisions that have a marked impact on individuals and groups in this state. For these reasons, it emphasises that ministers must accept standards of conduct of the highest order. The new code of conduct for ministers is one of the toughest codes of conduct applying to ministers in this

country. Unlike the previous code of conduct that existed in this state, the new code prevents ministers from actively acquiring shareholdings and other financial interests in companies during their term of office, and prevents ministers from trading, that is, buying or selling any shares that were held by them before taking up office.

In my case the only shares I own are in Charlton Athletic. Not only would I never sell those shares but also it is probably doubtful that I would receive anything for the shares if I did try to sell them at a future date when I was not a minister, although they we are doing better than we have since 1947.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That's right. Manchester United has the theatre of dreams: we have the valley of tears. For example, ministers can retain only those shares that do not conflict with their portfolio responsibilities, and if there is a conflict they must divest those shares. The code requires ministers to disclose to cabinet office the details of any private interests of their spouse, domestic partner, children or business associates that might conflict with their duty as a minister. The code requires ministers to disclose to cabinet office the content of family trusts.

The code prevents ministers from acting as consultants or advisers to companies and organisations during their term of office except in their official capacity as a minister. The code places a two year restriction on the type of employment activities, consultancies and directorships that ministers can take up after they have ceased to be a minister. The code prevents ministers from employing members of their immediate families or close business associates to positions in their own offices.

The code sets out specific obligations in relation to cabinet confidentiality and details procedures for the disclosure of conflicts of interest in respect of matters going before cabinet. The new code also defines more clearly the type of action that the Premier or cabinet may take against ministers who are in breach of the code, whether it be a reprimand, requiring an apology or asking the minister to stand aside or resign. That essentially recognises honest mistakes, inadvertence and things such as those. Commonsense must prevail.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am not looking at the honourable member: I try not to. The code came into effect on 1 July last year. The state government believes that if we set the highest standards, and importantly meet them, we will contribute to renewed public confidence in the standing of government and indeed of parliament. That is what our community in South Australia expects and deserves.

The government also introduced a package of legislation last year to give new scope to the independent watchdogs—the Ombudsman and the Auditor-General—and to require higher standards of accountability for those who work in and with government. The Ombudsman (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Amendment Act 2002 was assented to on 28 November last year but it is yet to be proclaimed because the regulations are currently being drafted. The act broadens the powers of the Ombudsman to ensure that he can, of his own accord, undertake administrative audits of government agencies. It also extends the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to include the investigation of administrative acts arising from the outsourcing of government functions.

The Public Finance and Audit (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Amendment Bill 2002 was passed by this house last year and is currently being debated in the Legis-

lative Council. The bill requires government to produce a charter of budget honesty, as South Australians deserve to know what the government is doing with their money. It also extends the authority of the Auditor-General to investigate publicly funded projects and government contracts.

The final bill in this series of honesty and accountability legislation is the Statutes Amendment (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Bill 2002. The bill is based on the belief of this government that all senior executives, employees and others in the public sector should be subject to the highest obligations to act honestly and ethically in the interests of the South Australian community. To this end, the bill, among other things, gives explicit legislative backing to the code of conduct for South Australian public sector employees. It imposes a general obligation on directors, chief executives and all employees to act honestly in the performance of their duties. This even includes contractors who perform government work. A failure to comply with these provisions will, in most instances, constitute an offence.

For the first time in this state the bill requires all senior executives of public corporations to disclose in writing their pecuniary interests, including the interests of any associates. It also requires senior executives and employees of public corporations to declare any conflict between their interests and duties. Similar conflict of interest obligations are placed on members of advisory boards such as the Economic Development Board, senior officials and on all public sector employees. That bill is currently before the upper house.

The government believes that, following this raft of comprehensive legislation, we now need to take matters further. It is important for the actions of all members of parliament and not just ministers to be open to scrutiny. At the moment there is no code of conduct in South Australia for opposition members—front bench or back bench—government backbenchers, independent members or, indeed, officers of the parliament. Now we want to go further to cover all members.

The people of South Australia deserve the highest standards of accountability. A tough new code will protect the public, the parliament and individual members of this place. This is about commonsense. The state government believes that there are too many grey areas. It is proposed that the code will address a whole range of issues that cover the integrity of parliament, the primacy of the public interest over the furthering of private interests, disclosure of interest and independence of action.

The government proposes that the code should also address the use of entitlements and public resources covering areas such as honesty to the parliament and the public, proper relations with ministers and the public service, the confidentiality of information, the appropriate use of information and inside information, the duties of a member of parliament and government contracts.

It is proposed that the joint committee will also explore the value of an ongoing education program for members of parliament on ethical and constitutional matters. If we are to properly enforce such a code, ministers must have the opportunity to be fully informed and kept up to date with the issues involved. We believe that a code of conduct for members will not only give voters the reassurance of the standards of their parliamentarians but will offer protection for members of parliament themselves.

The code should consider a procedure of enforcement that is likely to be similar to a professional disciplinary body. There must be effective investigation and adjudication of

complaints. We believe that it is crucial that this code be impartially administered if it is to enjoy both bipartisan and community support.

We would not be alone in adopting such a code. In the United Kingdom codes of conduct for members of both houses of parliament are based on recommendations of the Committee on Standards of Public Life. That committee was established to recommend codes of conduct for members of parliament, ministers, local government, boards and public servants. The result in the United Kingdom is a consistency of standards for all those groups in public life.

Queensland has its own code of conduct for all MPs. In fact, it is the most comprehensive recent code of all the Australian parliaments. The Western Australian parliament has a draft code of conduct out for discussion. The ACT Legislative Assembly is in a similar position, but has referred the preparation of a code to its Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure.

The New South Wales codes were developed after what became known as the 'Metherell affair' in which Terry Metherell, as a retiring minister, was offered appointment to a senior public service position. The Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) Act of 1988 required recognised standards of conduct for all members of parliament. Interestingly, the New South Wales parliament has appointed a parliamentary ethics adviser to advise members on request, although this is not an investigatory role. A solution here might be to give the role of ethics adviser to the Clerk of the parliament. I hope that will be considered by the members of the joint committee.

It is proposed that the joint committee comprise three members from each house and that the committee report no later than 1 October this year. We did not shirk from the responsibilities of ensuring the highest standards of honesty and accountability in government established by law. In the same way, I look forward to members of this parliament working together in a bipartisan way to come up with a code that helps restore the community's faith in us, which does not impede our work on behalf of the public but which is about commonsense and decent practice.

I know that the Deputy Speaker has ideas on an oath re parliamentary conduct at members' swearing in, in addition to the loyal oath, and maybe this could be considered by the committee when it is established. I commend this measure to the house.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.J. Atkinson:

That this house—

- (a) draws the attention of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission (the 'Commission') to:
- (i) the Constitutional Convention proposed by the government; and
 - (ii) the likelihood that the convention will make recommendations about the number of state districts;
- (b) recommends that the commission should complete its deliberations after
- (i) the convention has made its recommendations to parliament; and
 - (ii) the parliament has deliberated upon such recommendations; and

(c) requests that the due diligence required of the commission pursuant to section 82(3) of the Constitution Act 1934 be interpreted in the context of the government's support for the convention and its possible outcomes;

and it is the opinion of this house that if the commission's deliberations are not unduly accelerated, more accurate and more current demographic information relating to population dispersal and trends potentially affecting the boundaries of the state districts will become available to the commission late this year, which will enable the commission to be better able to decide state district boundaries in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution Act.

(Continued from 5 June 2002. Page 526.)

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

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Motion carried.

ELECTRICITY (PRICING ORDER) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 2191.)

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I rise on behalf of the opposition to support this legislation. In so doing, in the manner which the government would expect, I pay it a compliment for introducing this legislation to the house, because it facilitates an important measure that, in particular, protects rural South Australians. The background to this bill is that, as part of the electricity reform and sale program implemented by the Liberal government, a commitment was given to South Australians living in rural areas that they would not pay more than 1.7 per cent more for their electricity prices than those paid by equivalent small electricity consumers. This commitment was met by the Liberal government through what was known as the country equalisation scheme, and that was established under clause 8.2 of the electricity pricing order bill. The country equalisation scheme effectively came into effect from 1 January this year under electricity pricing order.

The Essential Services Commission is required to issue an equivalent country rate equal effectively to 101.7 per cent of charges for city customers for that size and load shape. However, 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 detailed in the electricity pricing order, is effectively unworkable and, as a consequence, made recommendations for changes to that pricing order. The opposition understands that this bill, therefore, has been introduced retrospectively effectively to authorise further amendments to the electricity pricing order such that were issued by the Liberal government on 11 October 1999 and section 35B of the Electricity Act.

The government has made amendments to the electricity pricing order that are referred to in this bill by a reference to a notice the government placed in the *Government Gazette* of 5 December 2002 (page 4 458). In fact, the mechanism being used by the government is very similar to a mechanism that was used by a Liberal government during implementation of the order in the first instance. Importantly, section 35B(7)(b) of the Electricity Act provides that an electricity pricing order cannot be varied except as contemplated by the electricity pricing order itself and cannot be

revoked. This provision was included by the Liberal government so as to give some certainty to all participants. That includes the electricity supply participants and their customers at the time of considerable change that was brought about by the introduction of the national electricity market and the leasing of the state's electricity businesses.

The dilemma that the government faced is one the opposition appreciates, that is, in view of the number of ways in which electricity prices can be and will be able to be charged to small electricity use customers, it effectively was not possible for the Essential Services Commissioner to set a dollar rate per megawatt hour that would deliver the intent of the Liberal government's initial undertaking and commitment to country South Australians—that being they would pay no more than 1.7 per cent above the prices that were being paid by equivalent small city-based consumers. This occurs essentially because clause 8.2 of the electricity pricing order details a very prescriptive approach for determining the equivalent country rate, specifically requiring that the rate be calculated as a dollar per megawatt hour rate.

As a consequence, the Essential Services Commissioner suggested to the government that the 1.7 per cent effectively be applied to each package offered to city customers. Of course, the dilemma that the Essential Services Commissioner found was that, particularly when there can be a variety of usages of electricity in quantity but that a standard supply charge is levied against a consumer, there can be quite disparate amounts paid per megawatt hour because of the existence of the supply charge. If the Essential Services Commissioner were to set a dollar per megawatt hour rate based on the disparate amounts that were in existence, if it were to be fair to the electricity retailers, that rate would have to be set quite high. However, that would not deliver to country consumers the 1.7 per cent no greater than price intent.

So I applaud in the first instance the Essential Services Commissioner for pointing out to the government that the requirement of him under the electricity pricing order was not possible to implement as was intended. As a consequence of that, a considerable amount of work has been done by Treasury and Finance, the Crown Solicitor's office, parliamentary counsel and no doubt the minister's staff to incorporate a revised clause 8.2 of the electricity prices order, and this bill facilitates that change. The opposition also notes that the bill further facilitates some procedural amendments to change references to 'Treasurer' in the principal act to read as 'minister,' and those are sensible changes, particularly in light of the fact that the Treasurer is no longer the Minister for Energy. In fact, during the last few months of the Liberal government the Treasurer did not have that responsibility. These amendments have been sitting waiting for an opportunity, and the opposition also believes that they should occur.

I note that, in undertaking its consultation on the bill, the government has obviously approached AGL as existing sole retailer but, importantly, TXU and Origin Energy who are expected to enter the market later this year. It is my understanding that all three companies are satisfied with the proposed changes.

I also note at this time that, thankfully, no rural South Australian has been disadvantaged by the existing problem with the electricity pricing order in that AGL as a sole retailer is not charging a differential rate for country South Australians. The opposition is gratified that the impost has not been levied on country South Australians to that effect.

Of course, as noble as this piece of legislation is (and, as I indicated, I applaud the government for introducing it in a timely manner), regrettably the legislation cannot save country South Australians, nor any South Australian, from the other impost that has been implemented from 1 January this year; that is, the unacceptable and atrocious increase in their electricity prices to the tune of 32 per cent. It does not matter how this issue is looked at, that increase is unacceptable and it is one that South Australians ought not have to sustain. I do note that the government in its consultation has spoken to Origin Energy and TXU, who will be entering the market. It disappoints me that Origin Energy and TXU were not active participants in the market from 1 January, so that all South Australians might have some joy in relation to electricity prices. But for this government's laxity in bringing forward their code changes to facilitate the commencement of the national market from 1 January this year, that competition could have been in place.

I have volunteered to this house before that very quickly after becoming responsible for electricity at the end of 2001 I did meet with potential players in the market, and it was very obvious that Origin Energy and TXU were going to be part of that entry. Those companies put to me that, in order to be ready to retail electricity to householders from 1 January this year, they needed the code changes in place by 30 June 2002. I gave them a commitment that, if our government was to continue in office after the election, that would be delivered. Those code changes would be in place by 30 June 2002 to ensure that at least they had a fair and reasonable opportunity of being in that market by 1 January.

The new minister on coming into office knew of that commitment and he knew of that deadline. He knew that by 30 June 2002 the code changes had to be in place. When did we see the facilitation of that through this parliament? Not before—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The minister interjects 'white car'. He may well put his backside in a white car, but it is a matter of public record that I did not accept a white car, nor a driver; and it is a matter of public record that I object to the way in which white cars are allocated and used. The last time this was raised, I put on the public record the costs and savings as a result. I am happy to do that again if the minister wants to tackle that. The minister might try to divert me from the topic, but the fact is that these things will be said whether or not the minister likes it.

The fact is that those changes did not come to the parliament in order to facilitate the code changes by 30 June 2002. That meant that when those changes came to this parliament, as I said to the parliament at the time, there was no chance—I emphasise 'no chance'—of competition in the market by 1 January 2003. This means that South Australians had no chance whatsoever of a fair and reasonable chance of being offered other opportunities.

It does not end there. It is not just the issue of there not being competition in the market. The other issue is that the government rolled over and had its tummy tickled on the 32 per cent increase. I contrast the situation with the Labor government in Victoria. That government also has what the minister would refer to as a privatised system, a similar system to that of South Australia. The Labor government in Victoria entered the national market from 1 January 2002. When the Labor government in Victoria received its submissions from electricity companies for increases, one of the many submissions it received was from AGL, which also

markets electricity in Victoria, as indeed it does in New South Wales.

AGL is a company that has been involved in the business for quite some time. When it wanted to enter the market in Victoria, it applied for a 15 per cent price increase. When the Labor government in Victoria was confronted with a 15 per cent price increase, it said, 'No, the Victorian public would not be subjected to a 15 per cent increase'. What was Victoria given? It was given a price increase not of 15 per cent but one of 4.7 per cent. At the time that occurred, AGL was not particularly happy about it. It was so unhappy about it that it made a number of public statements. The public statements were to the effect that it would be difficult for it to meet its company commitments and expectations and that it would have difficulty in making a profit from the fee that had been set. Some commentators even went so far as to suggest that the Labor government in Victoria might even be creating a Californian type situation and have people walk away from retailing in Victoria.

None of those things happened, but something interesting did happen. From 1 February 2003, AGL's new price increase for Victoria applied. It is interesting to reflect on what AGL applied for as its electricity increase for this year. It did not try to put forward its 15 per cent increase; it did not even go for a 4.7 increase again. Rather, it applied for an increase of just 2 per cent. Victorians have a 2 per cent increase from AGL and South Australians have a 32 per cent increase. The big difference is that this government has rolled over and had its tummy tickled in relation to electricity prices.

It is not only the opposition that is saying this because it goes wider. The Minister for Energy, and indeed his colleagues, were oft quoters of a number of people in relation to electricity issues, but they were a frequent quoter of Dr Robert Booth—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is important to look at what Dr Robert Booth has to say about the electricity situation today. I am aware that Dr Robert Booth had a number of things to say about the electricity situation when the Liberal Party was in government. I am certainly aware that our minister at the time and our government were not particularly enamoured by the comments made by Dr Booth, but that is the way of government, and negative comments are made about what you do. This government cannot walk away from the comments that Dr Booth has made about it.

I know that the minister can come into this house and throw quotes at me which have been put on the record by him and his colleagues previously regarding aspects of electricity management by the former Liberal government. I know he can do that, although I hasten to add that those comments were made when I was not the electricity minister. Let us look principally at what Dr Robert Booth has said about this government and the administration under this minister—and they make interesting reading.

This minister has continually said that electricity prices are not his responsibility; rather, they are the responsibility of the Essential Services Commission. In relation to the Essential Services Commission, Dr Robert Booth has described them as being:

... altogether too generous and uncritical of AGL and pay too little regard to what an economically efficient player operating under effectively competitive positions would be able to charge.

Dr Booth went further and also said:

There is no fundamental reason why electricity tariffs in South Australia should be increasing above the inflation rate—let alone by over 10 times that rate in one step.

Dr Booth also makes comments in relation to the Essential Services Commission's examination of the allowances made to generators. He has some interesting things to say in relation to plants.

Mr Koutsantonis: He certainly does.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In relation to capital costs of gas turbine plants, Dr Booth says:

The real new entrant power costs to new plants and for existing plants is much lower than the estimates used.

And he is referring to those of the Essential Services Commission. In relation to Essential Services Commission guidelines, he states:

In all cases the guidelines are well in excess of the allowances made in other states and because of this very real high tariff increases are being proposed in South Australia.

All this happens against an interesting backdrop, and the interesting backdrop is a very simple one. On the very first day of the state election campaign—which actually saw a majority vote returned for the Liberal Party, not the Labor Party—the now Treasurer, Kevin Foley, said:

If you want cheaper electricity you vote for a Mike Rann Labor government.

The minister might like to share with this house where those cheaper electricity prices are. I wonder whether Labor's plans are somewhat more insidious. The government knows full well that, with new market entrants coming into the market later this year, electricity prices will come down. It knows that they will come down from where they are now. And it knows that they will come down for one further reason: the wholesale prices that AGL contracted to were contracted some 18 months ahead of the start of summer, and the government knows full well that AGL can achieve a better wholesale contract price rate for the next round for the next summer.

With new market entrants coming into the market with a better wholesale price, it stands to reason that there is a good chance of progressively tumbling electricity prices. If one wants to maximise that as a government that might want to manipulate public opinion (and we have certainly seen a lot of that from this government), and if you are going with a big hit and the prices come tumbling down (particularly after you have been in government for a year), you can give the impression that you actually achieved it.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, sir. The honourable member is plainly imputing improper motives not only to me as minister but to Lew Owens as the Essential Services Commissioner who, after all, did set the price, and I would ask him to withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I am not of the opinion that the member for Bright was imputing improper motives to the extent that I would force him to withdraw. In his reply, the minister is more than capable of dealing with any matters the member for Bright has put to the house with which he disagrees. The member for Bright.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: A government, in that scenario, could come out and appear to be the hero for dropping prices. Well, that could be a situation that a

government might seek. If prices do come down, and I suspect they will, it will be only because of new market participants, with competition driving that down, and also the new contracted wholesale prices. It is worth reflecting on one of the principal reasons why the wholesale prices for electricity are becoming significantly better in South Australia. Under a Liberal government, in its last three years of office, there was a 37 per cent increase in total power generation capacity within the state.

It is worth my putting on the record where that increase in power generation occurred. I will list for the house the generators that opened, when they opened and the capacity therein: the Osborne cogeneration plant opened in December 1998, putting out, at that time, 175 megawatts; the Origin Energy plant at Ladbroke Grove opened in December 1999 with 72 megawatts additional capacity; and Australian National Power, as it was then, at Pelican Point, opened its first phase in November 2000 with 165 megawatts and later in March 2001 with a further 285 megawatts.

That particular plant was vociferously opposed by the Labor Party right throughout. Labor Party members were involved heavily in opposing that plant and in encouraging activists to oppose the plant. It did not matter what meetings Liberal cabinet ministers attended: they were regularly confronted with a barricade of protesters holding up images of pelicans on sticks opposing that particular plant. However, that plant has served South Australians well. The minister, I am sure, would know full well that if he did not have that plant today we would have had very serious electricity problems indeed.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: If we had not had a Liberal government we would not have had a 25 per cent increase, and everyone knows it.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The minister is correct. He interjects that if we had a Liberal government we would not have had a 25 per cent increase in electricity prices. No, we would not have.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, sir. That is not what I said. I said, if there had not been a Liberal government there would not have been a 25 per cent increase.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I will ask the member for Bright to keep his comments relevant to the bill. It is not a licence to stray into general government policy. A specific bill is before the house and I ask the shadow minister to keep to those matters.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The other power stations that have opened—and these are relevant because they produce the electricity that ultimately—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, sir. I was going to let it go but, sir, you just ruled that it should be relevant. There is absolutely no relevance to the very simple matter of our providing a legislative mechanism for ensuring that country prices can only be 1.7 per cent higher than those offered to small customers in the city. The member for Bright, while giving lip service to the chair's recommendation, has simply continued on his merry way.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will allow the member for Bright to continue, but I will ask him to keep in mind my earlier ruling. As I said, the second reading contributions on a bill are not licence to stray into generalities of the minister's portfolio. There are other opportunities to do that. I will ask the member for Bright to keep his comments relevant to the bill.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Before the minister's interjections and his rising to his feet in this place, I was

about to say that the next two are, indeed, both rural power stations. The power station at Cummins was launched in January 2002, a further 20 megawatts; the power station at Hallett, an AGL station, 45 megawatts from January 2002; and, of course, Origin Energy opened its quarantine station from January 2002 with 95 megawatts. That was a total of 857 megawatts of additional power generated in South Australia for use by South Australians in just three years. That was a 37 per cent addition to our electricity regenerating capacity, taking our new capacity at that time to 3 163 megawatts.

That is what happened because of some private sector involvement in South Australia. They built those power stations and helped to divert what could have been a significant power crisis for South Australia had that new capacity not been there. I dread to think what would have happened to South Australians (country or city) if Labor had its way and Pelican Point had not been built. What was Labor's option? Labor did not want Pelican Point built; in fact, their leader Mike Rann put out a pledge card on electricity. He said, 'We'll fix our electricity system, and an interconnector to New South Wales will be built to bring in cheaper power.'

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, in the interests of finishing what is an important matter for the people of South Australia, could we please have some relevance to the debate? I know that this is a complex matter, but you do need to talk about it even if you do not understand it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order! I did not hear the specific comments, but I again bring to the member for Bright's attention my previous ruling and ask him to confine his comments to the bill.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Do you understand the bill? Perhaps if you understood it—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The minister might carry on like a thug and a bully in his own party room, but this is the parliament.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, the member for Bright is now getting excited. He should apologise and withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I direct that the member for Bright apologise and withdraw.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In the interests of moving the debate ahead, I apologise to the house and withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I accept the member's apology.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: As I said at the start, I congratulate the minister for introducing this bill because it ensures that country South Australians will get this 1.7 per cent protection, but the point is that that 1.7 per cent protection above city prices pales into insignificance against the 32 per cent slug that they are already facing. It is not 25 per cent but 32 per cent from 1 January this year—and in one hit. By any measure, that is unacceptable. We have seen all sorts of—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I am particularly concerned about pensioners and people on a low income, who have got a particularly bad deal out of this. This would have been an opportune time for the government to address the extra hurt that is experienced by those people. The concession rate for electricity for pensioners and low income earners has not been varied by this mean-hearted government.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Before the election, the government undertook to its members to match the budgeted increase in electricity concessions for pensioners and low income earners and the budgeted allocation for self-funded retirees who were not previously getting such a concession. Many people in South Australia received those assurances directly from members who now sit in this house and from Labor—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, is there any constraint upon the subjects to be traversed, because we have heard about every single thing that is vaguely connected with electricity? This is a simple bill which purports to help the people of South Australia. Can we get on with it?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I also point out that interjections from members on my right do not assist in my keeping good order in the chamber. There will be an opportunity for the minister to reply and there will also be an opportunity for members on my right to make a contribution. I want to keep the debate on the bill in front of me, but bear in mind that I will be consistent in my rulings for other members who also wish to contribute to the debate. If I give some small amount of latitude to the member for Bright, I will also do that for other members who wish to contribute to the debate later. The member for Bright should keep that in mind, but I ask that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! —members on my right assist me in keeping order by keeping their interjections to a minimum and not constantly interrupting, and unnecessarily prolonging, the member for Bright's speech.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Country South Australians will be protected by this legislation to ensure that they do not pay more than 1.7 per cent above the price paid by equivalent city customers. If they are pensioners or low income earners, they would have been even more appreciative of having the concession pledges that were made before the last election honoured, but it seems that the election policies and promises of the Labor Party are given the equivalent status of the rolls of toilet paper that are put into their administrative offices, because all too often those policies and promises are discarded and flushed away. That is a travesty and a tragedy for South Australians.

Those issues cannot be covered today because the government has reneged on them and refused to bring them before the house to resolve them for all South Australians, but at least in this instance the minister has brought legislation to remedy an anomaly. I believe that the formula that has been put together to cover this anomaly is workable, provides a fair system and ensures that the commitment that was given to rural South Australians is put into effect and honoured. I look forward to the passage of this bill to ensure that the South Australian rural community at least gets part of the protection that it deserves with this 1.7 per cent, even though it will not get the protection of the Labor government's 32 per cent.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I was not going to say anything about this bill, but I was so moved by the contribution of the member for Bright that I feel I must say a few things about it. I will begin by putting this whole electricity problem into some context. In doing this, it is important that I place formally on the record that I strongly support this legislation and the effect that it will have in assisting country South Australians to be spared some of the more unpleasant consequences of electricity price rises which otherwise might have come their way.

Let us look at why we have this present problem. I was talking to my four-year-old son the other day, and he was explaining to me that he and other children at the kindergarten were quite au fait with the fact that if you place a monopoly in the hands of private business they rig it for all it is worth. If my four-year-old son understands that selling off a monopoly state asset to private individuals will result in their maximising their profits to shareholders and screwing the public by the neck until it has almost expired every year, indefinitely—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RAU: He is four and he has worked that out.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Did you tell him about the State Bank as well?

Mr RAU: He was not born then. This four-year-old has worked out something to which the previous government—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RAU: —apparently had not twigged. If you take a state monopoly such as electricity and hand it over to private individuals, they will wring it for all it is worth. And that is exactly what they are doing. That is why, plainly and simply, we have power price increases. The other thing I was explaining to my four year old son was the attitude of Her Majesty's opposition in this state about electricity supplies. He said, 'Why is it that the member for Bright and other people keep on getting up and asking questions of the Minister for Energy about this and keep making these statements about how this government is responsible for the price increases?'

You have to think of how you can explain it to a four year old, so I told him that it is a bit like an arsonist who has just set fire to hundreds of thousands of hectares of properties, causing untold loss of livestock, crops and homes, defending himself by attacking the fact that the CFS arrived a few minutes late, or they only brought three fire trucks and not five or, when they finally got there, one of the tanks was empty, trying to shift the issue from the fact that he was the arsonist who started the fire to the fact that the people who have been sent in to clean it up are having some difficulty dealing with the magnitude of the mess he has caused.

The situation we are dealing with here is that the member for Bright and his colleagues went to an election some years ago promising solemnly that they would not get rid of the state's asset full stop, no questions asked, that is it. They then did a backflip in a few weeks, decided they were going to sell it and, in the process, have created a mess so big that even—

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, I have been sitting here listening to the debate and the points of order that have been raised by the minister, and your rulings on them, and hearing you ask the opposition spokesman on this matter to come back to somewhere near what we are debating. I think that the member on his feet at the moment has strayed.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I gather the gist of the member for MacKillop's point of order. I am closely listening

to the member for Enfield's contribution. I am sure that he is about to bring his comments to the bill in question, and I look forward to his doing so.

Mr RAU: As I was saying, just because the opposition has created a mess so large that even an individual of the incredible capabilities of the Minister for Energy has not in 12 months been able to clean it all up does not in any way detract from the merit of this bill. What a marvellous bill it is, protecting those pensioners out there in the country. The member for Stuart has many constituents who otherwise would have been savaged by the Liberal Party-inspired increases in electricity prices but who now are being spared, and I know he will be telling the good news to his constituents. It is good news for people in the country.

It is a magnificent bill. And is it not marvellous to know that in the Minister for Energy we have someone who is not daunted by the fact that he is confronting a mess of the sort of proportion that most people would just give up on. They would find it too much. I would like to take up another theme, in trying to support this magnificent piece of legislation.

I would like to pick up on a particular theme that the member for Bright touched on, which was the toilet rolls in ministerial offices. He mentioned that, so I think it is legitimate that I address it. He suggested that people were being treated much like the material there. He only dealt with a certain aspect of what happened to it but I think he was leaving it to our imagination that other things happened to it as well. That reminded me of a great Australian vernacular expression that refers to a very special kind of sandwich. Because we are in parliament I am going to refer to it as a special sandwich. This special sandwich is folkloric for Australians. It appears in all different places at all different times. It is the sort of thing that all of us have at times alluded to and, unfortunately, from time to time all have to have a munch on.

What has happened is that the member for Bright and his colleagues spent approximately four years with a knife, some butter and a great deal of material to go into these sandwiches and made a huge pile of them. And approximately 11½ months ago they handed most of them, although not all (because the Treasurer also got several of them), to the Minister for Energy and said, 'Here you are: you wanted this job, now you've got it. Work your way through these.' And he has been manfully working his way through them. Even though he is sick to the back teeth of munching on them, he continues to do so. It is a tribute to him and his digestive powers that he has been able to work through so much of this rather unpleasant material.

It is part of the process of working through this plateful of special sandwiches that has resulted in this legislation, and I am delighted to see that everyone in the chamber is supporting it, albeit for different reasons. Those on the other side are supporting it out of a feeling of embarrassment for what they have done to us all, I suppose. We over here are supporting it on the basis of anything to lighten the minister's load as he stares at that plate, which is diminishing day by day but which is still an awesome spectacle.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It'll be crayfish soon!

Mr RAU: I hope it does become crayfish sooner or later, because it is still an awesome spectacle, a massive plate. This is a tribute to the minister and to the government, and I take great pleasure in supporting this bill.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): It amazes me that members will come to the chamber and proudly debate a bill

using the logic of a four year old child, because that is what we have just heard.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Didn't go over your head, did it?

Mr WILLIAMS: No, it certainly didn't go over my head, but it has convinced me that the member for Enfield has not only a very limited grasp of economic theory but has no understanding of what this bill is about. For the edification of the member for Enfield I will just go over where this bill has come from. In the last parliament, when the Liberal government was seeking to divest the public of South Australia of the risk posed by owning what I will refer to as the old ETSA assets and to bring private enterprise into investing in generation in South Australia, it was my vote that gave the last number to get the series of bills through this chamber. I amended several parts of the legislation, and one of the amendments which I brought and which was carried through the house was one that protected country consumers.

The best information that I could ascertain at the time was that it cost up to 1.7 per cent more to deliver electricity to some of the far-flung country communities in South Australia. I thought that, if we were going to encourage private enterprise to be involved in generation and distribution of electricity in South Australia, then it was only fair and reasonable that country consumers be protected, and I was able to convince the government of the day that that should be enshrined in legislation.

The minister now brings to the house a bill to slightly modify that part of the legislation, because in a practical sense, in the way that electricity tariffs are made up of several components today, it was very difficult to adhere to the letter of the law as it stood, and the minister has brought this before the house to modify that so that the intent of the original legislation can be maintained and, in a practical sense, the bills can reflect that intent without becoming overly burdensome and complicated. So, I am fully supportive of the legislation. My understanding is that, in fact, it does just that—protects country consumers—while, at the same time, acknowledging the real cost to the providers of the infrastructure to distribute electricity.

But, a lot of other things have been canvassed in this debate and I briefly want to touch on some of them. The member for Enfield gave us his understanding of economic theory and monopolies, etc., but, first, he failed to acknowledge that the one other major energy source in South Australia is natural gas and, secondly, that it was a previous Labor government that sold SAGASCO, which was a state-owned monopoly company which provided the infrastructure for the sale and distribution of gas in South Australia. The member for Enfield might also be interested to know that, at the time that that was sold, over 80 per cent of households in South Australia had access to natural gas via the SAGASCO infrastructure. So, for the member for Enfield to come in here and say that this is something that a Liberal government would do and something that a Labor government would never countenance, is absolute nonsense.

As the shadow minister (the member for Bright) has ably pointed out, one of the things that underpinned the decision, certainly on my part, to allow for the long-term lease—which has often been called privatisation—of those ETSA assets was to bring private enterprise and the investment of the private sector into our electricity system, particularly in relation to generation. South Australia was in dire need of new generation—and I will not go through the names of the generators and the dates and their capacities—but, as the member for Bright rightly pointed out, in the last three years

of Liberal government in South Australia, generation capacity increased by some 37 per cent, and it was all paid for by private investors.

Imagine where the Treasurer would be today and how much hair he would have left if those assets were not privatised and if that money was not used to pay off the debt, and the previous government had to go out and borrow literally hundreds, if not billions, of dollars to build 800 megawatts of generation. Imagine where the taxpayers of South Australia would be today if that was the scenario. We had no choice, and for this minister and his colleagues on the front bench (the Premier and the Treasurer) to say that the increase in prices of electricity in South Australia over the last couple of years has anything to do with privatisation is an absolute nonsense. What really disappoints me—in fact, I think it disgusts me—is that the Premier, the Treasurer and this minister know that it is a nonsense, but for base political reasons they continue to go out into the community and peddle this nonsense. If it was not for the fact that I do not want to be unparliamentary, I would call it what it actually is, and it is a lot worse than nonsense.

South Australia was in dire need of generation capacity. The state had been left in a mess by the previous Labor governments and did not have the financial capacity to build generators. When the old ETSA organisation came to the government in 1996 and said, 'We need extra generation capacity and we need to upgrade Torrens Island,' the government of the day said, 'What sort of money will it cost to upgrade Torrens Island to allow us to escape blackouts in the immediate future?' I am told that the advice was that Torrens Island would require about \$600 million worth of refurbishment and upgrading. The South Australian taxpayer had been left in such a state that that money was not available. I ask the minister to contemplate why the people of South Australia found themselves in that position. It is because of the absolute mismanagement of a government—almost a monopoly, as the old State Bank and SGIC were: they had a very large share of the South Australian market—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Acting Speaker, we are now on the State Bank.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have been giving the member for MacKillop some latitude, but I think he is now going well beyond the scope of what is even remotely to do with the bill in front of us, and I ask the member for MacKillop to bring his comments back to the subject of the bill.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you for your direction, Mr Acting Speaker, and I will be delighted to come back to the bill; I will be delighted to hear what the minister has to say; and I will be delighted also to hear him talk about electricity prices without mentioning privatisation. I would be delighted if the minister could do that, because he has been totally unable to do it for the last couple of years. He knows that 90 per cent of what he says is nonsense but, fortunately, the public of South Australia largely understands that as well. They saw the pledge card.

I have brought out the nonsense that is being put out by government ministers. Let me come back to the protection of the price of electricity for country consumers of electricity. I am very disturbed that there is one tariff which impacts on only country consumers—I think it impacts on only country farming consumers—involving the service charge, which is now at \$67 per quarter, whereas the service charge for just about every other tariff in the state is some \$23 and a few cents per quarter. I cannot understand, if this minister and this government had any compassion for country people and were

serious in saying that they brought this bill into the house to protect country people, why this minister signed off on that increased service charge. The minister has said in the house this week that he was unaware of it and, when it was pointed out that he was aware of it because one of our members had written to him months ago, he said, 'I didn't say I was unaware of it. I said I didn't realise it was such a big issue.' Yet, he has the temerity to come into this house—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: —and say that he is interested in keeping electricity prices—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You actually have to sit down now.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member has not only strayed from the bill, but he is misleading the house. My other option is a matter of privilege. I do not want a substantive motion to be dealt with, but he is plainly not telling the truth.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but I will ask the member for MacKillop again, as nicely as I can, to stick to the bill in front of us.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I may be wrong but I thought that the minister in his second reading speech suggested that this bill was about protecting the price that country consumers are charged for electricity. I am concerned about one small sector of the South Australian community being slugged a service charge of \$67 per quarter on a meter.

I will explain that I operate a farm, and on that farm I have several electricity points. They are generally remote from my home and remote from each other. They are used for things such as shearing sheds so that we can run electric motors for a shearing machine to shear sheep and run wool presses, and things like that. We have irrigation pumps, which are all over country areas. Every one has a meter. I have one shearing shed that I use for a bit of crutching—we probably use \$5 worth of electricity per year on it, yet it will cost my business \$67 per quarter just to have the supply there. It is not as though it is out in a remote area—the supply goes straight past to the house, which is a couple of hundred metres from the shearing shed, but it is owned by a different person, so it is on a different meter and there is no capacity to combine the meters. That is why I have brought up the matter. I wish the minister would take that matter very seriously because it is impacting heavily on many country and rural people.

I congratulate the minister for bringing to the house a bill that maintains the integrity of what the parliament tried to do back when it agreed to the privatisation or long-term lease of the ETSA assets, namely, to protect country residents from an electricity tariff that was no more than 1.7 per cent higher than their city cousins. I congratulate the minister for that and fully support the bill because it maintains the integrity of the earlier legislation with which I had a lot to do. I hope that the minister starts to tell the truth about electricity prices in South Australia and, secondly, does something about those meters.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That suggestion is unparliamentary and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): The allegation against the minister that he has not told the truth is unparliamentary and I direct him to withdraw.

Mr WILLIAMS: I unreservedly withdraw it: far be it from me to be unparliamentary. I will replace those comments and say that I wish the minister would reflect the facts

as they truly are in South Australia. I commend the bill to the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not appreciate the member for MacKillop, having withdrawn a remark, then rephrasing it in a slightly different way but essentially saying the same thing. I am ask him to again withdraw the remark.

Mr WILLIAMS: I withdraw the remark and the inference that the minister was telling an untruth. Political debate revolves around people coming at an issue from different sides, but somewhere buried in political debate there are some fundamental facts.

Ms Rankine: Does the member get to debate your ruling?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am waiting to see what he is saying. If he is seeking to engage the chair in debate, he will be in dire trouble. I know that the member for MacKillop was winding up.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am winding up and I would never seek to engage you in debate on a ruling you had made. I merely wish, in concluding my remarks, to say that there is a huge divergence of opinion both within and without the chamber, but I think the people of South Australia have been well served by what has happened to our power industry over recent years. To have the private sector put literally hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars into generation capacity in South Australia has underpinned the future of South Australia and ensured that we will keep our electricity prices as low as possible.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I will only be about 10 minutes, given the time of day, but I support the bill. In so doing I will outline why I support it and mention other issues integrated with the bill. I declare my interest in that I am a country resident and therefore this, like any other country matter, is of some benefit to me and my family.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I am making sure I declare any potential interest. I also have an interest in rural meters on properties. I speak on this also because I represent a rural electorate where they have multi-meters on their properties and I want to get something on the public record while the minister is here.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: When the minister introduced the bill, I said that I supported it because it is what we call a housekeeping bill. It is simply cleaning up some legislation that needs a little bit of tidying up because circumstances change, and that is confirmed by the fact that the whole bill comprises three pages. It is not a big detailed bill but rather a housekeeping bill to keep in order an initiative we put forward when in government. That initiative was that where people would be unduly affected by virtue of power costs we would ensure, given that the Liberal government has an absolute commitment to rural and regional South Australia, that we would ensure that people did not suffer a burden over and above 1.7 per cent for having to purchase power in rural and regional South Australia.

Now and again I feel for the minister with this portfolio because I have been a minister and I know that now and again you get something you would only be able to call a 'gritty sandwich'. This minister has one of those with this portfolio. Why? Because when the Labor Party went to the election it pledged that it would ensure a reduction in electricity prices—a party commitment and not a commitment of the minister. It is now the minister's job to try to drive that through. It will not be an easy process for the minister. We

knew in government that it would not be because there are some fundamental flaws in the way the national grid and the structures around it were designed, along with NEMMCO, and the minister agrees with me on that.

If most people sat down and looked at it they would say that when Paul Keating put in place all the mechanisms for a national grid he was right—I give credit where it is due to anybody, irrespective of the colour of the party, when they try to do something that will improve an opportunity in Australia. Whilst Paul Keating was right in the basic principles, from then on it got right out of control in its structure and development. The current minister agrees with me on that, as does the previous minister. Anybody who knows a little about what is happening with power prices around the globe would agree with me.

So that we do not have to bring in bills like this, the structures need to be rubbed out and started again nationally by the relevant ministers and some real lateral thinking in looking at issues like Tasmania where a lot of federal money is going over there and their own state desperately trying to get industry and trade development over there. Perhaps they should focus on their niche opportunities and look at how the national grid and Tasmania can become a real national grid and that, where you have readily available and sustainable renewable energy resources, you put them into the grid properly with a mass link. Then you look at equities within that right across the spectrum, so that you bring in some fairness into the situation where you have a better power fairness and the intent of the national grid becomes a reality.

I would go to Canberra, or wherever else the minister wants me to go to support him, as I am sure the shadow minister would, if we could get some commonsense happening nationally and stop the diatribe that we have heard over the last couple of years. I know from sources who have leaked to me that they have been told by senior members of the government that what the government has to do, for two reasons, is try to make the phrase 'privatisation of ETSA' mean higher power prices and the equivalent of a negative legacy or an Achilles heel for the Liberals, as indeed was the State Bank for the Labor Party. That is the strategy.

That is not going to wash when down the track we do not see a reduction in power prices because, to quote from the government's pledge just before the election, 'If you want cheaper electricity, vote for a Mike Rann Labor government.' What have we seen? We have seen a 27 to 32 per cent increase in power costs. We have also heard the Premier say that an interconnector to New South Wales will bring cheaper power to all of South Australia. We are still waiting to see whether that will happen, but advice given to me is that that will not, to use Paul Keating's phrase, bring home the bacon.

The government is in a dilemma because, sooner or later, the community will wake up to the fact that it is a national problem and we need a national solution. If this Minister for Energy in South Australia goes down that track, he will get my full support and that of probably the whole opposition. In the meantime, if the argument is about privatisation causing high power prices, we are going to have to point out that it is an absolute furphy, and that it is an excuse for the fact that the government made a promise, not just a commitment, that it is now breaking. One has only to look across the border to Victoria, which is fully privatised, and note that power prices have not gone up anywhere near as much as they have in South Australia.

I wanted to get that on the public record because, when you are in opposition, it is hard to put the facts forward. It is

easy when you are a minister, but the poor old shadow minister has only 30 seconds to ask a question and then has to sit down while the minister can make a free and far-ranging response. I have been there, and I enjoyed that side of it a lot more because it is a lot easier, believe you me! At the end of the day, we all have a responsibility to try to keep South Australia competitive. We all have a responsibility to get this national market problem fixed. We know it is not about privatisation. We know that, with the best intentions, Paul Keating's base principle structure, when it became a strategy that had to be rolled out, was flawed from the beginning. Let us get together on a truly bipartisan basis to lobby nationally for a new start.

The only other thing I would like to say in supporting this bill is that, as a parliament, we need to be bipartisan in our efforts to deal urgently with this serious matter of multiple meters, and I declare my personal interest on this point. I have five meters on my farm, and I would have six if I could afford to equip another bore. There has been full deregulation of the dairy industry, and the industry has many other problems. I am no orphan because my neighbours have similar problems. Indeed, seven of my neighbours are potentially exiting the dairy industry this year, and that is sad for the district. In the viticulture area of my electorate, most of my constituents have been contacting me for some time because they got wind of this possibility.

Whether or not it can be argued that it is because of privatisation, I argue—and I believe the minister has indicated this—that there is an opportunity to fix this legislatively. In fairness, the minister has allowed six months for this to be sorted through, and I believe that the whole parliament needs to sort out a solution because it is absolutely outrageous that someone can try to capitalise on a national problem by jamming charges of \$67 per meter on these people who have no choice.

I would love to have all my meters in one place, as would my constituents, because gates would not be left open. I would get regular readings because the meter reader would not do what they have done for years, that is, think, 'It's a long way out there. I don't want to walk through all those cow paddocks. I can't get my car out there so I will just guesstimate the reading and have a look in a couple of readings' time.' That sort of stuff has gone on for years. I would love to have one bulk meter area, and it would be good at night when you get a power flick to be able to go to one meter instead of having to jump on the bike in the cold and the dark to ride around and get all the meters going again because your power protectors have dropped out. If I could, I would, but you cannot do that because you are talking kilometres, and you have to get a meter there. That is the problem.

We have got a few months to fix that issue for rural and regional South Australia and for business, in particular, as well as for those people who are in strip shops and the like; and I offer my bipartisan support, as I know the parliament would. There must be a solution because that is an absolute rip-off. It is appalling, and I do not know how those people can consciously sit in boardrooms or wherever those decisions are made and try to rip a heap more out of a few people by knocking them off at \$67 a meter. That is absolutely outrageous. The problem must be addressed and fixed, and I offer my support on behalf of my constituents and the people of South Australia.

I thank you, sir, for allowing me to canvass a number of issues that integrate with this bill. I feel pleased that I have

been able to get out the facts about its history. None of us can fix the past, and we need to go forward. A lot of players have come in and power generation has increased. Gas lines have come in, and I give credit to this government for completing what we initiated. However, because of where we are located and because we are limited in cheap, renewable energy sources in this state, if we are to be serious about a national market that delivers the best for all Australians, I would urge this minister to bat for a rubbing out and a starting again of the base strategies to capitalise on Paul Keating's initial intentions. In that way, the gritty sandwich that he has been given may not implode on him in his own electorate in 2006 when the old pledge card will remind people that this government was going to deliver cheaper power. I support the bill and I wish the minister all the very best in the one portfolio that none of his colleagues want to touch.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): It will not take me long to respond to all the matters that have been raised in regard to the particulars of the bill, given that, to the best of my recollection, none were raised. The bill was universally supported and welcomed, and I was praised for it, and I can respond to the praise by saying that I think I deserve it. As to the criticism, how entirely misplaced they were.

I will respond to some of the matters that have been raised. The opposition, as one might expect, wanted to use this debate as a sort of lengthy grievance on electricity prices and Labor's handling of the issue, and they made a number of points. There are a few fundamental points that I would make, but I urge people not to believe the opposition's crocodile tears on an average 25 per cent increase, because we are now the government and we have the records of government. A few years ago, when the privatisation of the assets was stuck and the Liberal government just could not get it through the upper house, they bashed up Nick Xenophon until he sued them a few times. They tried everything, and then they came up with a cabinet submission.

It was a cabinet submission as a result of the failure to get what they wanted for privatisation. That cabinet submission, well developed, was for a 25 per cent increase in ordinary customers' tariffs. So, please do not believe them when they cry crocodile tears in here for the poor people who have to pay. They had a cabinet submission, which was withdrawn only when a couple of people who should not have done it suddenly changed their vote in the upper house. They did not need to get their 25 per cent increase in the tariff because they were getting it through the back door, through the privatisation—which is why there was always going to be high prices. The privatisation locked them in. Just like if they did not get it they were going to get it the up front way through a 25 per cent increase in tariff. If the shadow minister—the former minister—does not believe it, I will say this: he was not responsible at the time, but I am quite happy to go back and find the documents, to find the cabinet submission; no problem at all.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, it is very interesting reading. So, we now get this feigned outrage. I will make a few other fundamental points. As the former minister would know, FRC was a process that occurred at different times for differing people, for larger customers sooner than smaller customers. The first price increases after the privatisation of ETSA, the previous round of contestability, the second last one for large customers, saw an average increase in tariff of

45 per cent. I made the point before that I had many discussions with OneSteel (which is doing an excellent job in Whyalla with its refurbishment and investment), which endured a 65 per cent increase. Again, it is hard to take seriously the claim that the average 25 per cent increase was something that came out of the blue. It was locked in for years, and it was unavoidable. I particularly take umbrage at the suggestion that it is something that we have done: it was unavoidable. That is simply, I think, below the standards even of the opposition.

It was said that it was not the fault of privatisation—it was either Labor's fault or it was someone else's fault, it was the national electricity market's fault; all of those things. The only voice invoked in support of the former minister was Robert Booth, because Robert Booth said some things not about us but about the Essential Services Commission. I must say, that was some time ago, and those comments were subsequently answered by the Essential Services Commission. As the former minister knows, he also said much worse things about the former government and its privatisation plans.

I do have something a little more recent (and I think it is 10 February) from Robert Booth that I will share with the minister. It was during an interview on Leon Byner's program. Four times during question time last year the shadow minister referred to the respected electricity consultant. It is an excellent opportunity to get this quote on the record. He says:

I must say, I think Pat Conlon deserves a pat on the back.

Of course, my modesty would usually prevent me from raising that in parliament but, since he is the only voice invoked in support of the opposition's position, I thought that we had best see what he really thinks of the efforts of the government. The notion that it is not the privatisation is given the lie by a number of events. Of course, in New South Wales and Queensland, where they own the assets, they have been able to put in place an equalisation scheme to protect their consumers, and the lowest prices in the national electricity market are where the assets are owned by government. It is a really hard argument to sustain.

The attack was that we did not move fast enough to get competition in place, and that somehow it all stopped. I really need to make a couple of points. If the members of the previous government had not refused to go after 13 February, when Peter Lewis announced that Labor would form government, if they had not clung on for a month—keeping the salary, getting their superannuation a little higher, pretending that they were important, embarrassing the Queen by presenting two Premiers—we might have had a bit more time to do it. Possibly there is some blame attached to us, because we did find on a whiteboard the previous minister's plan to fix it all up. Unfortunately, we could not implement it because we could not understand it.

It looked rather like a Bruce Petty cartoon. It had electricity blackouts, electricity brownouts, load shedding, electricity restrictions and back-up to emergency procedures. In another place it had 'FRC interconnectors' written down, along with some notes. I know that it was useful to someone: it was not much good to us, though. We decided that we had better start again. We decided that we had better formulate our own plan. When the former minister criticises it, I guess we should be embarrassed that we could not really discern the genius out of what appears to be a jumble of pictures. I will not go further: absurd comments were made.

The member for MacKillop said that we should stop talking nonsense (and he struggled; he did not want to be unparliamentary but he struggled a lot trying to work out a way to avoid being unparliamentary) about privatisation causing the price increases. We saw Robert Booth; that was the only person whom they could put up. I think he had best go off and read some of the comments from the National Farmers Federation, with which I think conservative country members of the Liberal Party would normally be in some agreement. But there is absolutely no doubt, when one reads the media comments from the representatives of the National Farmers Federation, where they place the blame for the problems facing rural members—firmly at the feet of the privatisation process. And who was responsible for that? The previous government. While I can invoke one of my friends in their support—someone who thinks that I deserve a pat on the back—I can certainly invoke one of their longstanding friends in support of our position. The arguments of the Liberals with respect to this matter are very empty.

I do not need to go much further. I appreciate the latitude given, but I am only responding to matters raised in the second reading debate. However, I will say this. The words of the member for MacKillop were along the lines (and members can read them in *Hansard*) of how he supports everything that was done regarding electricity in the past few years. The failure of this group to apologise, to accept they got it wrong, and accept that it has had terrible outcomes for the people of South Australia, will continue to haunt them. I do not have concerns about our pledge card. Even though I do not believe that there is a mote of any kind in our eye, I think they had best give regard to the beam in their own, particularly with the enormous betrayal of their promise on the sale of ETSA. I appreciate the support for the bill. I understand that it does not need to go to committee, and I look forward to its passage.

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

RADIO ANTENNA

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Earlier today in another place the shadow attorney-general (Hon. R.D. Lawson QC) accused me of spending \$30 000 to install a radio antenna in my ministerial office. The accusation is false—

An honourable member: A radio antenna?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, we all have to listen to TABRadio in the Attorney-General's Department! These are the relevant facts. Upon my appointment as Attorney-General I was astounded at the wastage of money to media monitoring by my predecessor. I resolved to re-prioritise spending in the office. The Hon. R.D. Lawson was not content to share newspapers with other staff members on the floor. He had his personal copy of four newspapers delivered every day. I cut this unnecessary duplication and cancelled most subscriptions.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson was also not content with the government's media monitoring service. He subscribed to an additional media clipping service, at a cost of more than \$1 500 every month. In December 2001, for example, my predecessor spent \$1 155.62 on subscriptions and \$417 on other publications. Other months also reveal spending of this order. I decided that, rather than spend this amount of

taxpayers' money every month, I would be much happier listening to the radio. Alas, reception was poor—the Hon. R.D. Lawson conceded as much in his question. Unlike him, I was not content to wander about my office with a transistor radio seeking improved reception as he says he did.

Instead, a quote was sought to install an antenna, and \$1 900 expenditure was approved by me from my office budget—not \$30 000 but \$1 900. The cost did increase owing to technical and access problems. However, I am informed that as of today less than \$500 has been paid. The remaining amount is yet to be finalised but it is estimated at \$4 388.67. This one-off cost is around the same amount that the former Attorney-General would have spent on publications, subscriptions and media monitoring in about a month and a half.

Finally, I reject any suggestion that spending on the antenna has been hidden. I have spoken about the antenna installation on talkback radio on many occasions, including on 27 March 2002, where I joked with Bob Francis, 'We'll get reception in the Attorney-General's Department within the budget—the budget set by you.'

Yesterday in another place, the Hon. R.D. Lawson denied that he had recommended to me that I appoint Mr Christopher Kourakis QC as Solicitor-General. I consulted the Hon. R.D. Lawson as the opposition spokesman on my portfolio about the appointment as part of my consultation on the appointment. Indeed, I consulted him twice. The first consultation was by telephone. On that occasion, Mr Kourakis was the Hon. R.D. Lawson's only suggestion. I noted Mr Kourakis's name alongside the Hon. R.D. Lawson's initials in the list of recommendations made to me by 14 lawyers I consulted about the appointment.

An honourable member: 14 lawyers?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, amazing. I hope there is no overlap. I still have those notes. The second consultation occurred in my government car on the way back to parliament from the Migrant Resource Centre annual meeting on 27 November. My ministerial assistant—

An honourable member: With your driver?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Boris Yeltsin and I are both guided by our driver. My ministerial assistant Mr Peter Louca was present in the car, and here is his account of the conversation:

On Wednesday 27 November 2002 at approximately 6.40 pm, I accompanied the Attorney-General, the Hon. Michael Atkinson MP, acting in his capacity as Minister for Multicultural Affairs, at the Migrant Resource Centre of South Australia Inc. annual general meeting. The meeting was held at the premises of the South Australian Italian Association, known as the Italian Centre, at 262 Carrington Street, Adelaide.

The Attorney-General was invited as a guest speaker and he addressed an audience of over 200 representatives of the various multicultural communities of South Australia. Several members of parliament attended the meeting, including the shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC. It was a parliamentary sitting day and all members were obliged to return to the parliament. It was a particularly busy schedule for the Attorney-General as he had several bills of importance that were to be debated including the Terrorism (Commonwealth Powers) Bill and the Criminal Law (Sentencing) (Sentencing Guidelines) Amendment Bill.

The Attorney-General addressed the meeting, launched a series of pamphlets designed to aid new arrivals to South Australia and left shortly after. It was just after 7.15 p.m. We left the AGM and were met outside the Italian Centre by the Attorney-General's ministerial vehicle. The Hon. Robert Lawson MLC emerged from the Italian Centre immediately behind us, and the Attorney-General offered his parliamentary colleague a lift back to Parliament House, which he accepted.

We journeyed in a northerly direction along Frome Street and then west along North Terrace. We were delayed by traffic and stopped by several traffic signals. There were four occupants in the vehicle, including the driver Mr Malcolm Boyce, the Attorney-General, who sat in the front passenger seat, the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC and myself, on the rear passenger seats. The Attorney-General, the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC and I engaged in light conversation that included a discussion on the meeting, noting the renovations of the building and the improvements made to the facilities.

Near the intersection of Frome Street and Pirie Street, I remembered a conversation earlier that day that I had with the Chief of Staff, Mr Andrew Lamb, who asked me to remind the Attorney-General to meet with the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC to discuss candidates for the office of Solicitor-General. The Attorney-General took the opportunity and asked the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC if he had any preferred candidates. The Hon. Robert Lawson MLC said his opinion had not changed from the previous conversation. He thought for a short while and responded that, while there may be several people who could be candidates, there was one person in particular who stood out, and that person was Mr Chris Kourakis.

The Attorney-General agreed he was the preferred candidate, and clearly and deliberately asked a question that would influence Mr Kourakis' potential nomination. He told the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC that Mr Kourakis had acted on his behalf for free in the Ralph Clarke case and that he had declared this in his interests. The Attorney-General asked, would this form an impediment to Mr Kourakis' appointment as Solicitor-General. He also asked the Hon. Robert Lawson's opinion if anyone in the Parliamentary Liberal Party would object on this basis.

The Hon. Robert Lawson's response was considered. He said that he personally had no objection, and that he did not view it as an impediment. He added, while he could not speak for all his colleagues, the fact Mr Kourakis had previously acted for the Attorney-General should not prevent the appointment of the best candidate who in his opinion was Mr Kourakis. He said it was his belief that the Opposition Party room would not object and thanked the Attorney-General for his courtesy and consultation.

The journey ended soon after, and we arrived at parliament to the ringing of the House of the Assembly bells. The Attorney-General thanked the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC, we exchanged pleasantries and parted. When I accompanied the Attorney-General back into the parliament building I light-heartedly remarked, should I begin writing a 'stat dec' to confirm the conversation. The Attorney-General said the Hon. Robert Lawson MLC was 'decent' and not to worry. I recalled the conversation to several of my colleagues the following day.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

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: In question time today the member for Davenport asked me a question about the proposed ban on the transportation of low level nuclear waste into South Australia. He quoted from what he said was a leaked copy of crown law advice to the government. I have had the opposition member's claim checked. I can inform the parliament that the opposition member was quoting not from current crown law advice but from advice that was provided to the former government on 18 May 2000. That advice was provided to the Chief Executive of the Department for Environment and Heritage and I assume the minister of the day. The then minister for the environment is now the shadow minister for the environment, the member for Davenport. In summary, the member for Davenport has said that he has a leaked copy of advice that was provided three years ago when he was the minister.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 24 March at 2 p.m.

Corrigendum:

Page 1473, column 1, line 60—for '4 000' read '4 million'.
Page 2108, column 2, after line 49—Insert:

EDUCATION, PROJECTS

98. **Ms CHAPMAN:** Why have the four key education projects at Victor harbor and Port Elliott been deferred, what criteria were used for assessment, who undertook the review and were the sites visited as part of the review?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I have an obligation to ensure that the capital works budget is spent in a manner that will provide maximum benefit for all students. The Government has delayed a start to these projects to give us time to ensure that we get the best possible outcome for the southern Fleurieu communities. An allocation of \$500,000 this year will ensure that progress on the projects continues.

Since taking Office, I have reviewed the Investment Program focusing on a re-examination of priorities to ensure current facility needs are met and to confirm appropriate planning had occurred to support proposed projects. I sought advice from the department in relation to works priorities, given that the former government's list of works was formulated over 12 months ago. In addition, I sought specific briefings on a number of projects still in the planning stages

to assess the adequacy of the plans to best meet the education needs of students and achieve value for money.

That work has resulted in a comprehensive list of projects, incorporating those which are new, those which have been brought forward, and those that have been deferred. No project has been cancelled.

The government is contributing nearly \$9 million extra towards capital projects and upgrades in schools and preschools than the previous government had planned to spend in its 2002-03 capital program.

The capital works program for the next financial year will be announced at the time of the 2003-04 state budget.

SCHOOLS, OAK VALLEY ABORIGINAL

118. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Who organised and sent out the invitations to the opening of the new Oak Valley Aboriginal school, how many Education Department officers attended and who selected them?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The planned opening of Oak Valley Aboriginal School on 1 November 2002 was postponed due to the death of a prominent member of the Oak Valley community.

The Oak Valley School, community and Maralinga Tjartuja office prepared a list of people that it wished to invite to their community to help celebrate the official opening of their new school.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. D.C. KOTZ** (4 December).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Development Agreement between the Government and the Angas consortium is still to be finalised.

The Angas Consortium has undertaken a very extensive and protracted consultation with the Brompton residents and the Council, given the high level of interest in the project.

The consultation has identified a range of matters that the Consortium and Land Management Corporation wished to respond to. The response has included the very positive decision by the Land Management Corporation not to include the Brompton Community Centre property in the redevelopment. I recently announced my decision to hand the property over to community control for as long as it continues to operate as a community centre.

No Government funding has been sought by or guaranteed to the Consortium for the project. Land Management Corporation anticipates that Government expenditure will be limited to funds that may be required to address historic groundwater conditions, liability for which will remain with the Government.

The Consortium has scheduled work to commence on site in mid 2003 with the project concluding in late 2005, subject to movements in the State's residential property market.

The Land Management Corporation now anticipates the Development Agreement will be resolved with the Consortium in the first half of 2003.

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I refer to Ms Chapman's questions arising from comments by the Auditor-General on the operation of our State's criminal injuries compensation scheme.

Since 1999 the number of claims finalised each year has remained around 1100 to 1200. The amount of money paid each year is the sum total of recompense paid to victims to cover economic and non-economic losses arising from their injuries, solicitors' fees and disbursements. The variations from year to year mirror changes in claimants' behaviour, for instance, the number of victims who choose to make a claim, which is a decision for them not the Government or me as the Attorney-General.

In 2001, 1,046 claims were finalised and in 2002, 1,177 claims were finalised. There is nothing sinister in the numbers or the variation. The decisions the Crown Solicitor's office and I make about the operation of the criminal injuries compensation scheme are bound by the same law as my predecessors, the Hon. Robert Lawson and the Hon. K. Trevor Griffin. Indeed, the drop in the number of claims in 2001 occurred while a Liberal Attorney-General was administering the scheme. Since then the number of claims has increased to be consistent with the number of claims in 1999 and 2000.

Bank account reconciliations for the years that Ms Chapman requested show the following closing cash balances: 2000-2001, in rounded figures, \$16.1 million and 2001-2002, again in rounded figures, \$20.2 million.

Ms Chapman also queried what action I intended to take to recover the \$46.6 million criminals owe the criminal injuries compensation scheme. Crown Solicitor's Office civil litigation staff engaged in administering the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act estimate that in about 50 per cent of claims the offender is unknown; hence recovery from the offender is impossible. Among the other claims, a proportion of offenders are young offenders against who recovery cannot be taken while they are minors, offenders who are impecunious or imprisoned or both.

Consequently, recovery is only feasible from—based on an estimate—about 40 per cent of offenders. Hence, it might be better not to consider the effectiveness of the Crown's debt recovery in terms of the total debt, but rather in terms of the debt that could reasonably be expected to be recovered (i.e. debt arising from cases where offenders are known).

I am also told that occasionally the Crown has to dispense with proceedings where an offender is known but his/her whereabouts is unknown. This also impacts on the Crown's rate of recovery against debt.

Taking these impediments into account, it would be unreasonable to expect that the Crown Solicitor's office will ever recover the full

\$46.6 million. The Crown does pursue criminals who owe a debt. Improvements can be made. The Victims of Crime Co-ordinator, Crown Solicitor's staff and others are exploring ways to increase the amount recovered, and I will let this House know in due course what will be done to better ensure that criminals pay their debts.

In the meantime, I remind the House that the Premier and I have announced that the Government intends to introduce mechanisms to improve the recovery of criminals' debts arising from compensation claims. Officers in my department are working with the Victims of Crime Co-ordinator on how to best achieve this. As I said previously in this House, I am of the view that criminals should be required to pay their debts in much the same way as tertiary students are required to repay their HECS debt.

In reply to the **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (21 November).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The total cost of the unit for the period following establishment until 30 June 2002 is \$201,898.88.

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have received this advice:

The Audit Review was received by the Courts Administration Authority on 24 December, 2002.

Audit found that a centralised application access administration function is in place within CAA, with responsibility for the management of access for CRIMCASE, FATE and other CAA applications. Audit found that although the procedures and processes are well established, the documentation required was not always formally completed.

Two processes were mentioned, and in each case recommendations were made to improve the process. The processes are Access Change Approval and 'Modelling' of User Access.

Access Change Approval

Within CAA, access change request forms have been established to provide a standard means of obtaining all of the relevant information and authorisations for access to CAA systems. The form also incorporates a signed acknowledgement from each user of their responsibilities and obligations in relation to security.

Audit found that authorisation and user signatures were not always present on the forms. Audit also found that the process in place to follow up incomplete forms and obtain the missing information and signatures was not consistently applied.

Audit identified the following risks:

- access changes may be applied without appropriate approval and authorisation;
- where such access is outside that required to fulfil the user's allocated job role, there may be a risk to the confidentiality, integrity and availability of key CAA applications;
- users may not be able to be held accountable for their role and responsibilities in relation to the security of CAA systems.

Audit recommended that:

- the procedures be updated to enable the access request form to provide a full trail of authorisation for each access change;
- that no requests be actioned without the completion of all mandatory fields on the access request form.

'Modelling' of User Access

One type of access change request form allows for the selection of user access based on that defined for an existing user. This provides a simple means of allocating access for an equivalent job role. It is based on the assumption that the user on whom access is modelled has only the required level of access for their specific job role. However, if this assumption is incorrect, any inappropriate access may also be defined for the new user.

Audit found that there is currently no step in the authorisation process that provides for an assessment of the existing user access of the 'modelled' user.

The risks are that:

- inappropriate user access may be cloned to other users;
- access that is valid and relevant for one individual (above that normally required for a specific role) may be incorrectly and inadvertently passed on to another user.

Audit recommended that:

- the facilities available to new users should be discretely defined on each access request, perhaps by establishing user access templates or access groups;
- a check should be performed after the access is allocated to confirm that the access and permissions are as per the authorised request, and that they are appropriate to user

needs.

CAA response to the recommendations

The Acting State Courts Administrator replied to the Auditor-General on 10 January, 2003. The CAA accepted the recommendations of the Auditor-General and is currently conducting a review of the existing application access administration with a view to improving the process.

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have received this advice:

Ms Chapman has referred to three statements on page 405 of the Auditor-General's Report. These statements should not be read in isolation. The complete statements on page 405 of the Auditor-General's Report are as follows, with those isolated statements referred to by Ms Chapman underlined.

1. 'As mentioned above the:

- Chief Executive is the only appointee to the Department of Justice. The Chief Executive is also the Chief Executive of the Attorney-General's Department. That Department discloses related remuneration payments;
- activities of the Department's Special Deposit Account are disclosed in the Attorney-General's Department Financial Statements under administered transactions.

As a consequence, no financial statements in respect to the Department of Justice have been prepared.'

2. 'The Chief Executive is the only appointee to the Department of Justice. The Department was up to 30 June, 1999, assigned no functions and this still remains the same at 30 June, 2002, with the exception of the following.

In the 1999-2000 Budget, appropriation arrangements for a number of agencies within the Justice Portfolio were changed. In prior years appropriations were paid directly to the Attorney-General's Department, Courts Administration Authority, Department for Correctional Services, Police Department and State Electoral Office. From 1 July 1999, appropriations for these agencies were provided to the Department of Justice.

The Treasurer approved in June, 1999, the establishment of a Special Deposit Account for the Department of Justice to:

...record all activities of the Department and various activities within the Justice Portfolio including the transfer of funds to other agencies within the Portfolio, operating and investing expenditures, revenue from various activities and injections of funds provided from the Consolidated Account including from borrowings.

The Department does not control revenue and expenses in relation to this arrangement but is simply responsible to coordinating the funding process for the abovementioned agencies.

Given that the Department does not have a staffing structure, the activities of this Special Deposit Account are administered by the Attorney-General's Department. For further details, refer to Attorney-General's Department Financial Statements—Schedule of Administered Expenses and Revenues for the year ended 30 June, 2002.'

When considered in context, the statements of the Auditor-General as isolated and referred to by Ms Chapman are not a criticism of the structure or purpose of the Department of Justice. The Government intends retaining this structure as it provides for a centralised and coordinated approach to the distribution of funding for the numerous agencies within the Justice Portfolio.

In reply to **Hon. D.C. KOTZ** (4 December).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Following consultation between Treasury and myself, the matter of any change to the LCM Charter was not proceeded with at least for the time being. The Charter therefore stands as signed by the previous Minister for Government Enterprises and the previous Treasurer in compliance with the regulations.

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (4 December).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

Slippage/Savings occurred against the following SAPOL major projects:

	Slippage	Savings	Total
	\$m	\$m	\$m
Adelaide Police Station	0.952	0.557	1.509
Call Centre	1.861	-	1.861
Netley	-	0.932	0.932

Of the above projects, Adelaide Police Station has now been completed. Netley was completed in 2001-02 with savings of \$932k. The Call Centre project is currently ongoing. To ensure that these and all other major projects are monitored, SAPOL has improved its capital reporting for all projects in excess of \$50k.

With regards to the Mobile Data Terminals (MDT's), approval was obtained in 2001-02 to carry forward \$6.0 million into 2002-03. Of the \$6.0 million carried forward, cabinet has recently approved a program which forecasts expenditure of \$4.1 million in 2003-04 and \$2.4 million in 2004-05. It is estimated that \$0.4 million will be spent on MDT's in 2002-03.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (28 November).

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Under the provisions of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 the Auditor-General is required to carry out an audit of the accounts of Bio Innovation SA and Playford Capital Pty Ltd with respect to each financial year.

In the case of the financial Year ending 30 June 2002 audits of both organisations were carried out and unqualified independent audit reports were issued. However, the audited financial statements for these two organisations were not included in the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament.

In preparing the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament every effort is made to ensure that only matters which are relevant, appropriate and timely are included. Subsection 36(2) of the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987* provides the Auditor-General with a discretionary power to choose which agencies are excluded from this Report, and on this occasion both Bio Innovation SA and Playford Capital Pty Ltd were so excluded by the Auditor-General.

The following factors are taken into consideration by the Auditor-General in determining which agencies are to be included in this Report:

- materiality of financial operations
- materiality of any impact on the public finances
- timeliness of information
- materiality of issues arising from the audit
- public interest

A number of agencies excluded from the Report are required to prepare an Annual Report in accordance with the requirements of the Public Sector Management Act 1995. In addition, Treasurer's Instruction 19 required that each Chief Executive Officer must ensure that the Public Sector Management Act 1995 and Regulations, or other legislation, includes the general purpose financial statements in the form in which they were presented to the Auditor-General, together with a copy of the Report of the Auditor-General on the statements.

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (28 November).

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The financial statements in the Construction Industry Training Board Annual report 2001-2002 (the Annual Report) indicate the total accumulated funds at 30 June 2002 to be \$6,949,000. This figure includes \$1,614,000 of strategic reserve and \$5,335,000 of accumulated funds.

As outlined in Note 17. of the Annual Report, the sector specific balance of accumulated funds at 1 July 2002 is as follows:

Sector	Accumulated funds
Housing sector	\$3,295,000
Commercial sector	\$ 671,000
Civil sector	\$1,435,000

Total accumulated funds as at 30 June for the last 3 years of the Board's operations are as follows:

Financial year	Total accumulated funds
2001-2002	\$6,949,000
2000-2001	\$7,034,000
1999-2000	\$7,188,000

The Board is an industry based organisation responsible for the administration of the Construction Industry training Fund (the Fund). It is not underwritten by government.

The Board maintains the strategic reserve to safeguard against unforeseen and unavoidable events.

With respect to the accumulated funds, in accordance with the Construction Industry Training Fund Act 1993, the Board prepares an annual training plan which is based on the industry's training needs and is funded through annual income and drawdowns from accumulated funds.

The construction industry is subject to a range of cyclical

constraints including changes in interest rates and the first home buyers scheme which cause Fund income to fluctuate from year to year. These constraints impinge on the Board's capacity to influence the level of Fund income in any given year.

The accumulated funds, which are sector specific, provide the mechanism whereby the Board maintains its distribution of training effort to each industry sector at a reliable and consistent level, irrespective of these fluctuations.

The question of the level of accumulated funds is a policy matter. I am required to approve the Board's annual training plan, and through this process, I intend to ensure that the accumulated funds are utilised strategically and in a managed and sustainable way.

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (21 November).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My Government recognises the great importance of volunteers in South Australia and their valuable contribution to all of our communities. I decided to take on the role of Minister for Volunteers because I believe the role of volunteers deserves the full recognition of the Government not only for creating a caring society but also one which is both cohesive and inclusive.

In a recent report by Dr Duncan Ironmonger of the University of Melbourne, commissioned by the Office for Volunteers, it has been established that volunteers contribute nearly \$5 billion to the State's economy representing more than 10 per cent of the Gross State Product.

Aside from the growing economic value, volunteering gives us clear individual, social and community benefits which go way beyond economic gains.

I am pleased to confirm that the Office for Volunteers will be ongoing and will be appropriately funded. The next call for applications for the small grants program, entitled the *Volunteers Support Fund*, will be in May/June 2003.

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (4 December).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Expenditure Review and Budget Cabinet Committee has approved the following carry-over bids submitted by Country Fire Service through the Treasury and Finance;

- 9 x 24P Appliances with a carry-over value of \$1.065 million, and
- 6 Land/Building contracts with a carry-over value of \$0.465 million.

In addition, the Expenditure Review and Budget Cabinet Committee has also approved a further carry-over of \$0.571 million from the Community Emergency Services Fund for Country Fire Service fire appliances.

I have recently agreed to utilise \$0.320 million of this carry-over towards the procurement of Road Crash Rescue Equipment to replace ageing equipment for ten Country Fire Service brigades. The balance of \$0.251 million will be used to purchase one heavy fire fighting appliance.

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (28 November).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The South Australian Department of Treasury and Finance, on behalf of Heads of Treasuries, prepares forward estimates of the guaranteed minimum funding amount, budget balancing assistance and net impact of tax reform as defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Reform of Commonwealth-State Financial Relations (IGA). This analysis is updated periodically. The latest update followed the recent release of the Commonwealth Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook 2002-03.

The latest estimates of the impact of the IGA on States and Territories is provided in the attached table. With respect to South Australia current estimates show that the State will receive budget balancing assistance up to and including 2006-07. A net benefit from tax reform would flow to the State from 2007-08.

This is one year later than was expected at the time of the release of the State Budget in July 2002. The delay results from a downward revision by Commonwealth Treasury to the estimate of long-term growth in GST revenue from 5.75 per cent to 5.5 per cent per annum. This lower growth results in lower GST revenue (and greater budget balancing assistance) to the States and Territories than previously estimated.

Long-term projections of this nature are problematic, particularly with respect to estimates of GST revenue over the period—a 1 per

cent error in the GST estimate for 2007-08 is equivalent to around \$35 million for South Australia alone. As such these estimates should only be considered as indicative and they remain subject to significant change over time.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (28 November).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As reported in the 2001-02 Budget Results document, a further net improvement in operating expenditures, capital expenditures and own-source revenues of \$105 million has occurred across agencies from that published at the time of the 2002-03 Budget.

In itself this would result in an improvement in the 2001-02 budget result.

However there are many other factors, both planned and unplanned, that affected the 2001-02 result from that published at the time of the 2002-03 Budget. These are reported in the 2001-02 Budget Results document.

In reply to **The Hon. DEAN BROWN**: (4 December).

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Department of Human Services funding to Sexual Health Information Networking and Education Inc (SHine SA) in the 2001-02 financial year was increased by \$278,200 from the 2000-01 financial year's allocation of \$2,644,800, to \$2,923,000 for 2001-02.

The increased funding included a late payment of \$147,000 under the Public Health Outcomes Funding Agreement (PHOFA) for growth funding. The remaining increases were approved in July 2001 and included enterprise bargaining costs for medical officers and nurses, workers' safety-net increases, and funding to increase the disability education coordinator to a full time 1.0 full time equivalent (fte) position from a 0.6 fte part time position.

At 30 June 2002 the level of SHine SA's unspent funds was \$704,000, up \$100,000 on the previous end of financial year balance. This increase was largely due to unspent PHOFA funding of \$98,000 allocated for Aboriginal men's worker education. This allocation has been expended this financial year.

The overall level of remaining unspent funds is largely held against the following initiatives:

- Teenage Unplanned Pregnancy Program, for three full time regional schools coordinators, resources and program evaluation
- Indigenous Health Program, for two full time coordinators, plus resources.

These programs are currently operating and, as a result, SHine SA is forecasting that there will be a significant drop in the level of unspent funds at the end of the current financial year.

SHine SA is a non-government agency and the accounting standards applicable to the preparation of its financial statements differ to those of a state government department.

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (28 November).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Initially, the Reserve Bank approached the government to ascertain if the Government was interested in purchasing the Reserve Bank building. Following initial discussions at officer level, a due diligence process was approved and undertaken, including a full review of the works necessary to refurbish and refit the building, together with estimated costs. After considering the financial implications, and in response to a request from the Reserve Bank, an offer was made to purchase the property. This offer had regard to the substantial costs to refurbish and refit the building and the financial risks involved in refurbishing the building. Soon after, the Bank advised that it was in contract negotiations with an unsolicited offer, which was substantially above the Government's offer. It was not seen as economic to attempt to increase the Government's bid above the other offer and it was therefore decided not to continue with the purchase.

OMNIBUS QUESTIONS—NUMBER 6

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (6 August).

The Hon. L. STEVENS The number of positions attracting a total employment cost of \$100,000 per annum or more within all departments and agencies comprising the human services portfolio and reporting to the Minister as at 30 June 2002 is:

Department of Human Services executives	52*
Health service executives	32
Medical staff located in health services	95

Total 179
 These figures do not include the annual Executive salary increase provided for 2002-03.

the Office for the Status of Women that attract employment costs of \$100 000 or over.

*Figure represents total DHS Executives, some of which may also report to the Minister for Social Justice.

REVIEWS

OFFICE FOR THE STATUS OF WOMEN

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (29 July).

The Hon. S.W. KEY: There are currently no positions within

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

Department of Premier and Cabinet
 Reviews undertaken—2002

Title of review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total cost of contract \$ (if applicable)
Prior to government being elected: Review of Public Sector Responsiveness in the 21 st Century	Review initiated in December 2001. Report tabled in Parliament in May 2002	Task Force—not consultant	\$55,000 (fees paid to members)

Reviews scheduled—2002

Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
Whole of Government Review of Board and Committee Remuneration		The two non-Government members of the review panel have been engaged on a fee for service basis & are therefore not considered to be consultants	\$17,500

ARTS SA

Reviews undertaken

Title	Details	Consultant	Cost
Adelaide Festival Corporation	Financial Analysis*	Higgins Botha	\$9,600
Artlab	Strategic planning and development of business plan	Intrinsic Planning (Tim Miller)	(Arts SA) \$7,000 (Artlab) \$2,500
PLAIN Central Services	Review of public libraries and community information grant program*	Tony Lawson Consulting	\$9,600
PLAIN Central Services	One-day workshop—Governance issues	Prodirections Consultants	\$1,000

*Initiated under the previous Government
 2002-2003 reviews scheduled for after 29/7/02 and as known on 29/7/02:

Reviews scheduled

Title	Details	Consultant	Cost
Tandanya	Board strategic direction	Lindsay Holmes & Associates	\$6,900
State Library of SA	Development of marketing plan	Michel Warren	\$8,800
PLAIN Central Services	Joint use library guidelines	To be appointed	\$10,000

EMPLOYMENT COSTS

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (7 August).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Total number of positions attracting a total employment cost of \$100 000 as at 30 June 2002 and estimates for June 2003

I offer the following information to the Member for Unley:

DWLBC

30 June 2002, 12

30 June 2003, 14

Department for Environment and Heritage

30 June 2002, 12

30 June 2003, 12

Environment Protection Authority

30 June 2002, 2

30 June 2002, 2

All figures are based on salaries as at 30 June 2002.

In relation to the Environment Protection Authority it should be noted that this entity was established as a separate administrative unit effective from 1 July 2002. The Executive level structure of the Authority is currently being reviewed. Furthermore the remuneration for the newly created position of Chief Executive of the Authority (currently in process of recruitment) is yet to be determined.

REVIEWS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (1 August).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have received this advice:

Details of the reviews undertaken or scheduled from 5 March, 2002, to 29th July, 2002, are as follows:

Reviews undertaken

Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
			Nil

Reviews scheduled

Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
Justice Business Reform	Review of business practices across the Justice Portfolio	Internal	

REVIEWS

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I provide the following information in relation to Office of Multicultural Affairs up to 29 July, 2002.

Reviews undertaken—2002

Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant	Total Cost of Contract \$
Biennial review of ITC's charges	Full cost recovery assessment against charges for Interpreting and Translating Centre services	HLB Mann Judd Consulting	8 000
ITC assignment processing system	Implementation of State Auditor-General's suggestions, including clear separation of operational and financial processing functions	Interbiz	1 424
		Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	1 596
		Walldorf	3 120
		Solution 6 Learning	6 937

Reviews scheduled—2002

Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant	Total Cost of Contract \$
ITC assignment processing system	Implementation of State Auditor-General's suggestions, including clear separation of operational and financial processing functions	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	1 800

REVIEWS

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (6 August).

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The following information is provided for the period 5 March 2002 to 29 July 2002. Please note this is for the whole of the Department of Human Services and will be the same as the information provided by the Minister for Social Justice.

Reviews since this government (March 2002)

Name of Review	Scope of Review	Consultant	Cost
Management Structures Review Project	Review of DHS management and organisational structure	Lizard Drinking	\$38,700
Child Protection Review	Reviewing child protection policy and practice within government Departments and government funded services as well as criminal processes and legislative frameworks. Started April 02—to be finished end December 02	Robyn Layton QC	\$125,000
Review of the structure and functions of Family and Youth Services	To provide advice to the Minister for Social Justice on the proposed regional structure for FAYS, July 02	Des Sempé & Associates	\$12,000

Review of Hospital Performances	Reviewing hospital performances over the past five years using a range of performance indicators	J Bissett Associates	\$25,000
SACHA IT Review	Review of SACHA Information Technology internal and external systems	Aspect Computing Pty Ltd	\$20,800
Review of Infection Control in Metropolitan Hospitals	To evaluate the effectiveness of infection control programs, policies and procedures in South Australian public hospitals and review the status of control and recommend ways to improve systems	MA International Pty Ltd Drs Brennan, Spellman & Hughes	\$46,000
Review of Assessment and Transition Practices in Public Hospital Projects	Consultancy to examine hospital-based assessment practices that facilitate the transition of older people from the acute setting	University of South Australia	\$83,200
Generational Health Review (GHR)	Examining: Strategies for an optimal health system Strategies to meet future demand Mechanisms to ensure co-ordination and integration Potential funding models Strategies to improve community participation Strategies to facilitate whole of government planning Strategies to develop non-gvt and private sector initiatives Workforce requirements Strategies to rebuild connections and capacity The GHR is being carried out by an independent committee, supported by a research team comprising predominantly public sector employees.	Mr John Menadue—Chair. Ms Carol Gaston—Deputy Chair and Executive Officer. Committee members: A/Prof Judith Dwyer, Ms Sarah McDonald, Dr Helena Williams, Prof Dick Ruffin, Prof Paddy Phillips, Prof David Wilkinson, Prof Stephen Leeder, Ms Sue Crafter. Ms Kate Griffith—media strategy Prof Kathy Eagar—expert advice to the Governance and Funding Task Group.	\$750,000 committed to the Review. Payments at 30 June 02 \$301,365

JOB LOSSES

In reply to various members during Estimates Committee A and B.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I provide the following information on behalf of the government:

Agencies can offer TVSPs to affected employees who cannot be redeployed elsewhere and who voluntarily want to consider a separation package.

The 2002-2003 Budget allocated \$42 million to fund up to 600 TVSPs to assist agencies to achieve approved budget savings initiatives. Access to the TVSP fund is contingent upon each agency obtaining approval from the Commissioner for Public Employment (after consultation with the Department of Treasury and Finance). Agencies must demonstrate how the use of TVSPs will contribute to the achievement of the agency's budget task.

Agencies can offer TVSPs to excess employees who cannot be redeployed elsewhere and who voluntarily want to consider a separation package.

As it is a voluntary process, definitive numbers of accepted separation packages cannot be ascertained at this stage.

To the end of December 2002, approval had been given for agencies to offer up to 194 separation packages.

Portfolio	TVSPs Approved to offer (Up to ...)
Arts SA	6
Child and Youth Health	1

DAIS	25
Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade	17
DHS Central	55
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	7
Land Management Corporation	2
Planning SA	1
Primary Industries and Resources	40
Revenue SA	1
SA Tourism	13
TransAdelaide	4
Transport SA	22
Total	194

ELECTRICITY, OUTAGES

In reply to **Mrs HALL**.

The Hon P.F. CONLON: The most reliable and easily comparable statistic regarding outages is the measure of how long each customer is without electricity supply for any given year when averaged over all customers on the network.

Below is a table showing, where the data exists, average minutes without supply per customers per year, for all States and Territories over the last 10 years, sourced from the Electricity Supply Association of Australia.

Minutes without power per customer per year

State	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01
SA	106	171	118	116	116	118	113	117	119	158
Tasmania	267	274	167	162	180	139	133	237	245	265
WA	188	107	472	144	152	207	149	127	228	124
NSW/ACT	n/a	n/a	n/a	150	133	96	155	147	112	115
Victoria	n/a	n/a	n/a	255	203	218	195	173	129	92
NT	403	287	331	n/a	n/a	378	395	352	n/a	n/a
Queensland	n/a	n/a	n/a	185	242	175	275	301	n/a	n/a

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' SALARIES

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL**.

The Hon P.F. CONLON: For the Government Enterprises Portfolio, I advise the following:

Employees with remuneration over \$100,000—

	At 30 June 2002	Estimate for 2002-03
SA Water Corporation	30	40
Land Management Corporation	9	10
SA Forestry Corporation	3	6
Lotteries Commission of SA	5	5

ForestrySA has advised that the proposed increase in employees earning over \$100,000 is a result of ForestrySA moving to a Corporation. The ForestrySA Board has reviewed the functions of the Corporation, the appropriate executive structure and remuneration levels.

SA Water advises that the increase for 2002-03 is due to an estimated 8 employees currently on a salary close to \$100,000 who it is expected will go over that amount when the 2001-02 remuneration process is completed in September 2002 and salary increases have been implemented. In addition, two specialist positions are currently vacant and these will possibly command remuneration over \$100,000.

Note that the Industrial and Commercial Premises Corporation has no employees and operates under a servicing arrangement with the Department for Administrative and Information Services (DAIS).

REVIEWS

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (30 July).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON:

Portfolio: Government Enterprises

Reviews undertaken

Title of review	Details of review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total cost of contract \$ (if applicable)
Nil			

Reviews scheduled

Title of review	Details of review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total cost of contract \$ (if applicable)
Nil			

PORTFOLIOS, UNDERSPEND AND CARRYOVER

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND** (30 July).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The table below shows the expected underspend and approved carryover for each portfolio for 2001-02.

Portfolio/Agency	Minister	Agency underspend				Cabinet Approved Carryover			
		Operating Expenditure \$000	Investing Expenditure \$000	Revenue \$000	Total \$000	Operating Expenditure \$000	Investing Expenditure \$000	Revenue \$000	Total \$000
DETE—Education and Children's Services	White	1,060	0	0	1,060	1,060	0	0	1,060
DETE—SSABSA	White	152	275	0	427	152	275	0	427
		1,212	275	0	1,487	1,212	275	0	1,487
DPC—SA Multicultural Ethnic Affairs	Atkinson	80	0	0	80	80	0	0	80
DPC—Division of Multicultural Affairs	Atkinson	271	0	0	271	271	0	0	271
Justice—Attorney-General's	Atkinson	15,200	2,739	0	17,939	7,637	2,739	0	10,376
Justice—Courts Administration Authority	Atkinson	1,700	500	0	2,200	1,700	500	0	2,200
Justice—Attorney-General's—admin items	Atkinson	3,350	0	0	3,350	3,350	0	0	3,350
Justice—SAPOL	Conlon	20,601	3,239	0	23,840	13,038	3,239	0	16,277
Justice—Minister for Police and Emergency Services	Conlon	490	8,109	0	8,599	490	8,109	0	8,599
Justice—Minister for Police and Emergency Services	Conlon	0	4,756	0	4,756	0	4,756	0	4,756
Justice—ESAU	Conlon	0	1,168	0	1,168	0	1,168	0	1,168
DTF—Energy	Conlon	749	649	0	1,398	749	649	0	1,398
Government Enterprises—LMC	Conlon	0	5,342	1,800	7,142	0	5,342	0	5,342
Government Enterprises—Lotteries	Conlon	0	1,670	0	1,670	0	0	0	0
		1,239	21,694	1,800	24,733	1,239	20,024	0	21,263
DIT—Industry and Trade	Foley	37,700	2,605	0	40,305	21,000	2,605	0	23,605
DTF—Treasury and Finance	Foley	500	1,700	0	2,200	500	1,700	0	2,200
DTF—Central Contingency	Foley	3,135	0	0	3,135	3,135	0	0	3,135
DTF—SAIIR	Foley	207	0	0	207	207	0	0	207

		41,542	4,305	0	45,847	24,842	4,305	0	29,147
Environment and Heritage	Hill	4,541	500	0	5,041	4,541	500	0	5,041
Water Land and Biodiversity—Sustainable Resources	Hill	171	419	0	590	171	419	0	590
Water Land and Biodiversity—Water Resources	Hill	10,015	1,844	0	11,859	10,015	1,844	0	11,859
		14,727	2,763	0	17,490	14,727	2,763	0	17,490
Agriculture, Food, Fisheries	Holloway	2,175	6,494	0	8,669	2,175	6,494	0	8,669
		2,175	6,494	0	8,669	2,175	6,494	0	8,669
DHS—non Health	Key	15,518	9,383	12,383	37,284	0	9,383	12,383	21,766
		15,518	9,383	12,383	37,284	0	9,383	12,383	21,766
DPC—Tourism	Lomax-Smith	4,476	0	0	4,476	4,476	0	0	4,476
DPC—Office of Innovation	Lomax-Smith	110	0	0	110	110	0	0	110
DAIS—Science and Information Economy—IEPO	Lomax-Smith	2,647	0	0	2,647	2,647	0	0	2,647
DAIS—Playford Centre	Lomax-Smith	551	0	0	551	551	0	0	551
		7,784	0	0	7,784	7,784	0	0	7,784
DPC—Premier and Cabinet	Rann	4,483	400	0	4,883	2,163	0	0	2,163
DPC—Arts SA	Rann	3,675	0	0	3,675	3,675	0	0	3,675
DPC—Office for Volunteers	Rann	300		0	300	300	0	0	300
		8,458	400	0	8,858	6,138	0	0	6,138
DAIS—Aboriginal Affairs	Roberts	120	0	0	120	120	0	0	120
		120	0	0	120	120	0	0	120
DHS—Health	Stevens	23,100	18,870	0	41,970	0	18,870	0	18,870
		23,100	18,870	0	41,970	0	18,870	0	18,870
DTUP—Planning	Weatherill	4,231	200	0	4,431	4,231	200	0	4,431
DTUP—Office of Local Government	Weatherill	80	0	0	80	80	0	0	80
DAIS	Weatherill	21,474	59,470	0	80,944	16,690	31,001	0	47,691
		25,785	59,670	0	85,455	21,001	31,201	0	52,202
DTUP—Transport SA	Wright	4,528	0	0	4,528	953	0	0	953
DTUP—PTB	Wright	600	2,455	0	3,055	600	0	0	600
DTUP—TransAdelaide	Wright	0	1,120	0	1,120	0	1,120	0	1,120
DAIS—Recreation and Sport	Wright	9,950	0	0	9,950	750	0	0	750
		15,078	3,575	0	18,653	2,303	1,120	0	3,423
		177,339	130,668	14,183	322,190	94,579	97,674	12,383	204,636

KALBEEBA LANDFILL

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (27 August).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. There are a number of issues considered to be of major economic, social or environmental importance associated with this proposal.

These include:

- The environmental and economic implications of establishing a very large scale (5 to 6.25 million tonnes) solid waste landfill facility.
- The economic effects of locating a landfill close to the metropolitan area where most waste is generated.
- The potential to upgrading the existing substandard landfill and make use of the existing quarry resource and infrastructure.
- The visual and amenity impacts of such a large development in a rural area.
- The impacts of increased vehicular movements through the town of Gawler and through the rural area.
- The potential for impacts by leachate on the Northern Adelaide Plains aquifer which is used to irrigate the Virginia area.

The proposal would have had significant traffic implications for the Gawler and Kalbeeba communities associated with trucks carrying up to 250,000 tonnes of waste per year over the next 20 years. The government did not believe these traffic impacts were acceptable. The proposal also raised a number of issues with impacts on the local community.

Following initial assessment, the Governor has now refused the proposal. This refusal has been issued under the “early no” provisions of the *Development Act 1993*. Refusal without requiring the applicant to prepare a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement will avoid the cost and uncertainty for the applicant associated with further work, given the state government has decided

not to support the proposal. This also removes the uncertainty for the local community.

POLICE TRAINING

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (18 November).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: A decision has been taken to restrict the use of the Academy pool to core police training whilst the future requirement for the facility is being assessed. The pool is not maintained in a condition appropriate for general use nor is a supervisor provided to ensure the safety of individuals. The pool is closed to all persons other than STAR Group. The pool is not used in mainstream police training other than for specialised water response activities for STAR Group personnel.

The pool costs approximately \$70,000 a year to maintain and there is a need to repair the heater and broken tiles at a cost of approximately \$25,000. Given the need to make investment decisions on redevelopment of the pool facility, options are being evaluated as to future requirements.

CRIME PREVENTION

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE** (15 October).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The state government does not hold statistics on how many councils employ private security firms and at what cost. It is up to the individual Council as to whether it contracts out services or employs staff direct. Collecting the information would be an onerous task involving contacting each Council individually and then maintaining updates as circumstances change. The Local Government Association of South Australia also does not hold such statistics.

PLANNING SA

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (4 December).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. The reduction in the Planning SA Deposit Account balance between the two years is actually \$885,000 and not \$1.17 million. The decrease in the balance is mainly due to the following:

- A one off payment of \$311,000 to the Department for Environment and Heritage (DEH) in relation to the transfer of the Environmental Information Services Unit from Planning SA to DEH.
- A strategy to draw-down cash balances in the account to an optimal working balance. This meant that appropriation funding for the 2002 year was less than in previous years.

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (4 December).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. Seven (7) in total.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT'S OFFICE

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (4 December).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. The cost of administration of the current government (March 2002 to June 2002) Minister Weatherill's Office in 2001-02 was \$0.279 million. The costs were as follows:

Employee costs (including oncosts)	\$0.178m
Administration and Contracts	\$0.052m
Accommodation	\$0.049m

CONSULTANCIES

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (4 December).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The 23 consultancies recorded for 2002 relate to the Department of Transport and Urban Planning and not just Planning SA. Since the government came to office, Planning SA has engaged the following consultants in relation to the Oaklands Station Rail Interchange project:

Consultant	Amount
Resource and Environmental Management	\$1,500
J.A.E. Whitehill	\$2,400
Golder Associates	\$8,100
Alexander & Symonds	\$1,450
Sinclair Knight Merz	\$16,782
Total	\$30,232

The result of all the above consultancies was to better define Oaklands Station Redevelopment Project scope and costs.

An outline of the scope of work undertaken by the consultants is shown below:

Resource and Environmental Management—undertook preliminary investigation for site history assessment (likely contamination due to past activity).

J.A.E. Whitehill—arborist consultant assessing health of one hundred trees on Trans Adelaide land and to recommend the removal of unsafe or dead trees and to develop a maintenance schedule for the remaining trees.

Sinclair Knight Merz—undertook site contamination assessment (preliminary)—land contaminated by previous rail use.

Golder Associates—engaged as the environmental auditors. Standard procedure required to oversee and audit environmental consultants (Sinclair Knight Merz and Resource and Environmental Management).

Alexander & Symonds—undertook survey of Tran Adelaide property boundaries.

In addition to this, although not included in the consultancy figures (per the Auditor-General's Report), public relations firm Michels Warren were engaged to carry out work in relation to a public consultation process for the North Terrace Redevelopment project. The fee paid to Michels Warren for this work was \$43,734.55.

The various firms employed under the previous government to design, document and cost manage the project have continued to carry out those functions.

PLANNING FEES

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (4 December 2002).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Planning related fees comprise the following:

Lodgement Fees—these fees are associated with the lodgement and decision making processes for land use and land division development applications as determined by the Development Assessment Commission. The fees are set out in Schedule 6 and 7 of the Development Regulations.

Building Fees (4 per cent)—councils and private certifiers are required to pay to the Minister 4 per cent of all building applications. The majority of these applications are determined fully by the councils, with no involvement of the Development Assessment Commission.

LOTS Search Fees—these represent Planning SA's share of the total government fee charged for a Section 7 search. These searches are provided to prospective purchasers of properties for sale. These fees are received from the Department for Environment and Heritage—Property Assist/LOTS Section 7 Unit.

Planning SA receives development application fees relating to land use from all councils within the state. The timing of when payment for such fees is received from councils varies significantly. It is this timing difference that has resulted in the reduction in development application fees between the two years.

DOG CONTROL

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (7 August).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In 1986 the Criminal Law Consolidation Act was amended to contain "Acts endangering life or creating risk of grievous bodily harm."

The offence is of general application and therefore could apply in the case of children around unsupervised swimming pools.

The Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972 requires swimming pools to be fenced to restrict unsupervised children from accessing a property with a pool. Under the Development Act 1993, all new pools are required to be fenced to restrict unsupervised children from accessing the immediate pool area. All pools installed since July 1993 must comply with the Development Act requirements.

The penalty for non-compliance is \$15,000. There is no readily available information on non-compliance or prosecutions.

BUILDING MAINTENANCE

In reply to **Hon. D.C. KOTZ** (13 August).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. It is not the government's intention to close regional building maintenance nor to downsize the current services and reduce staff members in regional areas of the state.

Building maintenance continues to operate from nine regional offices based in Mount Gambier, Berri, Murray Bridge, Nuriootpa, Clare, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln and operates on a fee for services basis.

The statement that government has cut funding in this area by \$2.753m is untrue. Building maintenance has no direct appropriation of funds and receives its income from fee for services and contracting activities to government agencies.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (22 October).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee started the Port Lincoln Rapid Response Program in 1998. It was adapted from the British Home Office's, Merseyside Demonstration Project. The aims of the Program included (i) reducing the likelihood of a woman being a victim of domestic violence in the 12 weeks after she made her initial report to the police and/or domestic violence workers and (ii) increasing the feeling of safety for women and children who have left violent situations. One of the high risk times for domestic homicide, and domestic violence generally, is at and after the separation.

Strategies used by the Program included installing rapid-response alarms for victims of domestic violence, case-management and review procedures for each client and regular liaison with security, police and domestic violence workers. Contact with women who had recently left violent relationships was a priority for the program.

The Eyre Peninsula Women's and Children's Support Centre and the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee were jointly responsible for the project management and other participating agencies

included Port Lincoln Community Health, Port Lincoln Police and the Port Lincoln Domestic Violence Action Group. In addition to the project management costs, this program utilised \$8,000 per annum from funding made available through the Local Crime Prevention Program.

During the 2000-01 project year, until 30 June, 2001, these outputs or outcomes were reported:

- About 40 women had participated in the Program and it was common for eight to 15 women to be involved with the Program at any given time.
- Women on the Program commented that they felt safer knowing help was only a few minutes away when they had the monitored alarms installed.
- A report by the Eyre Peninsula Women's and Children's Support Centre claimed a reduction in the time women needed to stay at a shelter and that in most cases the program was able to support women and children in their own homes.
- The program won a National Violence Prevention Award that was accompanied with a \$5,000 contribution. This award was presented to the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee on behalf of Australian Heads of Government.
- The program was recognised nationally as a Model of Best Practice for the prevention of domestic violence and listed on The Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearing-house website (<http://www.austdvclearinghouse.unsw.edu.au/>).

The Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee did not include this Program in its work plan for the period 1 July, 2002 to 30 June, 2004. The decision not to provide any additional project funds to this program was made by the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee before any notification that funding was to be reduced. That is, the Committee did not intend to support this project with the on-going crime-prevention project funding. Intended support was likely to include assistance with attracting other sustainable sources of funding; like those currently utilised for emergency accommodation.

Before the funding reduction, the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee had planned to target domestic violence differently. That is, for the period from 1 July, 2002 to 30 June, 2004 the Committee was aiming to reduce the number of bullying incidents occurring at primary schools, reduce the number of violence incidents in boy-girl relationships and increase community awareness of domestic violence by implementing a number of new strategies. The latter was to promote the State Collaborative Approach for the Prevention of Domestic Violence and develop a localised regional approach relevant to the City of Port Lincoln. The State Collaborative Approach is the South Australian policy framework developed by the previous government to address domestic violence. It provides a framework for collaboration in a whole-of-government, whole-of-community response to domestic violence.

Contact has been made with the Eyre Peninsula Women's and Children Support Centre who confirmed that there had been no expectation that the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Program would directly fund this Rapid Response Program after current resources had been expended. The Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Committee supports this view. It was confirmed that current carry-over funds from the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Program and the aforementioned Award expire 31 October 2002. Although there are currently 12 women on the program, it is unknown how the future installation of alarms will be funded.

The funding made available to the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Program will allow the Program to continue until 31 December, 2002.

TAFE

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (5 December).

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Included in the \$3.5 million target is a transfer of \$1m worth of training hours to User Choice, which will have no effect on the aggregate volume of publicly funded VET training available. It is estimated that over 50 per cent of those training hours and associated funds will come back to TAFE.

Reductions will be made in TAFE overheads through the achievement of efficiencies that will not impact upon courses. There will be minor reductions to TAFE training hour targets for 2003.

Analysis conducted as part of the planning process for 2003 indicated a lowering in the priority of Business Studies courses and to a lesser extent Engineering, Recreation, Building and Furnishing, Preparatory Education and Expressive and Visual Art. Conversely the analysis revealed a need for higher levels of participation in Food and Beverage Processing, Community and Health Services, Printing and Graphic Arts, Transport and Agriculture/Horticulture.

These trends have been reflected in the resource allocation arrangements and training profile set for TAFE in 2003.

It is anticipated that 91,000 students will access TAFE courses in 2003.

TRANSPORT SA

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (28 August).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

Will the Minister for Transport advise the house whether negotiations regarding the supply of light vehicles to Transport SA have been completed and, if so, will he advise the house of the outcome and financial impact on Transport SA?

Transport SA was supplied with light vehicles by AH Plant under a contract, which commenced following the sale of that agency's plant and mechanical business in 1997.

AH Plant advised Transport SA that it does not want to continue business of supplying light vehicles. AH Plant therefore sold the light vehicle fleet to Fleet SA on 28 June 2002. Since that date, Fleet SA has provided Transport SA with light vehicles.

With regard to the financial impact on Transport SA, the full impact has not yet been determined. Discussions with both Fleet SA and Treasury have not been completed. However the prices charged by Fleet SA are significantly lower than those that were being charged by AH Plant.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT REVIEW

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHERE** (19 November).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Given articles in the Messenger and a previous letter to me regarding the minister's initiative to review public transport in the south—and, in particular, the Willunga Basin—will the minister advise me what stage that review has reached and whether or not it will involve an opportunity for metro ticket and weekend and night services?

To meet the government's policy commitment for a review of services in the south, the Passenger Transport Board in conjunction with community representatives has embarked on a review of passenger transport focusing on the Onkaparinga and Marion Council areas (aligning with the Office of the South). A working group has been formed in conjunction with the Southern Adelaide Region Transport Advisory Group (SARTAG) and local councils to identify passenger transport issues for the community.

The question of extension of the Metroticket area also is being considered. However, any extension of the Metroticket system would need to be considered in the light of other public transport priorities.

ARNO BAY BOAT RAMP

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (20 November).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have been advised that the Arno Bay harbour facility will proceed now that the South Australian government has agreed to contribute the final third of the project cost. A funding package of \$500,000 has been approved from the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund to assist with infrastructure costs associated with the harbour.

The development will have an enormous impact not only on the community of Arno Bay but also for the Eyre Peninsula in terms of job creation and economic development. Involving a total investment of \$1.5 million, the development will facilitate the creation of 300 new full-time positions over the next three years and will provide much needed access to the sea cages located offshore from Cleve.

The commercial harbour facility is an important regional development initiative that has been the culmination of a number of years of aquaculture planning and expertise between public and

private interests in support of the emerging finfish aquaculture industry.

Contract arrangements have been finalised with the government and the District Council of Cleve will shortly commence tendering for works involved. Understandably, all parties are eager to have this development proceed as soon as practicable.

FISHERIES COMPLIANCE OFFICERS

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (9 July).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has provided the following information:

In 2001, 17 Fisheries Compliance Officers were appointed within PIRSA FISHWATCH. This was the result of an extra \$1.0 million per annum in funding allocated to Fisheries for the next 3 years and the filling of vacancies. The additional positions were funded by government as part of a 3 year project aimed at boosting regional fisheries compliance presence in response to increasing reports of illegal fishing and the resultant threat to the sustainability of our fisheries resources.

It is regrettable that the then government chose to fund these additional officers for 3 years only instead of committing to ongoing expenditure.

Currently the number and location of Fisheries Officers across the state is being discussed and reviewed as part of the PIRSA budget discussions for the 2002-03 financial year. The Member for Flinders concerns for the Eyre Peninsula are noted and it is acknowledged that this region is a centre of major fishing activity within South Australia. Every effort will be made to ensure services provided by Fisheries Compliance Officers are maintained at current levels.

However, the previous government's decision to fund the extra positions for only 3 years and the budget deficits inherited by the government have increased the difficulty of this task.

AUTISM

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (24 October).

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Autism is a relatively newly diagnosed disability, which was first described by Leo Kanner in 1943. Studies over the past 20 years have demonstrated variations in the characteristics and severity of autism, now referred to as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), which includes autism and Asperger Syndrome. Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder can range from those who are intellectually above average to those who are very low functioning.¹

It is not known if Autism Spectrum Disorder is becoming more common or if more children are being identified with the condition due to improved diagnosis and professional awareness.²

Estimates of the prevalence of Autism Spectrum Disorder vary. According to the Autism Association of SA, a conservative estimate is that autism occurs in approximately 10 in 10,000 people. In more recent times the Autism Association is considering a prevalence of 20 in 10,000 people with Autism Spectrum Disorder. A study by the Medical Research Council, London, found that the average prevalence from all studies published by the year 2000 is 10 per 10,000 for autistic disorder, and 2.5 per 10,000 for Asperger Syndrome. This gives a prevalence figure of Autism Spectrum Disorder of 12.5 per 10,000. Estimates from more recent studies have indicated higher incidences, reflecting better ascertainment.³

Higher prevalence indicators are argued from other sources. For example Autism-Europe, an organisation comprising of members from throughout Europe, argue that clinical studies have demonstrated that the prevalence of full, classical autism is 4-5 per 10,000 with up to 10-20 per 10,000 people who exhibit many of the symptoms and so could be included within the "autism-continuum".⁴

Based on the conservative figures proposed by the Autism Association, South Australia, with a current estimated population of 1,520,600 at the end of the March quarter 2002⁵, would be likely to have in the vicinity of 1,900 people with Autism Spectrum Disorder (12.5 per 10,000).

Finally it should be noted that if the conservative prevalence indicators accepted by the Autism Association of South Australia and the British Medical Research Council are accepted, the rapid increase in the number of individuals in South Australia diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder over the last 5 years is likely to slow and plateau at around 1,900 individuals. However less conservative estimates indicate the number of people with Autism Spectrum Disorder may reach approximately 3,000 individuals.

¹ Autism-Fact Sheets for Health Professionals, Centre for Community Child Health & Ambulatory Paediatrics Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, April 1977

² National Centre on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, USA, website

³ MRC Review of Autism Research; Epidemiology and Causes, London: Medical Research Council, Department of Health, December 2001, p18

⁴ Autism—Europe, A European Association which helps to improve the lives of those whose existence is affected by Autism, website

⁵ 3101.0 Australian Demographic Statistics, Australian Bureau of Statistics.

POLICE TRAINING

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (18 November).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: A decision has been taken to restrict the use of the Academy pool to core police training whilst the future requirement for the facility is being assessed. The pool is not maintained in a condition appropriate for general use nor is a supervisor provided to ensure the safety of individuals. The pool is closed to all persons other than STAR Group. The pool is not used in mainstream police training other than for specialised water response activities for STAR Group personnel.

The pool costs approximately \$70,000 a year to maintain and there is a need to repair the heater and broken tiles at a cost of approximately \$25,000. Given the need to make investment decisions on redevelopment of the pool facility, options are being evaluated as to future requirements.

MENINGOCOCCAL DISEASE

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (28 November).

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The matter of the presentation, discharge and representation of a young boy to the Paediatric Emergency Department (PED) at the Women's and Children's Hospital has been investigated by the Department of Human Services in conjunction with the chief executive officer of the Women's and Children's Hospital (WCH).

The child concerned was referred by his general practitioner to the WCH Paediatric Emergency Department (PED) with a suspected viral infection and possible meningococcal type rash.

On presentation to the PED, the child was febrile (feverish) and his parents reported a recent history of upper respiratory tract infection and tonsillitis. The child was examined by an experienced medical officer, who found his rash was non-purpuric, which suggested a non-meningococcal type infection.

As the child's general practitioner had also indicated in the letter of referral that the child might have early signs of pneumonia, a chest X-ray was performed and this possibility excluded. Given the child's symptoms, history and clinical findings of inflamed tonsils, a diagnosis of tonsillitis was made and penicillin prescribed. As this diagnosis accounted for his febrile state, the child was subsequently discharged home as there was no clinical indication for him to be admitted at that time.

Shortly after returning home, it appears that the child had a brief febrile convulsion and was returned by ambulance to the WCH PED.

The WCH PED advises that, although febrile convulsions can appear frightening to parents, such convulsions are in themselves not dangerous in most circumstances. Febrile convulsions have been known to occur despite treatment to decrease body temperature. They affect one in 25 of the general population and experience shows that it is impossible to predict which child will be affected.

Following his representation to the PED, the child's temperature had decreased, although he was still febrile. The diagnosis of tonsillitis was confirmed, a complete blood picture and blood cultures were performed and, as it appeared the child had suffered a febrile convulsion, he was admitted overnight for observation.

Dr Jeremy Raftos, Director of the WCH PED, has reviewed the medical record and confirmed that the treatment the child received following the first presentation was entirely appropriate at the time. A correct diagnosis and febrile cause was found and pneumonia and meningococcal infections were quickly and appropriately dismissed.

In view of the public concern raised by the dangers of meningococcal infection, it is fully understandable that the child's parents would be anxious and it was entirely appropriate for the family doctor to refer him to the WCH for further medical assessment.

The child in question was properly and expertly assessed by an experienced paediatric emergency medical officer and a possible

meningococcal infection quickly excluded.

Although it would be very reassuring to parents if all children who presented to the WCH PED with a fever and a rash were admitted for observation, this would be an over-reaction and an inappropriate use of public hospital resources. Proper medical assessment within the PED can quickly identify any child who presents with symptoms of meningococcal infection from those with common viral infections or, as in this case, other bacterial infections common to childhood that can be treated without admission to hospital. Having said this, the WCH PED always takes a precautionary approach and will admit a child if there is uncertainty as to the cause of the child's presenting symptoms.

SCHOOLS, NON-GOVERNMENT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: There have been no changes to the criteria for allocating operational funding to the non-government sector.

CAPITAL WORKS

In reply to **Ms CHAMPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Expenditure for 2001-02 related to the construction of the Australian Science and Mathematics School is as follows:

	\$
DAIS costs and fees	208,130
Service Contractor fees	1,143,245
Major Contracts	1,530,926
Sundries and other	232,303
Total	3,114,604

SCHOOLS, FLEURIEU PENINSULA

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (27 August).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I have asked for a report to be presented to me as a matter of urgency that will outline how we can best meet the educational needs of people living on the southern Fleurieu Peninsula into the future.

That work has already started under a team led by Julieann Riedstra, Director of Infrastructure, Department of Education and Children's Services, and I expect it to be completed without delay.

Unlike the previous government which had planned to commit funds this financial year that would never have been spent, I want to make sure I have a clear plan on which to base future budgetary considerations.

Given the extensive backlog of school maintenance and repair left to us by the previous government, I am very mindful of making sure that precious funds are used prudently and in the best possible way.

I was not confident, upon considering the previous government's progress on these projects, that that was being done.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: \$21.5 million was for teachers and \$22.7 million was for other staff. It should be noted that of the cost for other staff, \$11.5 million was for TAFE lecturing staff, leaving \$11.2 million for staff other than teachers and lecturing staff.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (28 November).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am advised as follows:

There was one incentive and assistance approval during the caretaker period, between the calling of the election and the swearing in of the new government, requiring referral to the IDC in accordance with the policy of this and the previous government. This incentive was for Royal and Sun Alliance Insurance Australia Ltd and was approved by the former Minister of Industry and Trade on 26/2/02 in consultation with the nominated opposition member in accordance with the agreed caretaker conventions. The IDC was briefed on this approval on 14/08/02.

Following the swearing in of the government it was some time before the IDC was appointed on 8/5/02. During this period one incentive and assistance proposal requiring referral to the IDC in accordance with the policy of this and the previous government was approved.

This approval was for Mitsubishi Motors Australia Limited on 25/3/02 and modified 19/4/02. The IDC was briefed on this approval on 14/8/02.

Since 8/5/02 there have been no proposals referred to the IDC for recommendation as there have been no new approvals requiring such referral in accordance with the policy of this and the previous government.

On 9/9/02 the Acting Minister of Industry, Investment and Trade approved a variation to a previous approval for Meatcorp (Australia) Pty Ltd.

I am advised that the Office of Economic Development intends to brief the IDC on this approval at its next meeting.

STATE LIBRARY

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. Bequests

Due to the very nature of bequests, i.e., the receipt of a donation on the death of a beneficiary, the amounts received via this means fluctuate significantly from year to year and cannot be planned for.

The following table demonstrates how receipts from bequests to the State Library of South Australia have varied over the last five years:

	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total					
Bequests	51,277	9,209	nil	107,516	22,845

The Library received two large bequests in 2000-01 from the Estates of Sidney Crawford (\$97,515) and Roy Bevan (\$10,000). Only one bequest was received in 2001-02 from the Estate of Arthur Pengilly (\$22,845).

The State Library has recently increased its emphasis with respect to bequest activities. A two year contract position of Bequest Officer was created in 2001-02 to promote the State Library as an institution worthy of being considered as a beneficiary in a person's will. The financial legacy arising from this increased promotion will, of course, not be received for several years and will not be predictable.

Donations

In terms of dollars, the majority of donations are received from The State Library Foundation. Donations totalling \$166,000 were received from the Foundation in 2000-01 compared to only \$7,000 in 2001-02 (although an additional amount of \$62,000 relating to the 2001-02 year was received from the Foundation in July 2002).

The receipt of donations from the State Library Foundation is dependent upon several factors, such as the level of fundraising carried out by the Foundation in any particular year, the timing of State Library projects and activities which the Foundation may choose to support and the general economic climate which may curtail the Foundation's ability to raise funds.

2. De-accessioning Policy

The North Terrace Institutions have de-accessioning policies in place. Generally, de-accessioning is assessed on a case by case basis, with any relevant disposal conditions forming part of the legal bequest documentation.

Issues such as those recently highlighted by the Dr Mocatta and the National Trust matter, led to the development of these de-accessioning policies. The North Terrace Cultural Institutions are particularly cognisant of the issue associated with disposing of gifted items, including works of art.

HISTORY TRUST

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I advise the member that the History Trust has responded to the Auditor-General in terms of the concerns that were raised and has put measures in place. I can provide some details of those measures. If the honorable member would like some information, I can arrange for that to be provided to him in due course.

In response to the honorable member's question on this matter I advise that the following information has been supplied to me.

All of the matters raised by the Auditor were considered minor and the Auditor-General was satisfied with the response provided by the History Trust.

With reference to the specific matters highlighted by the honorable member's question, the following comments are offered:

1. Management of the heritage collection

The History Trust has a detailed Collection Management Policy which has been in operation in the organisation for some years. It includes a mechanism for valuing collection items and for sighting items. Although the Auditor-General found this process satisfactory in the past, a new auditor assigned to the History Trust this year suggested some improvements. The History Trust has undertaken to work with the Auditor to devise a workable system.

2. Management of non-current assets

The Auditor raised two issues:

- (a) At the time of the audit there was one item at the Migration Museum that had not been labeled through an oversight. This has been rectified.
- (b) Audit advised that the National Motor Museum had not updated its asset register for items under \$5,000. This has been completed and procedure for an annual check is in place.

3. Financial systems

The Auditor questioned a number of practices at the Migration Museum. Again these had been in place to the satisfaction of the Auditor for a decade, but a new Auditor preferred an alternative system of managing the advance account and processing revenue. The History Trust undertook to change the systems and this has been done.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (19 November).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Environment Protection Authority and the Department for Environment and Heritage have advised me that they have not supplied any information to the Commonwealth for the Commonwealth Communication Strategy called, "the Announcement of Low Level Radioactive Waste Sites in South Australia".

As I told the House on 14 August 2002 the EPA is auditing sites where radioactive material is stored in South Australia. I quote from this Hansard:

"There will be a complete audit of where radioactive waste is currently stored in South Australia and its condition. The EPA is planning the audit now. It will be conducted by departmental officers, who will undertake site inspections throughout South Australia. The sites include approximately 120 companies and also laboratories and hospitals. In addition, uranium mines will be audited where waste storage practices and products and use will be examined."

However, an article in the Advertiser newspaper on 15 August 2002 reported that I had ordered the EPA to investigate more than 130 sites to determine whether the waste is being stored safely.

The audit being undertaken on 120 companies and also laboratories and hospitals is an audit of all radioactive material stored in SA including radioactive waste. However, the key issue briefing, (EPO23 dated 5 March 2002) only refers to sealed radioactive sources that may be suitable for disposal at a low level waste repository.

The exact sites of where low level and intermediate level material including waste is stored will not be known until the EPA audit is finalised. The previous survey of sealed radioactive sources registered under the *Radiation Protection and Control Act* undertaken by the then Radiation Section of the Department for Human Services in late 2000 identified that there were 185 sealed radioactive sources that may be suitable for disposal at a low level waste repository. The sources at that time were located at over 50 sites.

RAILWAYS, DERAILMENT

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (23 October).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The operator of the train involved in the 22 October derailment in the Adelaide Hills is licensed with the EPA. Whilst the general operation of a railway requires an environmental licence, the carriage of hazardous materials by train is not listed in Schedule 1 of the *Environment Protection Act 1993*, as an activity requiring a licence. Rather, the transportation of hazardous materials is controlled by the *Dangerous Substances Act 1979*.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (19 November).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The audit into the storage of radioactive materials in South Australia commenced in September 2002 and it is anticipated that the audit will be completed in June 2003.

TRANSPORT SA

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (26 August).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

Will the Minister for Transport advise the house if the government consulted with industry prior to making the decision to remove credit card facilities for the retail motor industry at Transport SA?

The recent state budget provided for a significant reduction in overall expenditure by government departments. In order to achieve its savings targets Transport SA identified a number of cost efficiencies. These include the reduced use of credit cards by vehicle dealers through alternative payment options, such as direct debit.

Alternative payment options for vehicle dealers are being examined in the development of an Internet-based electronic commerce facility. This will enable vehicle dealers to process a range of vehicle registration transactions central to their business of buying and selling motor vehicles. The type of transactions that they will be able to process, from their own business premises, include applications for the transfer of vehicle registration, applications for the registration of new vehicles and applications for the registration of second-hand vehicles.

While direct debit payment will be included in the electronic commerce facility, vehicle dealers who do not elect to process their own transactions through this facility will continue to be able to use credit cards (other than American Express and Diners Club cards) for the payment of Transport SA transactions.

The motor industry was informed in writing on the day of the budget. Subsequent consultations have reassured industry that the new system will not replace credit cards until it is proven.

Will the minister advise the house whether the government will still expect the small businesses it pays by credit card to accept them and continue to carry the cost of these facilities?

The provision of an option to pay accounts by credit card is essentially a matter for small businesses to decide.

PORT LINCOLN COVE MARINA

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD**.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

Will the Minister for Transport say why the transfer of Port Lincoln Cove Marina berths is taking so long?

Leases for each of the berths located within the Commercial Basin of the Marina were issued for a term of 99 years commencing 1 July 1987, and cannot be transferred or assigned without my consent.

Many of the tenure issues involving Lincoln Cove Marina are of a very complex nature, which require close scrutiny.

Some delays have been encountered within Transport SA in processing these transactions for my approval. Transport SA is mindful of the inconvenience this has caused and has reviewed the processes employed with a view to minimising delays in the future.

FIRE BANS

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND** (24 October).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The media releases issued on 17 October 2002 and 21 October 2002 were not warnings of total fire bans under the Country Fires Act 1989 but rather warnings urging people to delay any planned burn-offs. They were not legally enforceable nor was it the intention of the Country Fire Service that they be legally enforceable, they were simply warnings.

The media releases on 18 October 2002 was a warning broadcast, advising of a 'ban on all burn-offs for today'. The Country Fire Services Board had power to impose a total fire ban pursuant to section 37(1) of the Country Fires Act 1989 and must arrange to have a warning of the imposition of a total fire ban under this section broadcast from a radio station in the state. Here, the Country Fire Service Board, warned of a ban on 'all burn-offs' as opposed to the requirements of section 37(2) that is, that it warn of the imposition of a total fire ban. This warning broadcast therefore is country to the requirements of section 37(2). As such it is unlikely that a court would determine that it was an offence for a person to light or maintain a fire in the open air contrary to the terms of the warning broadcast issued on 18 October 2002.

Once the Country Fire Service Board has by order fixed a fire danger season all fire bans are enforceable. It is an offence to breach this section and a person can be fined or imprisoned if the section is breached. A fire may only be lit or maintained during a fire ban

season in certain specifically defined circumstances and under certain prescribed conditions.

As you would be aware the government took the threat of bushfires extremely seriously this year and introduced early and extended fire danger seasons where necessary throughout the state. This issue of unenforceable warnings does not apply within:

- the part of the state defined as the Adelaide Metropolitan Fire Ban District from 1 December 2002 until 30 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Eastern Eyre Peninsula Fire Ban District from 1 November 2002 until 15 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Flinders Fire Ban District from 1 November 2002 until 15 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Lower Eyre Peninsula Fire Ban from 1 November 2002 until 30 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Lower South East Fire Ban from 22 November 2002 until 30 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Mid North Fire Ban District from 15 November 2002 until 30 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Mt Lofty Ranges Fire Ban from 1 November 2002 until 30 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Murraylands Fire Ban from 15 November 2002 until 15 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the North East Pastoral Fire Ban from 1 November 2002 until 31 March 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the North West Pastoral Fire Ban from 1 November 2002 until 31 March 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Riverland Fire Ban from 15 November 2002 until 15 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Upper South East Fire Ban from 15 November 2002 until 15 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the West Coast Fire Ban from 1 November 2002 until 15 April 2003.
- the part of the state defined as the Yorke Peninsula Fire Ban from 15 November 2002 until 30 April 2003.

I have advised the Country Fire Service of the difficulties with the warning issued on 18 October 2002 and asked them to address their procedures relating to the warnings required for a total fire ban outside the prescribed fire danger season.

FINE EVASION

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (13 August).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have been advised by the Attorney-General of the following:

For the financial year 2001-02 the following number and value of matters were lodged with or imposed by the court.

Court imposed fines—29,594 clients, relating to 53,170 penalties with a value of \$17,124,444.53

Enforced notices—47,683 clients, relating to 87,843 penalties with a value of \$16,919,696.95

Relief applications —17,080 clients, relating to 26,675 penalties, with a value of \$4,398,674.00

Court imposed—relates to fines imposed by the Courts.

Enforced—relates to those matters sent to the court by Expiation Authorities to be court enforced.

Relief—relates to those applications made by people who are unable (due to hardship) to pay the full amount and wish time to pay.

When a penalty has not had a payment arrangement entered into or when there has been a default on the payment arrangement, the first order for enforcement is a Fine Enforcement Suspension, FES (licence suspension) and a Cessation of Business Order, COB (an order that prohibits a client from transacting business with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles).

There were 33,570 clients who had a FES/COB order imposed, relating to 78,523 penalties.

Those clients who are assessed as being unable to pay a fine can be referred to court for an alternative penalty.

There were 4,550 clients referred to court for alternative penalty.

This related to 38,968 penalties to the value of \$11,443,687.36

There was a total collection of \$31,680,432 for the 2001-02 financial year.

Collection methods used

Direct Debit Transactions	235,243 payments to the value of \$9M
Paid to Registries	\$15,793,917
Australia Post	13,692 payments to the value of \$3.3M

Transport SA Customer Service Centres	3,371 payments to the value of \$740,000
---------------------------------------	--

Easy Pay Fines Call Centre

There were 127,266 inbound calls and 39,805 outbound calls. 16,790 credit card payments totalling \$2,753,917.

Enforcement

Warrants for imprisonment are no longer issued.

Warrants are issued to seize goods or to bring clients before the court so that they can be assessed as to their ability to pay their debt.

Warrants issued 3,693 warrants

Garnishee Orders

There have been three garnishee orders for clients with the last order made on 5 July 2002. A payment rate of \$120 per month is being deducted from a defaulter's wages. Previous orders made: 12 February 2002, \$60.00 per fortnight from wages; and 21 March \$12,500 was paid in full when an order was made for an amount held in trust in a solicitor's account.

Data Matching

The Privacy Committee of South Australia has approved the Fines Payment Unit data matching proposal. Data matching enables the Fines Payment Unit to make contact with or confirm the status of those persons who have not previously been contacted to inform them of outstanding amounts. Data matching has commenced with the South Australian Police, Residential Tenancies Branch and Births Deaths and Marriages.

Centrelink

An agreement has been reached with Centrelink to enable clients to use Centrepay to make payments on fines.

This scheme, which commenced this month, provides an opportunity to clients who may otherwise find it difficult to meet regular payments to participate successfully in part payments.

Advertising Campaign

The Courts Administration Authority has been allocated \$350,000 to continue an advertising campaign, to ensure the public is aware of the consequences for the non-payment of fines.

Total collection since May 2002

May 2002—\$2,942,413

June 2002—\$2,512,368

July 2002—\$2,506,163

August 2002—\$3,031,835

September 2002—\$2,569,168

MAGILL YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

In reply to **Mrs HALL** (19 November).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am advised that as at 25 November 2002 the government had not formally engaged any consultants in relation to the proposed development of a new juvenile detention facility, although the government is in the process of engaging a consultant to assist with the analysis of the feasibility of a public-private partnership for the project.

The government is considering the development of a new juvenile detention facility as a matter of priority. At present, the government is undertaking an assessment of the project as a potential public-private partnership, but the government has not as yet taken a decision on this matter.

REVIEWS

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE**.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: SAPOL as part of its continuous improvement program undertakes a range of reviews using internal resources. Since the government was elected a number of reviews (all using internal resources) have been undertaken including:

- A review of the Communications Centre Operations.
- A Review of SAPOL's response to the Juvenile Justice System.
- Prosecution Project—improving the effectiveness and efficiency of SAPOL's prosecutorial practices and staffing.
- Brief Management Project—improving SAPOL's brief management processes and systems.
- Integrated Justice Information Project (IJIP)—this project is under the control of the Information & Knowledge Management Section of the Department of Justice. The Prosecution and Brief Management projects are linked to the IJIP project.
- SAPOL is also participating in the Child Protection Review being conducted for the government by Robyn Layton Q.C.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Minister for Energy has provided the following information up to 29 July, 2002:

Reviews Undertaken			
Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
-	-	-	-
Reviews Scheduled			
Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
Strategic review of the functions and programs of Energy SA	A small review team, comprising existing departmental resources and incorporating knowledge of energy issues and financial, human resource and change management issues, will undertake the review.	Not applicable	Not applicable

In reply to **Hon. W.A. MATTHEW.**
The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Nil reviews have been undertaken by the Micro Economic Reform and Infrastructure Branch.

OMNIBUS—EMPLOYMENT COST

In reply to **Hon. W.A. MATTHEW** (7 August).
The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:
 3. There are 3 positions in the Office of Minerals and Energy Resources attracting a total employment cost of \$100 000 as at 30 June 2002. The estimate for 30 June 2003 is also 3 positions. Overall, there were 23 positions in the Department of Primary

Industries and Resources SA attracting a total employment cost of \$100 000 as at 30 June, 2002. The estimate for 30 June 2003 is 30 positions. Of the estimated 30 positions, 8 are established positions that will move into the above \$100,000 salary range as a result of normal incremental movements in salary.

REVIEWS

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The following information is provided up to 29 July 2002:
 There have been three reviews undertaken and six reviews are scheduled as detailed in the tables below:

Reviews Undertaken			
Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
Review of Incident Reporting Procedures of SA uranium mines	Review of Incident Reporting Procedures of SA uranium mines	Mr Hedley Bachmann	\$17,615
Fisheries Act Review	To ensure that the Act facilitates ecologically sustainable development of the State's living marine and freshwater resources without burdening the community or fishers with unjustified costs or unjustified restrictions on their access to those resources.	Not Applicable – conducted internally	Not Applicable – conducted internally
Survey of stakeholders, SEAGas pipeline	Determine effectiveness of consultation undertaken and recommend changes to Petroleum Act if required	Hames Sharley	\$70,126
Reviews Scheduled			
Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
Review of Golden Grove Management Plan	This is a review of the overlying plan for the Golden Grove Extractive Industries Zone against which zone participants prepare the Mining and Rehabilitation Programs.	Johnson Geological Services	\$32,203
Review of Extractive Resources – Hard Rock	Review the resources for quarry products supplying metropolitan Adelaide.		
Occupational, Health, Safety and Welfare policies and procedures	Develop and review the Occupational, Health, Safety and Welfare policies and procedures	Business SA	\$10,164
Compilation of <i>Petroleum Geology of SA volume 5 – Great Australian Bight</i>	Preparation of text and figures and compilation and technical editing of the <i>Petroleum Geology of SA volume 5 – Great Australian Bight</i> .	Dr Geoff O'Brien	\$32,090
Bight Basin Fault seal study	Research and preparation of report on Bight Basin Fault seal for publication in the <i>Petroleum Geology of SA vol 5</i>	Adelaide Research & Innovation, Adelaide University	\$7,000
Otway Gravity Data	To promote the Otway Basin, offshore gravity data of the Basin was completed.	Intrepid Geophysics	\$1,950

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE** (30 July).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is important to note that the organisation structure referred to in the question is a functional structure. Hence the nine "new executive positions" referred to are not all new positions, many are similar to positions in the previous structure.

All new positions will be advertised in line with requirements of the Commissioner for Public Employment. People who may have occupied positions that may be replaced by positions that are advertised have certain rights under the Public Sector Management Act and/or their individual contract of employment. These, along with accepted good management and industrial practice, would dictate how a person would be dealt with if they no longer had a position, should that situation arise.

On 30 June 2002 the number of positions in the Department of Industry and Trade for which remuneration was in excess of \$100,000 per annum was 25. It is not yet possible to advise precisely how many positions will exist under the proposed structure for which remuneration will be above the \$100,000 level. However, I believe it is very likely that the number will be the same as or less than the current figure, as there should be some reductions through voluntary separation or natural attrition.

REVIEWS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN**.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The government has implemented the following reviews since it was elected:

	Subject	Consultant Hired	Cost	Starting date	Completion date
Partnerships 21	Review of the Partnerships 21 initiative	Professor Ian Cox	\$21,000	4 April 2002	1 November 2002
		Michael Court	\$10,000		
Kangaroo Island	Review of Care, Education and Training on kangaroo Island	Nil	Nil	18 July 2002	Not yet complete

These formal reviews are separate to the ongoing processes of re-evaluation and re-alignment in accordance with Labor priorities as part of the normal operations of the department.

30 June 2003 Not available—an estimate will not be available until further progress is made in the restructuring of the Department of Education and Children's Services.

GOVERNMENT SALARIES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN**.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Number of Positions with Remuneration over \$100,000 in the Department of Education and Children's Services:

30 June 2002	99 employees—excludes employees who have retired or resigned or who received a Country Incentives Allowance, for DETE and does not include employees who were transferred to the Department of Employment Training and Further Education on 1 July 2002.
4 July 2002	139 employees—excludes employees who have retired or resigned or will receive a Country Incentives Allowance.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have been advised by the Department for Correctional Services of the following response:

Seven (7) positions in the Department for Correctional Services attracted a total employment cost in excess of \$100,000 in 2001-02. The same number is expected in 2002-03.

REVIEWS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The following information is provided up to 29 July 2002:
Nil.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The following information is provided up to 29 July 2002:
Agency: Passenger Transport Board

Reviews Undertaken

Year	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
5 Mar 02—29 Jul 02	Human Resource—Job and Person Specification Advice	Sue Hemmings	3,800
5 Mar 02—29 Jul 02	Financial Advice	Higgins Botha	1,100
5 Mar 02—29 Jul 02	Executive Performance—Executive Performance	McPhee Andrewartha Pty Ltd	600
5 Mar 02—29 Jul 02	Human Resource—Job evaluation/Classification Advice	William M Mercer Pty Ltd	1,200
	Total Other Consultancies		\$6,700

Agency: Recreation, Sport & Racing

Reviews Undertaken 2001-02

Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
Grants Funding Taskforce	To establish new principles and guidelines for the awarding of grants money	In-house—using existing ORS resources	Not applicable
State Recreation and Sport Facilities Audit	Statewide audit to identify the physical resources and needs of the community	In-house—using existing ORS resources	Not applicable

RECREATION, SPORT AND RACING APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Hon. D.C. KOTZ** (1 August).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Within the Recreation, Sport and

Racing portfolio there are two (2) such positions as at 30 June 2002 and it is anticipated that there will be four (4) at 30 June 2003.

The increase is due to the filling of two (2) position which were vacant at 30 June 2002. These positions are the Executive Director, Office for Recreation and Sport and the Director, Office for Racing.

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS' SALARIES

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (31 July).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The number of positions attracting a total employment cost of \$100,000 within the Department of Transport and Urban Planning as at 30 June 2002 that report to the Minister is 25. The total number of executives within this Department and agencies is expected to be 23 at 30 June 2003. This assumes no addition of new functions or removal of existing functions over that period. This also assumes that all executives below \$100,000 remain at that level.

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (31 July).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

9. There are 9 positions that fit this description for the portfolios

of Urban Development and Planning and Local Government as at 30 June 2002. It is expected that this number will be the same at 30 June 2003.

In reply to **Hon. D.C. KOTZ** (1 August).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

2b. Within the Administrative Services portfolio there are thirty-three (33) positions attracting a total employment cost of \$100,000 as at 30 June 2002 and it is anticipated that there will be thirty-two (32) at 30 June 2003.

REVIEWS

In reply to **Hon. D.C. KOTZ** (1 August).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

Department for Administrative Services			
Title of Review	Details of Review	Consultant (if applicable)	Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)
2000-01			
Procurement Learning Program (PLP) July 2000	Review of the PLP in SA government agencies	Cap Gemini Ernst and Young	45,000
Evaluation of Strategic Planning Process December 2000	Assessment of the strategic planning process used in DAIS	Oztrain	14,300
Review of Data Access and Use February 2001	Develop implementation strategy for LSG data access and use	Cap Gemini Ernst & Young	32,000
State Supply Act 2001	Review of the State Supply Act to incorporate "services within the provisions of the Act	Nil	Nil
Refinement of Building Management	Review of operations and structure of Building Management	Cap Gemini Ernst & Young	34,400
ICS Policies and Standards Review	Review of whole-of-government ICT policies and standards	Nereus Consulting P/L	40,000
Spatial Information Integration services Project	Midterm review of project aims and outcomes	Stephen Taylor and Associates	25,000
SAGRN Review	Review of structure and related workforce strategies	William M Mercer P/L	25,000
Acceptance Inspection Testing Plan	Review of the plan for acceptance of the SAGRN	KAE Constellation Group P/L	10,000
2001/2002			
Registrar General Business Re-alignment August 2001	Business re-alignment of the functions of the Registrar-General	ADC Results	27,000
Funding and Resourcing August 2001	Review of the current level of funding, its adequacy and alternative types of funding	ADC Results	34,190
Warehouse operations November 2001	Review of warehouse operations	Contracting and Tendering Services P/L	25,000
IT Infrastructure Review Mar – Jul 2002	Structural and organisational review of IT Infrastructure	KPMG	25,480
Future ICT service arrangements for SA Government June 2002	Strategic approach to ICT service arrangements	None	No additional cost
Business Support Services	Review of GICS billing processes, systems and controls	Deloitte	21,500
Business Support Services	Post implementation review of new organisational structure of Finance Group	Deloitte	6,000
Land Services Organisational Review	To meet the current and future business requirements of LSG	GSI Consulting	20,000
Classification Review Roads & Crown	Classification stream and level determination	Westaff	10,000
Financial Modelling, Business Systems and Process Review	Review of financial systems and management	Delloite Touche Tohmatsu	68,344
2002-03			
Freedom of Information Act April 2002	Review of the FOI Act	Nil	N/A

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL** (31 July).
The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

Reviews Undertaken by Planning SA between 1 July 2001 and 30 July 2002			
Title	Details	Consultant	Total Cost
Information Management Review	Evaluate current information management practices and provide recommendations for improvement.	Intec Consulting	\$9990.00 (inc. GST)

Reviews Undertaken by Office of Local Government between 1 July 2001 and 30 July 2002			
<i>Details of Review</i>	<i>Consultant (if applicable)</i>	<i>Total Cost of Contract \$ (if applicable)</i>	
Adelaide Park Lands Review	Undertaken in house	N/A	
Competition policy review of the cemetery provisions of the Local Government Act 1999	Undertaken in house	N/A	
Joint State/Local Government review of the European Wasp Control program	Undertaken in house	N/A	
Review of Section 90 of the Local Government Act 1999 (confidentiality)	Undertaken in house	N/A	
Review and revision of OLG Strategic Plan	Undertaken in house	N/A	

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The balance at 30 November 2002 was \$105.996m, of which \$72.975m constitutes the accrual appropriation, which is held in a separate account and is not available to the Department for operating purposes.

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 November).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The difference is relatively small and represents a fluctuation of less than 5% between years. The items that make up this line in the financial statement include breakdown maintenance, minor works, vandalism, equipment purchases and the portion of major works that is assessed as "non investment" from an accounting point of view. These items in total vary by \$4.4m between 2000-01 and 2001-02. The investing component of the major works costs are identified in the Statement of Cash Flows, and show an increase of \$7.5m from 2000-01 to 2001-02. If these related items of expenditure are combined, the net variation would be an increase of approximately \$3m between the two years.

It is also important to note that when the current government came to government in March 2002, no maintenance funds had been allocated for the 2002 calendar year for non-P21 schools. That was immediately overturned and now all government schools have access to the pool of money associated with minor works, maintenance and equipment.

ELECTRICITY, SNI INTERCONNECTOR

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (7 August).

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The SNI interconnector will have a transfer capability of 250 megawatts. If the interconnector was

fully utilised (24 hours per day, 7 days per week) importing electricity from New South Wales to South Australia it would import about 2,190 gigawatt-hours per year. At the Australian Greenhouse Office standard emissions intensity for NSW, this would result in about 2.1 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions in NSW.

National Greenhouse Gas Inventory emissions are measured at their source. New South Wales has a mandated quantitative per capita target for electricity generation emissions reduction. NSW retailers are required to purchase low emissions and sustainable electricity, instigate energy efficiency and demand management programs and report annually to the regulator, subject to independent audit.

Higher levels of interconnection between South Australia and the other National Electricity Market (NEM) jurisdictions will increase the ability for green electricity from South Australian wind farms to be exported to the coal generating states. Interconnection between NEM jurisdictions is a vital part of national transmission planning that to date has not been adequately addressed.

The NEM Ministers Forum has recognised this deficiency and is addressing the issue of national transmission planning. At its meeting in Melbourne on 19 July 2002, the forum agreed that the resolution of transmission and regional boundary issues in the NEM requires clearer policy guidance from the NEM Ministers.

In order to provide that guidance, the forum will undertake a study on the policy implications of alternative transmission models. The results of this study will be used as the basis to develop policy recommendations for the future development of the transmission network in the NEM.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, 17 February 2003

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

12. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** With respect to the relocation of the Radiation Protection Branch from the Department for Human Services to the Environment Protection Authority—

- how many FTE Public Sector Management Act employees and contracted employees, separately, were transferred and what are their classifications;
- have Branch officers been physically relocated and if so, where to and at what cost;
- what role did the Branch undertake in 2001-02, what role will they undertake in 2002-03 and what is the reason for any differences; and
- what was the Branch's budget and actual expenditure in 2001-02, what is the budget for 2002-03 and the reason for any variance?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

- The Radiation Protection Branch of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has 13 FTE Public Sector Management Act employees and 1 FTE temporary employee who were transferred from the Department of Human Services (DHS). The numbers and classifications are tabled below:

FTEs	Classification
1	MPS-3
1	PSO-4
6	PSO-3
1	PSO-2 (Temporary)
1	PSO-1
1	TGO-3
2	ASO-2
1	ASO-1

- The branch has not been physically relocated.
- The branch's principal role, irrespective of the year, is to protect the health and safety of the people of South Australia and the environment from the harmful effects of exposure to radiation. For this purpose the branch administers the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982. The Branch will continue its role and administration of the legislation within the EPA, and complement the role of the EPA in protection of the environment.
- The Radiation Protection Branch is largely self-funded through licence and registration fees collected under the legislation it administers.

The total budget for the Branch, as determined prior to its reassignment, is \$1,042,500 while there is revenue of \$842,500. The Branch's budget allocation for the 2001-02 year was \$200,000.

Additional funding (\$73,000) was provided by DHS to purchase equipment and employ additional staff (0.5 FTE) associated with the surveillance of uranium mining operations.

The budget for 2002-03 is \$1.14 million. An additional \$50,000 has been made available to conduct the audit of radioactive wastes in South Australia.

BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

13. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What is the proposed new legislative approach to Biodiversity Conservation and will this encompass new legislation and if so, when?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The Environment and Conservation Portfolio is currently developing a framework for a proposed new biodiversity conservation Act. The legislation will be developed in the context of the government's Naturelinks plan for biodiversity conservation, No Species Loss strategy and Living Coast Strategy.

It is anticipated that a time-frame of eighteen months to two years could be expected to develop the legislation with a Public Discussion Paper due to be released early 2003.

COAST AND MARINE MANAGEMENT

14. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What is the proposed new legislative approach for marine and coast management and will this encompass new legislation and if so, when?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. The government's election policy identified in its Living Coast Strategy the need to develop an integrated framework for the management and protection of the marine environment, coastal areas and estuaries users.

I am developing a public consultation paper on a new Coast and Marine Act to replace the Coast Protection Act 1972.

The release of the public consultation paper is due in the first half of 2003.

YURREBILLA

21. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What is the budget for the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands—Yurrebilla for 2002-03, what was the budget and actual expenditure for 2001-02, what land is proposed to be added to the parklands this year and what is the status of the Yurrebilla trail?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

- The 2002-03 budget for the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands—Yurrebilla is \$505,000.
- The 2001-02 budget for the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands—Yurrebilla was \$500,000 and was expended completely.
- Additional areas included in the parklands that includes Glenshera, Yaringa and Mount George as well as Transport SA land to be added to Cleland Conservation Park and the state mountain bike park.
- Construction of the Yurrebilla Trail is nearing completion.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSOCIATIONS

24. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What are the details of the 5 Environmental Associations to be added to the Reserve System and if the target of 212 Associations is achieved, how many will still have 0 per cent of its association in the Reserve System?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

- The names of the five environmental associations to be added to the Reserve System are:
 - Moorlands
 - Seymour
 - Mongalata
 - Mabel Creek
 - Breakaways
- Following these additions, there will be 212 of the 382 environmental associations represented in the Reserve system, and 170 without any representation.

COAST AND MARINE MANAGEMENT

40. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Why has the budget of the Coast and Marine Management Services been reduced and which programs have been discontinued?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Some parts of the Coast and Marine Branch budget, such as information technology and accommodation costs have been moved to other parts of the agency. In addition, this year's budget does not include allocations for a number of one off projects funded in previous years:

- 2000-01, Barcoo outlet, Semaphore Park Trial Breakwater, and the Witton Bluff remediation project.
- 2001-02, Natural Heritage Trust program received \$85,000 for coastcare with a carryover budget of \$18,000 proposed for 2002-03.

42. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What is the budget for the office in 2002-03 and what was the budget and actual expenditure in 2001-02?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

- The 2002-03 total budget for the coast and marine branch is \$2,759,582
- The 2001-02 total budget for the coast and marine branch was \$4,345,989. Actual expenditure was \$3,066,997

The 2001-02 budget included several significant one off projects including \$532,000 for Witton Bluff, \$1 million for Semaphore Park and \$150,000 for Barcoo Outlet sand works.

It is anticipated that the 2002-03 budget will include carry over funding totaling \$1.5 million, lifting the budget to \$4,260,000.

WATER QUALITY

59. **The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What was the budget and actual expenditure for monitoring water quality at metropolitan Adelaide beaches in 2001-02 and which beaches were monitored, will this program continue in 2002-03 and if so, what is the budget and will the results continue to be published?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. The budget for monitoring water quality at metropolitan Adelaide beaches in 2001-02 was \$24,000. The corresponding actual expenditure in 2001-02 was \$47,363.

The following beaches were monitored in 2001-02:

- Largs Bay
- Semaphore
- Grange
- Henley Beach
- Glenelg
- Brighton
- Noarlunga

The metropolitan Adelaide beaches water quality monitoring program is continuing through 2002-03, with the inclusion of Glenelg North and West Beach to the program. The EPA will continue to make the results available on the EPA web page.

The budget for the 2002-03 metropolitan Adelaide beaches water quality monitoring program is \$51,500.

ROADS, INFRASTRUCTURE

103. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Which areas will be affected by the \$9.6 million reduction in the maintenance and operation of the road infrastructure and system?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The question appears to be raised in relation to the figures shown on page 9.31 of the budget papers. The budget papers report a reduction in proposed expenditure across the maintenance and operation of the road infrastructure and system of \$9.6 million.

This reduction has a number of components, some of which are reductions in services and some of which are savings through improved efficiency.

As part of the 2002-03 budget deliberations, \$3.5 million of reductions were applied to fund overall government priorities. These reductions included:

- A reduction in consultancies within TSA of \$0.44 million
- A reduction in the Regional Roads Program of \$1.5 million to \$0.7 million
- A reduction on outback road maintenance of \$1 million
- Postponement of some road drainage works in metropolitan Adelaide \$0.26 million

It should be noted that \$1.8 million of these savings have been transferred to fund works under the Safer Roads Program, which is under the Capital Investment Program. The Safer Roads Program is an area of government priority and includes activities such as the shoulder sealing program, the construction of overtaking lanes and the new state Black Spot Program (see below).

The remaining \$6.1 million in savings are not reductions in the level of Transport SA works but are derived from expected efficiencies within the Agency and a reduction (to a more realistic level as shown by expenditure in years prior to 2001-02) in works performed for external bodies.

With regard to outback road maintenance, patrol-grading effort from routine maintenance patrols will be maintained and four re-sheeting gangs have been restructured into two 'roving' (non-geographically based) gangs that will focus on re-sheeting priorities. Routine patrols are crucial to ensuring that road conditions are maintained and that public safety is protected. Transport SA maintains roads to a standard that ensures conventional vehicles (including emergency vehicles) are able to access the outback. This standard will not be compromised by the changes that are being made to the re-sheeting gangs.

Whilst funding to local roads through the Regional Roads Program has been reduced, the overall 2002-03 budget will deliver significant benefits to Regional South Australia. These include:

- Additional funding of \$1.7 million to boost the shoulder sealing program to \$5.1 million in 2002-03
- Maintaining the overtaking lane program at \$6.0 million per year, all to be spent in regional South Australia
- Introduction of the State Black Spot program of \$3.5 million with 69 per cent of the funds to be spent in regional South Australia.

Whilst to some extent, the government's investment in regional roads has been redistributed from local to arterial roads, this decision

has been taken in the light that approximately two-thirds of all serious casualty accidents occur on arterial roads which also carry higher traffic volumes.

TRANSPORT SA

104. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** What areas of Transport SA have been identified for staff reductions and how will the affect customer service

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Under the proposal to introduce a support services model into Transport SA, staff reductions are anticipated in the functional areas of finance, human resources, procurement and administration. It is intended that the overall level of customer service will be maintained.

METROPOLITAN PUBLIC PASSENGER SERVICES

105. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** How will the \$10.7 million income increase be achieved in the Metropolitan Public Passenger Services and why have expenses increased by \$4.9 million?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The question relates to revenue derived from Output 2.4 Metropolitan Public Passenger Services in the 2002-03 Budget Papers. Revenue from this output comprises: fares from Adelaide's public transport services; concession reimbursement paid to the Passenger Transport Board by other government agencies; and revenue from other sources like advertising and promotions.

The increase in revenue from 2001-02 of \$70.402 million to \$81.174 million in 2002-03, reflects the increase in patronage achieved by the Passenger Transport Board (PTB) and the cabinet approved increase in fares implemented in July 2002.

Patronage had been declining until 2000-01 and the PTB forward estimates for fare revenue reflected that trend. The fare revenue budget for 2001-02 did not include the projected increase in patronage or the increased fares for 2001-02.

The level of fare price increase for 2001-02 was not decided until after the budget papers had been finalised. Consequently, the 2001-02 budget did not reflect the projected additional revenue that would be achieved through increased fares and patronage. As a consequence, the budget for 2002-03 incorporates a 'catch up' factor for the previous financial year and now reflects the trend to increasing levels of patronage.

Fare prices for 2002-03 were increased by an average of 4.2 per cent in line with the cabinet approved CPI increase.

In addition to the increase in ticket revenue, the PTB has also achieved additional revenue from advertising. This was not previously included in the PTB budget.

The increase in expenditure of \$4.9 million against the Metropolitan Public Passenger Service is due to an increase in payments to metropolitan service contractors for incentive payments, relating to increased patronage and service variations, and the annual Treasury approved 2.5 per cent CPI increase applied against all expenditures.

TRANSPORT, PASSENGER NUMBERS

107. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** How will a 2 per cent increase in passenger journeys for regional passenger services be achieved?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The Regional Public Passenger Services output has targeted an overall increase in regional journeys of 3.3 per cent. This includes journeys taken on regional route services, regional town services and Community Passenger Networks. Of these, regional towns patronage has targeted an increase of 2 per cent. The regional towns services are bus services provided in the six provincial cities of Pt Pirie, Whyalla, Pt Augusta, Pt Lincoln, Mt Gambier and Murray Bridge.

The overall increase in regional passenger journeys is expected to be achieved through a combination of factors:

Community Passenger Networks will increase their emphasis on providing local passenger transport information in each region.

Improvement of existing services so that they better match the needs of the community.

Implementation of new services that have been developed following the extensive consultation undertaken by the Passenger Transport Board with communities in regional areas of the State.

Advice and assistance to improve regional passenger transport. For example, the Passenger Transport Board has recently assisted a number of Provincial City Councils to review town bus services.

CAPITAL WORKS

113. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** How much of the Capital Works Budget in 2001-02 was unspent and how much has been carried over into this year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The level of under expenditure in the Capital Works Budget for 2001-02 was \$1.7 million. \$1. million was carried over for deferred Park n Ride expenditure in 2002-03.

ROADS, LYNDHURST TO MARREE

117. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Does the government intend sealing the Lyndhurst to Marree road and if so, how much will be allocated towards this in 2002-03 and 2003-04?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: This government does not currently intend to seal the Lyndhurst to Marree Road.

The government's priorities in relation to transport were made clear during the election and subsequently with the announcement of the budget. In relation to roads, safety is a major priority. Projects that provide a contribution to the reduction of road crashes throughout the state will attract priority. Consequently, the government has provided \$20.84m toward a safer road program aimed at improving specific locations or road sections which are considered hazardous. At least half of these funds will be spent on regional roads throughout the state.

The Lyndhurst to Marree Road forms an important role in terms of access to the far north of the State but, when compared with other existing sealed arterial roads that have much higher volumes and significant crash histories, it is clear that our attention should be on improving the safety of other roads.

Transport SA will continue to maintain this open surface road to a standard that ensures its continued accessibility for freight and local community needs.

UNAUTHORISED ENTRY

119. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Have departmental officers operating under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 entered farming properties located on the Eyre Peninsula or in the District Council of Mount Remarkable without consent and if so, how many properties were entered and why weren't the occupiers advised?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 Section 36 (1), if a person authorised by the minister (an 'authorised officer') suspects on reasonable grounds that an offence against this Act is being, or has been, committed, the officer may enter and inspect the land on which the suspected offence is being, or has been, committed. There is no requirement under this Act for authorised officers to obtain the consent of the occupier prior to entering the land.

In instances of routine inspections, authorised officers will contact landowners prior to entering the property. However, this may not be practicable or possible in the case of an emergency, or where the landowner does not have a telephone or is an absentee landowner.

When authorised officers are investigating an allegation of an illegal activity such as the illegal clearance of native vegetation it may not be desirable to forewarn the landowner that officers are attending if there is a likelihood of evidence being removed or destroyed. Furthermore, there are occasions where it may not be possible to determine the exact location of an incident until a search of an area is first made.

As to the number of properties entered on the Eyre Peninsula or in the District Council of Mount Remarkable, I am unable to give an exact answer without a specific incident or location and timeframe.

INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

120. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:**

1. How many infringement notices were issued to truck drivers transporting hay on the road between Yunta and Cockburn in August and September 2002 and will these notices be withdrawn due to a subsequent change in policy?

2. How many departmental officers are employed in the Transport Inspection Unit at Port Augusta, how many vehicles do they have and what were the operational costs of this office in 2001-02?

3. How many departmental officers are employed in the region north of Clare?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

1. During August 2002, in response to NSW drought relief efforts, Transport SA provided permits to applicants which permitted the over height transport of hay to drought stricken areas of NSW.

Transport SA Inspectors operating in the vicinity of Yunta and Cockburn during August and September issued one (1) expiation notice to a transport driver (NSW registered) who was carrying hay.

The circumstances that led to the issuance of the expiation notice were such that the driver was observed at 4:15am carting hay, over width, without a permit or gazette notice. Given the nature of the load, the driver would not have been issued a permit, had he applied for one and was not entitled to operate under the existing gazette notice. As such, no consideration has been given to withdrawing this expiation notice.

Transport SA is unaware of whether any expiation notices were issued by SAPOL.

2. During 2001-2002 there were four Road Transport Inspectors (RTI's), one Vehicle Inspector and a 0.5 FTE Clerical Officer employed at Pt Augusta in the final part of 2001. During the early part of 2002 the number of RTI's reduced to three due to an officer being appointed to a position in another Agency.

Assets include two Commodore sedans and one Nissan four-wheel drive vehicle.

Total operational costs for the 2001-2002 financial year were approximately \$515,000.

In addition, the regional Chief Road Traffic Inspector, responsible for detachments in Ceduna, Port Augusta and Berri is accommodated at Port Augusta with a vehicle at his disposal. The Chief Inspector's salary costs; proportionate to his responsibilities in Port Augusta were approximately \$17,000.

3. It is assumed that the question refers to Transport SA inspectorate staff. Current employee numbers are:

Ceduna 1 Senior Road Transport Inspector

2 Road Transport Inspectors

Port Augusta 3 Road Transport Inspectors

1 Vehicle Inspector

0.5 FTE Clerical Officer

1 Chief Road Transport Inspector (accommodated at Port Augusta)

In addition, Inspectors from other areas visit the region specified in the question to supplement the Vehicle Inspector, performing programmed inspections and to support other operational activities.

POLICE, PRESENCE

121. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Was the large presence of police vehicles on the road between Port Wakefield and Gepps Cross on 9 November 2002 related to truck surveillance and if not, what was the reason?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON:

I provided the following information:

The presence of police vehicles on the road between Port Wakefield and Gepps Cross on 9 November 2002 was part of a police operation regarding the heavy vehicle transport industry.

Transport SA and the South Australia Police (SAPOL) have an agreed policing strategy to measure and enforce compliance within the heavy vehicle transport industry. Historically, during harvest season, drivers of heavy vehicles such as grain trucks have committed offences including a large number of over mass offences and vehicle defects.

Operation 'Harvest' is a dual phase campaign which has been run during the harvest season for several years. It consists of an educational and an enforcement phase.

The first phase (education) commenced 0001 hrs Thursday 24 October 2002 until 2359 hours Thursday 31 October 2002. The second phase (enforcement) commenced 0001 hours Friday 1 November 2002 and will conclude on 2359 hours Friday 31 January 2003.

The campaign will endeavour to reduce road trauma and increase driver awareness by displaying a concerted police presence throughout the state; by targeting all motor vehicles involved in carrying grain and by ensuring that vehicle load and mass standards and driver fatigue requirements are met.

