

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 5 August 1998

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

HEYSEN TRAIL

A petition signed by 308 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide legal status to the Heysen Trail such that it cannot be obstructed or re-routed and for its current aesthetic value to be retained was presented by Mrs Geraghty.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith)** 17 February.

The **Hon. J. HALL**: The number one priority of our Government is to generate more employment opportunities for South Australians. Since the Liberal Government came to office in December 1993 significant resources have been invested in employment generation activities and attracting employers to South Australia.

Over this time more than 27 500 people have participated in a range of employment and training programs, directly assisting many to secure employment in the private or public sector. In addition to this employment assistance, our State Government has created more than 4 600 traineeship opportunities for young South Australians in the public sector.

The State Government has recognised that we need to do as much as possible to encourage employment growth in South Australia and has responded with a \$100 million Employment Statement. This statement focuses on building on successful employment programs and supplementing ongoing programs.

Some of the employment programs being implemented to help meet our employment growth objectives include:

- The Small Business Employer Incentive Scheme, introduced in January and expanded in the Employment Statement, provides financial incentives for small businesses to employ additional trainees and apprentices.
- Community At Work, introduced in 1997 and also expanded in the Employment Statement, assists local communities to generate employment and business growth.
- The Government Youth Training Scheme has provided public sector traineeship opportunities for more than 4 600 young people and has been expanded for a further two years in the Employment Statement.
- Upskill SA is creating employment and training opportunities through ensuring trainees and apprentices are employed on outsourced State Government contracts. The pilot project in the building and construction sector generated 30 200 training hours. The program has since been extended to all contracts over \$500 000 (August 1997) and selected industry sectors for contracts between \$100 000 and \$500 000 (April 1998).

The State Government is also committed to creating both direct and indirect employment through investing in significant infrastructure developments in the State, for example the National Wine Centre Development, Holdfast Bay Shore Development, Airport Runway Extension and the Adelaide to Darwin Railway.

In addition, the State Government is assisting industries with a potential for employment growth or economic significance in our State. This is part of a strategy that is establishing South Australia as a market leader in Defence and Electronics, Call Centres and Back Office operations, Information Technology, Viticulture and Aquaculture.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith)** 17 February.

The **Hon. J. HALL**: For around 30 years unemployment in South Australia has consistently been above the national average. The State Government's primary goal is to increase employment opportunities for South Australians and, accordingly, to reduce our unemployment rate as much as possible.

The Premier has stated that our aim is to bring our unemployment rate down to the national average and, although we realise it will not be easy, it is a commendable goal that we will continue aiming to meet and to exceed.

There are many variables in quantifying this goal, including anticipated population growth rates, labour force participation rates, national employment growth rates and State employment growth rates. Any prediction of employment growth required to meet this goal is based upon countless assumptions that will be influenced by factors uncontrollable to any State Government, such as the Asian financial crisis and Federal Government policies. The issue should not be about playing with or predicting these statistics, but that the State Government is committed to creating as many employment opportunities for South Australians as possible. A goal that we will not hide from.

WORKSKIL INC.

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)** 24 March.

The **Hon. J. HALL**: The Commonwealth Government has the sole contractual responsibility for assessing the ability of Workskil to meet its obligations under the Commonwealth's Job Network. The State Government had no involvement with the assessment of tenders for the new employment services system.

State Government involvement with Workskil has primarily been restricted to the Department of Education, Training and Employment and the Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment (OCPE). The Department of Education, Training and Employment has previously utilised the services of Workskil to provide pre-employment programs and to act as a broker for the Job Shop scheme. The Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment has engaged Workskil to provide off-the-job training for State Government trainees.

All Department of Education, Training and Employment projects delivered in conjunction with Workskil have achieved solid outcomes. Similarly, the Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment has advised that projects utilising Workskil's services have produced satisfactory results.

The State Government is committed to the provision of quality employment assistance to all South Australians and will therefore continue to monitor and work closely with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that the new employment service arrangements will not negatively impact on South Australians seeking work and that any problems are addressed.

EDUCATION FUNDING

In reply to **Ms WHITE (Taylor)** 30 June.

The **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY**: Under the States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Act 1996 the Commonwealth provides general purpose grants to the states as a contribution to the overall cost of primary and secondary education. These grants are not specific to any particular program or project.

The grants are factored into the Department of Education, Training and Employment's overall budget and are supplemented annually by the Commonwealth for inflation based on the movement in the Average Government School Recurrent Cost Index (AGSRC) maintained by the Commonwealth.

It is difficult to accurately predict in advance the movement in the AGSRC and hence the level of supplementation. In 1997-98 the level of Commonwealth supplementation exceeded the department's estimates by some \$5 million p.a. This represents one source of funds available to finance the department's three year budget strategy and will contribute towards Government policy initiatives and other cost pressures in education.

The extent of the increase was significantly influenced by salaries movement across Australia and recognises the additional costs already incurred or committed.

SECONDARY TECHNICAL SCHOOL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Earlier this year I announced that the Government would re-establish a secondary technical school in Adelaide. After years of having no such facility, because the former Government closed the Goodwood Technical School, South Australia will finally have not one but two technical schools. I am pleased to be able to inform the House today that a trade school will be located at the Windsor Gardens High School in collaboration with the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE. This technical school will be ready for its first intake of students in the first term of next year. A second technical school will also be established in our southern suburbs to be ready for student intake in the year 2000.

Several years ago the former Labor Government closed down our large technical school at Goodwood. Goodwood Technical School should never have been closed. That decision bothered me then and it bothers me now more in Government when I see figures of our trade shortages. We now have a trade skill shortage, particularly in the area of toolmaking and welding. We made a deliberate decision to address this shortage because, while we will continue to focus on new high-tech industries because they are important, they need a trade skills base.

Goodwood Technical School's great advantage was that it was able to attract young people who wanted skills-based training and apprenticeship opportunities from schools around the metropolitan area and the State. We wanted to put in place the same sort of provisions, which meant the school had to be located on good transport links, so that students from various suburbs could easily access the facility. By placing a school in the northern suburbs and another in the southern suburbs no-one is disadvantaged in terms of access. A location is yet to be chosen for the southern suburbs facility. However, the Government will be calling for interested schools to make application in the coming months.

Both of these schools are not trades schools as we might have known them in our youth. In fact, they are better known now as vocational colleges, and they will be at the cutting edge of vocational education, equipping school aged students with skills which they need to get a job in today's business and high-tech industry. The vocational college at Windsor Gardens will provide a new and exciting way for schools, TAFE Institutes and industry to work together. I commend the Minister for Education for his initiative in driving forward this project.

It will also allow the joint delivery of courses and greater support for the development and delivery of traineeships and apprenticeships. The vocational college will offer courses of instruction for secondary school aged students at both the Windsor Gardens Vocational College and the Gilles Plains campus of the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE. This college will become a lead agency in providing vocational employment and career advice, and it is a commitment we have to the youth of this State. Unlike the former Government, which ripped the heart out of our trade base, we intend to rebuild it—and rebuild it we will.

The Windsor Gardens High School site, in association with the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE, is well positioned to take on the challenge of such a development. The school itself has demonstrated a strong understanding of and

commitment to integrating vocational and general education and, importantly, there is strong community support for the school and its students. In terms of funding, the Government will spend \$1.5 million for planning and course development and on upgrading facilities and equipment. A portion of that money will be made available immediately so that this process can get under way later this year. As I have said, the initial decision to close Goodwood Tech was one which worried me greatly. Now, after eight years of no such facility, and an eroded trades skill base, it is this Government which has demonstrated its commitment to our young people.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Office of Road Safety—Random Breath Testing—
Operation and Effectiveness, 1997

Ministerial Statement—Random Breath Testing in South
Australia: Operation and Effectiveness.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the report of the committee on regulations made under the Passenger Transport Act 1994 in regard to small passenger vehicles and other matters and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: I bring up the sixteenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: I bring up the seventeenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: In accordance with the preceding report, I advise the House that I no longer wish to proceed with Notices of Motion, Private Members' Business, Committees and Regulations Nos 4 and 8 standing in my name.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Does the Premier stand by his statement to this House in September 1994 that no deals were made by the Premier, then Industry Minister, with Motorola that related to anything other than the estimated \$16 million incentive package given to Motorola to establish its software centre in South Australia? On 21 September 1994, the now Premier told Parliament:

No side deals in relation to the development of the main package: the main package stands and falls alone. . . I repeat: there has been no formal or informal discussion with Motorola about other components of business.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Elder for asking a question at last on this topic. The member for Elder has been out in the community talking to the media, drumming up hysteria and misinformation in relation to this contract and until today he has asked me not one question in relation to this contract, even though he has been fully aware of how the management of this contract has been conducted. Further, the member for Elder has not taken the opportunity

to even be briefed, nor has any other member of the Labor Party. I make the offer on the record formally to the member for Elder that, if he wishes to have information about a topic, he need only ask for a briefing. That is all he needs to do: ask for a briefing. I appreciate the fact that the member for Elder has not been here all that long, but his other colleagues around him—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder will come to order. The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—will tell the honourable member that, if he were to ask me for a briefing, he will be provided with a full, accurate, detailed briefing. The invitation—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I cannot guarantee that the honourable member will understand it, but the invitation is there. It is an open invitation. If he wants information he only need ask the question. To help the member for Elder I will provide the House with some information in relation to this matter. The Government radio network contract project is a services based contract for the design, building and management of a wide area mobile radio, wide area paging and mobile data services.

Mr CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to relevance. I have asked the Premier whether he stands by a statement that he made in 1994; I did not ask the junior Minister for details.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I can well imagine why the member for Elder does not want this information put on the record because, as this information is unravelled on the record, it will make a mockery of some of the bizarre public statements he has made without taking the effort to equip himself with information.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member says that there is more to come—and I will be interested to see what that is.

Mr Conlon: It is not for you; it is for someone important.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the member for Elder for continuing to interject after he has been called to order. It is discourteous in the extreme and it is the quickest way for the honourable member to be named in this Chamber.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The three distinct services that I have just outlined are presently provided by Government through a network involving 17 pre-existing agencies, 28 separate networks, 12 000 radios, 8 000 pager systems and 45 000 users, and it has coverage of 226 000 square kilometres. This network will be one of the most visionary and one of the largest ever built in the world—

Mr Foley: And one of the most expensive.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I hope the member for Hart has some questions to ask, too, in relation to some of the bizarre statements he has made and, if he has, I look forward to answering them. The existing network is ageing and it is in a state of disrepair. Importantly, it has to be state of the art to provide valuable communication services for emergency services, police agencies and for other Government agencies relying on that network. With that task in mind, this Government has taken that task seriously. The Government is taking that task seriously to ensure that it puts in place an appropriate network to service those needs. Recently, the Premier announced that Telstra has been nominated by Government as the preferred bidder for the establishment of this network.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member would like to wait, we will bring Motorola into it. Telstra has the opportunity of putting that contract in place, and at this time negotiations are continuing with Telstra to finalise the contract to put it in place. At that time I will be pleased to ensure that the House is provided with further details of the costs of this network about which the member for Hart is so concerned.

The member for Elder mentioned Motorola, and the honourable member needs to reflect on this carefully. Motorola is the nominated designated supplier of equipment for the mobile radio or voice component only. If the member for Elder recalls the words that I used at the start, I indicated that there are three components to this contract. He wants to think carefully about this and make sure that he gets it right; he is sitting there hurling out insults. There are three components: data, voice and paging. Motorola has the status of being designated nominated supplier for the voice component only. Any contract that is reached with Motorola will ultimately be between Motorola and Telstra.

Ms WHITE: On a point of order, Sir, the question asked of the Premier was about a statement by the Premier, and the Minister is not responsible for statements by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: The Minister answered the question, as I saw it, because he has some ministerial responsibility for the subject material. The member for Colton.

Members interjecting:

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

HOGG, Mr R.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Premier advise the House whether he is aware of any invitation by the Economic and Finance Committee to the former Secretary of the Labor Party, Robert Hogg, to appear before the committee's inquiry into electricity reform in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am delighted to respond to the honourable member's question, because we have been apprised of a letter from Bob Hogg, now a consultant in New South Wales. He also chaired a committee of inquiry into the sale of the electricity assets in New South Wales. The letter states that he wanted to put on record for the committee a detailed explanation of his views, and his views make very interesting reading. I would like to quote some of those views, and I am sure that the Leader would be interested in them, because his former Labor colleague Bob Hogg, former National Secretary of the ALP, is strong on the sale of the electricity assets. Mr Hogg says:

Privatising public assets such as electricity corporations does represent another substantial change to the community and will be opposed. In this period of political turmoil the political instinct is to duck for cover and do nothing.

We are seeing that from the Opposition. Mr Hogg continues:

Doing nothing of course is no solution.

That is Labor's position in South Australia—do nothing—but it is no solution to the problem. They do nothing and hope it will go away but, as we know, these issues will not go away. Bob Hogg goes on to say:

Generally the failure in this period of reform and change has been the failure of political will necessary to manage that change fairly and equitably. Engaging in commercially competitive activities is not an appropriate function for Government and it is one which carries a high risk for the taxpayer and for a Government's longevity. When Governments and Oppositions know what the right course of action is, but do not act through fear of the electorate's reaction, then

that is a reflection on their political capacity to engage the community, to educate, to convince and to carry the electorate with them. It is also a fundamental abrogation of responsibility which further diminishes their standing.

Here we have the former Secretary of the Labor Party, Bob Hogg, laying out a clear case as to why our electricity assets must be sold. How many more people will it take for the Leader to realise that he is not doing the people of South Australia any favours by opposing this sale? He is trying to hamstring the future of this State for many years, all because members opposite will not look at the reality of the circumstances that we now face.

I challenge the Leader to ask any business community. If you put down a position one year and circumstances change, good business and commercial practice is that you adjust to the changed circumstances. If you do not, you put at risk the company, the shareholders' funds and the employment in that company. In other words, you do not have a future.

We will not sit idly by and allow that set of circumstances to prevail in this State. We are just pulling out of the trough of the State Bank debacle. We are seeing good economic indicators, some signs that at last this economy is starting to head in the right direction. It will stall if we do not ensure that input costs for business are reduced to internationally competitive levels.

When you get people like Bob Hogg, the former ALP Federal Secretary, putting pen to paper and talking about political will and the importance of taking on responsibility in Government, that is exactly what this Government is attempting to do. I have indicated before and I will say again: this Government has changed its mind and it did not do so lightly. It did so in the face of mounting evidence that failure to act would simply see circumstances of State Bank proportions revisited on South Australia, and that would be a total abdication of responsibility on behalf of all South Australians now and in the future.

Despite the political pain, we have taken the responsible decision. This decision, if the Parliament will allow it to proceed, will secure the future for South Australians. Failure to act will put at risk the future of our kids.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Will the Premier explain the conflict between his statement to this House in September 1994 that no side deals had been done with Motorola to bring its software centre to Adelaide and the Treasurer's recent statement that in April 1994 the Premier as then Industry Minister had offered Motorola a multi-million dollar deal to become supplier of radio equipment for the Government's communications network? In an official parliamentary reply to an Estimates Committee question made in July this year, the Treasurer said that in April 1994 the then Minister for Industry had offered to Motorola its appointment as designated supplier of radio equipment for the communications network. The Treasurer stated that the then Minister's offer to Motorola was 'subject to the establishment of its Australian software centre in Adelaide'.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Administrative Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir, the question is to determine whether or not the Premier has misled the Parliament. Why is the Premier not answering the

question himself? It is about a statement that the Premier made, which was contradicted by the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. There is no point of order. It has been the tradition of this House that questions can be directed to other Ministers. In this case, if the Minister has ministerial responsibility and a question is passed to him, he can answer it. The Minister for Administrative Services.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I remind the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Elder that all the information they are seeking today would happily have been provided to them in a briefing. All they needed to do was ask.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member sits back and listens, he will hear the answer. Motorola's involvement with the Government radio network contract was secured after an invitation to submit a preliminary proposal for a whole of Government shared mobile communication service was put out to five bidders.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Just listen to the answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. I issue a general warning to all members. The practice of a constant chorus of interjections is not to be tolerated, especially after the Chair has called members to order. If members persist in interjecting after I have called them to order, they are heading to be named. The Minister for Administrative Services.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: As I was saying, that was after an invitation was put out to five bidders. Motorola came to the State Government through that process. Motorola's proposal was an attractive one and the decision was made to nominate the company as the preferred supplier of the mobile radio component of the contract, subject to normal commercial criteria. In press statements made last week, the member for Elder went so far as to claim that the State Government had flouted the State Supply Act through this process: those were his words. If the member for Elder had asked for a briefing, he would have been told that the State Supply Board, at its meetings of 19 August 1996 and 21 October 1996—

Mr Foley: 1996?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Yes, 1996, that is right. It examined the selection—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the member for Elder.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Just listen. The board examined the process of the selection of Motorola to supply equipment. The member for Elder needs to bear in mind that no contract has been signed. There is no contract. In 1996, the State Supply Board considered the proposal and supported the designated supplier approach, through the State Supply Board process, which the member for Elder claims has been flouted. The State Supply Board found that the process of arriving at commercial criteria with Motorola was appropriate and that it was the sort of process that would withstand the appropriate public scrutiny. That is what we require of the State Supply Board: to examine the process, to endorse it, and it has done so. At this stage, Motorola has been nominated designated supplier status for a contract that is still being negotiated with Telstra.

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the member for Hart listens, he will hear that we have been through a tender process for the installation of the network, a preferred bidder has been announced—Telstra—negotiations are under way with Telstra at this time but the contract has not yet been signed. When it has been signed we will be happy to share with the House what the total cost of the contract will be. As part of that process, Motorola has been nominated as designated supplier for the voice component, one of three components of that contract. It should not be surprising to anyone—and, in fact, members of the Opposition ought to encourage this—that, when Government embarks on a contractual process, it uses that contractual process—

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: —as a lever to get economic development.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. It may be of interest to the member for Hart to know that he has interjected seven times. He has been cautioned. He is now warned. After the next interjection, he will be named. The Minister for Administrative Services.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is fair to say that, because Motorola achieved that nomination as designated supplier for part of the equipment, that was sufficient encouragement for it to establish its software development centre in Adelaide. That is a damn good deal for South Australians. At this stage the centre employs 230 people and it was initially expected to employ 300 people. The company has advised me that it anticipates the staffing numbers will be well above its original projections. Are the member for Hart and the member for Elder going to stand up and knock a company that is bringing jobs to this State? Is that what this is all about? You do not like the idea of jobs being created in South Australia. You want to see the State on its backside and you want to see unemployment high because, in your own selfish way, you consider that to be your way back into Government. Is that what members opposite want? You just want to see the State go down the gurgler.

I have news for you: that will not happen. Motorola's presence in this State ought to be welcomed. Motorola is respected internationally; it has brought South Australia 230 jobs and there is a lot more to come. I am sure that many Ministers in this House will take great delight in advising members opposite every time more jobs are generated.

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr VENNING (Schubert): My question is directed to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: I understand that the Premier is aware of the Australian wine export figures released yesterday. What steps are being taken to ensure that any changes to the taxation system will not adversely affect these wine exports?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The recent figures illustrate the importance of the wine industry to this State and demonstrate how critical the sector is to our exports. Exports of wine were worth \$564 million to the State in the most recent financial year. That was nearly 70 per cent of Australia's wine export,

and my understanding is that the industry has got close now to 72 per cent. In only the past 12 months exports have grown by 42 per cent, and since 1988-89 South Australian wine exports have grown eightfold, now accounting for well over 11 per cent of the State's total exports.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is, and the honourable member's electorate covers one of the premium areas. Wine, which goes mostly into the European and North American markets, although we see expanding Asian markets for wine, particularly good quality reds, is a major reason why the State's exports have held up so well, falling only ½ per cent in 1997-98 from the record levels of the previous year in the face of the Asian crisis. With the massive recent increases in vine plantings, wine exports could grow to \$1 billion by the year 2000. That projection and industry strategy, I think, is well on the way to being achieved.

It is worth noting, however, that imports of wine into Australia doubled in 1997-98 to 26.5 million litres. A time of rapidly increasing import competition in our own markets is certainly not the time to contemplate tax measures which further artificially disadvantage the domestic industry. These figures demonstrate why the long-term viability of the State's wine industry is a priority for the Government. The industry currently employs approximately 11 000 people and its expansion will create more jobs. It is an industry to which the Government is absolutely committed.

The current debate on national tax reform has presented us with some issues about the future of the industry. As I have mentioned in previous discussions in the House, the tax reform may deliver a volumetric top-up tax on wine. Let us consider for a moment what that will mean to the wine industry. Assuming that the measure is revenue neutral, what will that mean? First, prices will increase and consumers will pay more for cask, fortified and low-priced bottled wine. This is 70 per cent of Australia's total wine produce and will hit low-income earners the hardest. Wine production, investment and employment in areas such as the Riverland would reduce, and this would have a flow-on impact into regional areas, with employment levels again suffering.

In order to comply with the new tax, over 1 000 wineries across Australia would need to become custom bond stores and, under the Customs and Excise Act, be forced to observe complex and costly regulations.

Mr Venning: More paperwork.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Indeed, and it would impact on small and medium businesses, producers and growers. Australia is already the second heaviest taxed wine exporter in the world. The volumetric tax will dampen export activity and severely reduce international competitiveness. As one can see, that is not a pretty picture and not a path that we ought allow the Federal Government to pursue, doing so despite the representations that have been made solidly to the Federal Government in recent months. This Government will not sit by and let this happen to our wine industry. We took the fight up to Canberra in relation to tariffs and we will do it again.

The Winemakers' Federation of Australia has put forward an alternative proposal, and it is one which the Government wholeheartedly supports. I have indicated to the Prime Minister that, if a top-up tax is to be implemented, it should be in the form of an *ad valorem* and not a volumetric tax. I have outlined to the House the effect a volumetric tax would have on the wine industry. Let us look at the effect of an *ad valorem* tax: first, prices would remain the same—the consumer will not in any way be disadvantaged. Investment

in the wine industry will not be affected. We have seen increased plantings, record vintages of premium varieties and strong growth in the volume and value of exports in recent years, and with that investment growth comes job security and employment growth.

Compliance costs of this tax would be minimal. The long-term viability of the State's wine industry is vital to developing wine tourism, which is expected to inject millions of dollars into South Australia and create hundreds of new jobs. For example, a premium wine tourism package launched today will create special tourism links between each of the State's wine regions. A package—

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: My point of order relates to Standing Order 98. We have not yet reached the fourth question of the day and we have used 27 minutes of Question Time. Ministers are averaging eight to 10 minutes each per answer—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member well knows Standing Order 98 and its content. The Premier has not yet started debating the matter; rather, he is giving us information. Other than that, the Chair has no power to curb the remarks of the Minister under that Standing Order. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let the House note that the member for Ross Smith is not interested in the future of the State's wine industry. This issue is as important as the tariff issue for the automotive industry. There are 11 000 jobs at stake. The member for Ross Smith should know that, whilst he might be a connoisseur of wines, jobs and tens of millions of dollars worth of investment are at stake if the right policy decisions are not made. We have a Federal Government under pressure from various vested interests to change the base of the taxation measures.

I am sure that I have bipartisan support on this issue, or at least I hope I would have support from the Opposition to take this debate up to Canberra to make sure that any outcome ensures the protection of the wine industry in South Australia and that we do not tax out jobs. I return to my previous point. A premium wine—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Tailgating around Japan, I remember that well. For example, a premium wine tourism package launched today will create special tourism links between each of the State's wine regions. The package will target corporate travellers so that they can experience the excellent food and wine that South Australia has to offer. It is a way to value add an industry that is important as an export earner in itself. The wine industry is an integral part of this State's economy. We intend to make sure that it stays that way despite the protestations of the member for Ross Smith.

The SPEAKER: Any questions in the balance of Question Time which would have been referred to the Minister for Youth and Employment will be taken by the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Will the Premier explain whether, as the then Industry Minister, details of his offer to Motorola in April 1994 to become the designated supplier of radio equipment for the whole of Government communications service were put before the Parliament's Industries Develop-

ment Committee and, if they were not, why not? The Premier, in September 1994, assured the House that no other deals, other than the estimated \$16 million incentive package, had been made with Motorola. The details of Motorola's industry incentive packages were sent to the Industries Development Committee for parliamentary approval.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Obviously, the honourable member never knows the answer to the question. Let me come back to a couple of points in relation to this. The Minister has given a detailed response to the House as to the circumstances relating to this contract and the Opposition does not like it. It does not like the fact that, having had some 10 or 13 years in which to move in relation to putting in place a Government radio network contract, and with a Coroner's report highlighting the need to make these changes, the Labor Administration ignored the Coroner's report. We have picked up the responsibility and we are doing something about putting in place a radio network for our emergency services so lives will not be put at risk, as was the inference, clearly, in the Coroner's report. In doing so, we have gone through a very rigorous process over an extended period to get it right—to get the right contract in place to ensure that South Australia's emergency services have an appropriate network in place.

In his two answers to the House, the Minister has described the background detail and where we are at this point. The member for Elder, who has been here only five minutes, is trying to make his mark. All I say to the member for Elder is: just accept the briefing and get some information, get some facts, and then he will not embarrass himself further.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen will come to order. The member for Ross Smith complained that the House was not getting enough time for Question Time. He is only delaying the House further.

WATER INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House of employment opportunities that are being created as a result of having a vibrant water industry in South Australia?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Heysen for his extraordinarily important question about a growing international water industry in South Australia. Almost every week I am fortunate enough to witness yet another milestone in the establishment of South Australia as an international hub of the water industry. A couple of weeks ago—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Spence laughs, because he does not choose to acknowledge what is happening. A couple of weeks ago I advised the House of the opening of Hydramet's new facility and its exciting innovation in real time testing for water quality. Yesterday I visited the Regency TAFE, where there were a number of young students, who are the future of the water industry (being in receipt of certificates), because the water industry—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —determines that it is growing at a pace that we, as a Government, need to ensure that people are being provided for the future of the industry. That is great news for the people who will accept the jobs, but

it is lousy news for the Opposition because it does not want it to happen. As another example of this, only a few hours ago I announced the signing of a contract with Schlumberger. Schlumberger Resource Management Services has won the contract to supply SA Water with state-of-the-art water meters. It is one of the world's leading suppliers of metering products and systems. Under this quite major contract, the company will relocate its Australian headquarters from Melbourne to Adelaide. I do not hear anything from the Opposition about that, because it is—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Hart says 'Hear, hear!' Belatedly, the member for Hart acknowledges that this is very positive. Schlumberger will relocate its Australian headquarters from Melbourne to Adelaide, and it will establish—

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Exactly, as the Premier says. It will establish a water meter manufacturing centre here in Adelaide and, as part of those two initiatives, it will employ up to 90 South Australians. The multi million dollar contract which has today been announced may well create another 100 jobs and further boost the water industry in South Australia through subcontracting to SA Water's customers. So, there will be burgeoning of the industry in general. This is a major international water meter manufacturer relocating to Adelaide, and it is a very significant achievement.

Over the next six years (the term of the contract) it is anticipated that Schlumberger will generate up to \$75 million in sales of gas, water and possibly electricity and heat meters, and the South Australian content of those sales will be in the region of \$46 million. Again, I hear no derision from the Opposition, because it is a great contract, and it is a great contract as part of the international water industry. What this means is that the \$20 million project will see 440 000 new meters supplied to SA Water, which will then form a very reliable commitment of water meters to obtain accurate measurements, and they will be capable also of being fitted with automatic remote reading communications systems. This is, frankly, another case of the water industry in South Australia producing results for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair would appreciate the Minister for Government Enterprises not encouraging the Opposition to respond.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: I have not encouraged the Opposition at all.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Will the Premier explain how Motorola was able to become the designated supplier of radio equipment for the whole-of-Government communications network without the contract going to tender? The State Supply Act requires strict compliance with the supply and tendering of such multi million dollar Government contracts.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Clearly, the member for Elder is a slow listener. The Minister has detailed this matter to the House in his first two answers. I ask the member for Elder to read *Hansard* to ascertain the information given by the Minister. I repeat: would the member for Elder please take up the offer for a briefing, get some facts behind the matter, and then he will not sail off into these uncharted waters where, I repeat, he will continue to embarrass himself?

PRIMARY INDUSTRY, EDUCATION

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): What measures has the Deputy Premier undertaken to understand the education needs of the primary industry sector? I understand that the Deputy Premier has had a number of talks with industry regarding the direction of education in the agricultural sector.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I will have a try.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Just encourage me. This is a very important question for the future of rural South Australia. As technology in agriculture, and certainly the other primary production areas, is increasing and the opportunities for new products are also on the up, there is no doubt that education and training becomes even more important than it has been in the past within primary production.

Through the Education Department, we still have the basic agriculture and science courses at quite a few of the rural schools and at Urrbrae, and we have had discussions with the Minister about the vocational focus of many of those courses. Recently, the Minister for Education outlined to the House the excellent initiative being undertaken in relation to a vineyard at Naracoorte. There are also some excellent TAFE initiatives, including the aquaculture course, of which the member for Flinders is a great supporter. In addition, last year in excess of 3 000 South Australian farmers took advantage of the RAS training scheme as introduced by this Government. That initiative is aimed at widening the range of skills required by the primary producer and includes technical, financial and management courses.

Whilst these activities are catering well for the primary producer, some very valid concerns have been raised within the industry as to the tertiary courses which have been offered in South Australia, and the fact that potential employers feel that the skills mix of the graduates they are employing do not meet their needs and the needs of the primary producer clientele. With that in mind, I have held talks with the agricultural faculty of the university, and it is keen to respond to industry needs if those needs can be more clearly identified. I have also had talks with industry groups to identify their concerns and a means of articulating to the universities the skills mix required of today's agricultural graduates.

A comprehensive survey has been sent out to 170 relevant employers who have been asked to list the skills they require and comment on the strengths and weaknesses of recent graduates. I stress that this is no reflection on the standard of recent graduates but an effort to ensure that graduates learn the relevant mix of skills to maximise their potential contribution to today's primary industry. The universities and, particularly, the Roseworthy staff have been very constructive about this survey as they also see it as an important means of identifying which skills they can teach to best equip the graduates. South Australian primary production certainly has enormous potential, and it is vital that the very best and most relevant skills are available to maximise that potential.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): My question is directed to the Minister for Administrative Services. What is the value of the component of the whole of Government communications network that has been awarded to Motorola, and what is the value of the component of the network that has been awarded to Telstra? Motorola's Radio Networks Solutions Group

Manager, Mr John Cryer, was quoted late last year as saying Motorola's contract with the Government was worth \$134 million. In the Estimates Committee this year, the Treasurer said that the communications contract was worth between \$150 million and \$200 million. I do not need a briefing, just an answer!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I do not think that the member for Elder nor, for that matter, the member for Hart would want me to refer back to the briefing, because the Labor Party has had a fair bit to say about the cost of this contract. The member for Hart had an interesting diatribe to relate to the House as to his considered view. The member for Hart advised the House that he was concerned that the contract could cost upward from \$150 million to \$200 million.

The member for Hart quoted as an example a system in the state of Florida. I am happy to give the page reference if members want to refer back to it, but the member for Hart claimed to the Parliament that that system in Florida cost \$9 million. I would like to share with the House the information that has come back to me in relation to the system in Florida. In fact, my information is that they have 156 sites in Florida. It is expected that our contract—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My point of order goes to relevance. The Minister may not have heard me. I asked about our price and not the price in Florida.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Minister's attention to the text of the question. The Minister is also free to answer it as he sees fit but eventually he must come back to the question.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: As I am giving the example of Florida, the member can rest assured that I will provide a comparison with South Australia as I unravel the detail. In Florida, as I was saying, there are 156 sites. We expect to have approximately 125 sites. The coverage of Florida's communications system is 80 000 square kilometres. We expect that ours, as I indicated earlier, will be over 200 000 square kilometres. There are 10 000 subscribers using the system in Florida. We expect there will be at least 12 000 for ours in South Australia. They are using ASTRO SmartZone digital technology and Wide Area Trunking in Florida. We will be using similar technology here in Australia with the addition of new technology known as Omnilink, and I will be pleased to give the member details of that in his briefing.

Members must bear in mind that this is a system that the member for Hart told the Parliament cost Florida \$9 million. The project costs in Florida are not yet finalised. They are still unrolling the system, but their advice to us, converted to Australian dollars, is between \$530 million and \$730 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will come to order.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: That is a far cry from the \$9 million in Florida. Of course, with respect to our system, we are not in a position to give the costs because the contract has not yet been signed. Until the contract is signed, the costs cannot be finalised. But what I can say is that we can give the member the range we have given before. We expect that it will be at least \$150 million but doubt that it will be over \$200 million. As soon as the costs are finalised, I am happy to put them on the public record and share them with the member for Elder.

The member for Elder also asked what component Motorola will have, and he gave an example of \$134 million. The member for Elder is probably referring to a newspaper

article that appeared in a monthly newspaper a couple of years ago where that figure was quoted. At the time, the Government said that that figure was not correct. The Motorola price will be absolutely nowhere near \$134 million. I do not know what the exact price will be because there is no contract—it has not been finalised. As a guide to the member for Elder, I expect the Motorola component to be less than half of that which he has quoted.

BASIC SKILLS TEST

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training advise on the number of year 3 and year 5 students who are undertaking basic skills testing this year?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Government has the runs on the board with the basic skills test. Increasingly, parents are supporting the voluntary skills test. The union's judgment on this test is way out, and today is another clear indication of parents' support for this test. Let us look at the scoreboard. In 1995, when these tests were first introduced, 18.5 per cent of parents withdrew students from the test. In 1996, it was down 3.5 per cent to 15 per cent. In 1997, there were 7.5 per cent withdrawals and, from early reports today, it looks like being somewhere between 5 and 5.5 per cent withdrawals from the basic skills test.

Parents welcome the detailed, objective written report that is supplied with the test on how their child understands basic elements of literacy and numeracy. Parents value the second opinion of the test in addition to the professional insight that is given by the teachers. Parents appreciate the fact that the basic skills test is one tool in the way we assess students' capabilities and progress. Parents and teachers welcome the \$2 million that this Government puts towards basic skills testing to pick up those students who perform in the lower bands of the basic skills test and require additional help. Yet we are still being told by the union that these tests are harmful to children, detrimental to schools and not supported by the parents.

Almost 80 per cent of school councils support the basic skills test, so the union leadership has got it wrong again. The union leadership is in fantasy land over this, out of touch with parents and out of touch with many of our teachers. It is time they started listening to the customers of education—the parents and the children of those parents who go to our schools.

TRANSPORT SA EMPLOYEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises explain why a Transport SA employee, who was on WorkCover, was compulsorily escorted from his place of work on the afternoon of 26 June 1998? Was this action related to the worker's injuries or his WorkCover claim to prevent him from formally applying for a job he had been previously occupying?

The Transport SA worker who was escorted from the property had injured himself and had undergone surgery. He was employed on light duties in a job that had been ergonomically assessed to meet his required disabilities, a job which was to have been formally called after 26 June and which he no longer occupies. He had been performing that job very satisfactorily and there were no real grounds for this action.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I note the value judgment of the honourable member in saying that 'there were no real grounds for this'. I clearly know absolutely nothing of this particular incident. I am very happy to look into these matters and what I usually find when I do is that there are legitimate grounds for whatever might have been done. However, I will not make that value judgment until I know the facts.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services on behalf of the Minister for Employment. What action is the State Government taking to ensure that young unemployed people in the northern suburbs can take advantage of the increasing employment opportunities in information technology?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As we know, the IT industry is one of the most vibrant growth sectors within the economy of this State. This morning Minister Hall had the opportunity of launching an initiative that will help develop the highly skilled and motivated work force required by this industry. Network to Success is an innovative information technology program that addresses the skills needs of the IT industry in our northern suburbs. Twelve young people will have the chance to become qualified Microsoft certified systems engineers (MCSEs) under this program. Earlier this year the *Advertiser* reported that if you 'ring an IT recruitment agency and say you are an MCSE, they'll send a limo to pick you up'. Morgan and Banks have undertaken to place all participants in full-time employment within two months of successful completion of their MCSE training.

The course is highly intensive. Participants must pass six exams which will be delivered by the job network member, Nastec Solutions. Components of the study include: networking essentials; administering Microsoft Windows; supporting core Windows technologies; and supporting a Windows server. These skills are essential to modern business. They will also be supported by a personal development program that encourages the development of personal goals and performance standards; promotes productivity and effectiveness; develops learning skills; and encourages self-esteem.

The IT industry is one of our most vibrant and dynamic in South Australia. This industry now covers some 700 companies, of which more than 71 per cent are South Australian owned. The total revenues of those companies exceed \$1 billion, the revenue growth rate being some 25 per cent per annum. They employ more than 11 000 people and have employment growth of some 15 per cent per annum. Network to Success is obviously a good example of an employment program of which all involved should be proud. This is one of the best demonstrations of what can be achieved when business, community, State Government and local government work in cooperation and partnership. They have identified an area of skills shortage and have found an effective way of training young people to meet those skills. They have worked cooperatively to meet the cost. They have targeted a region with specific problems and are delivering jobs at the end of it all. The State Government is proud to be part of this initiative and I commend the City of Salisbury, Morgan and Banks, Nastec Solutions and BankSA for their involvement.

MEMBER FOR BARKER

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier in his role as Minister for Regional Development. Will the Minister approach his Liberal colleague the Federal member for Barker, Mr Ian McLachlan, and encourage him to relocate his electorate office from the twelfth floor of the Commonwealth Bank Building in King William Street, Adelaide, to Mount Gambier, which will assist local employment opportunities and provide for effective representation of local constituents? Mr McLachlan has been the Federal member for Barker for the past eight years and still has no electorate office—a campaign office, yes, but no electorate office. I am informed that he needs a road map to locate Mount Gambier.

The SPEAKER: Order! In calling the Deputy Premier, I invite him to reply as he sees fit. I am not sure that it is in his area of responsibility.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I certainly thank the former Deputy Leader for his question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: No, there is certainly not. I think it is terrific that the honourable member is showing interest in this matter, but I think he is a little out of date because, according to the paper in the past few days, the member for Barker is looking at opening an office in Mount Gambier and paying for it out of his own pocket. It is certainly not within my responsibilities but, if the honourable member would like to me to, I will discuss the matter with the member at the next appropriate opportunity.

CHILD CARE

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Education provide information on the success of the Premier's initiative in allocating \$1 million towards child care in this State?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: In June the Premier announced a \$1 million package for child care in this State for community managed, long day child-care centres: \$600 000 was to be available for up to 30 community child-care centres and \$400 000 for out of hours school care programs. This initiative responded to the change in circumstances and funding from the Commonwealth and particularly the withdrawal of the operational subsidies. South Australian community child-care services are predominantly small, parent run organisations, most of which have had to take difficult decisions about restructuring. There is evidence that families are moving out of the formal child-care sector and into informal child-care arrangements.

This initiative will provide one-off support and advice to child-care centres and out of hours school care programs to build into larger administrative structures, and the fund will help meet implementation costs. There has been departmental liaison with industry representatives and experts regarding the restructuring and long-term planning of those centres. There has also been liaison with community child-care centres and out of hours school care programs, with guidelines being developed and distributed to the relevant services in both sectors. What was the registration of interest? Applications for the \$1 million had to be in by 31 July this year. We have had 74 registrations of interest, totalling requests for assistance valued at approximately \$1.9 million. Applications will be assessed against criteria and priorities in consultation with

district staff and also with Commonwealth officers from the Department of Health and Family Services.

This initiative responds to the most active needs of the South Australian child-care sector. However, not only have community child-care centres been hit by the changes in Commonwealth funding but also private child-care centres are suffering a downturn in clientele, with people turning towards out of hours school care. That area, too, must be considered in the future in terms of addressing the problems.

RANDOM BREATH TESTING

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): On behalf of the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, I table a ministerial statement made in another place this afternoon concerning random breath testing in South Australia.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): On Monday I bought a T-shirt from a local sports and surf ware store at the Golden Grove Village. This store is owned and operated by Donald Dickie, who, football fans would know, is one of the Port Power players.

Mr Atkinson: He's a Norwood player.

Ms RANKINE: He actually trialled at Norwood with Brett Rankine, so he is more famous in our house for that. However, he is well known for his play at Port Power. I want to commend the initiative taken by an Australian clothing manufacturer, supported by many businesses across South Australia and Australia. Mambo, Donald Dickie and hundreds of others are making a real statement across our nation. In making this statement, they are not just talking: they are taking real and positive action. They have identified a wrong and they are doing something concrete about it. That is the challenge that I am throwing down to this Government today and to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, in particular. Today I want to put their ethics to the test.

I want to see this Government, like Mambo, Donald Dickie and hundreds of stores across Australia, put its talk into concrete action. Mambo was set up some years ago by Bare Jennings and a group of talented artists and musicians who have become well known for their strong stand on a range of environmental and social issues. They have demonstrated that they do not back away from tough issues, and I am proud to wear their T-shirt into this House today. I will be proud also to wear it in the candlelight rally taking place throughout our city tonight. As members will see, on the front of this T-shirt is a striking resemblance to a person who, sadly, can be credited not with encouraging one nation, a nation which is fair and equitable and which truly offers equal opportunity to all Australians, but instead with encouraging hatred and division that sets one Australian against another. I will read briefly from the tag that was attached to my T-shirt. It says such things as:

In 1996, a terrible thing happened in Australia. An ignorant minority, lacking the humanity and political expertise to make effective and genuine social change, were given a platform from

which to present their divisive and inward-looking vision for the future of this nation. Predictably, they made scapegoats of all the usual minority groups—in particular, indigenous Australians who have, in relative terms at least, only just recently been provided with increased assistance (still largely inadequate) to compensate for 200 years of cultural and social neglect.

In addition, I can tell members that \$15 from the sale of each of these T-shirts goes to the National Aboriginal and Islander Skills Development Association, a national education institution that works to maintain and strengthen indigenous culture through language, song and dance. Mambo and those supporting it deserve the congratulations of this House and the support of the Australian people.

Now I put a challenge to this Government: I am sure that members will recall the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs advising us back in March about the establishment of an economic development team under her direction to assist Aboriginal people establish enterprises and find work. Indeed, the Minister said:

... there is now general agreement that economic development holds the key to Aboriginal self-determination and greater self-esteem.

She went on to tell this House of one of the ventures that would receive support—the Salisbury Aboriginal women's group that her department was going to help to establish an art and craft gallery and cafe. What she did not tell us, or appeared not to know, was that the Aboriginal educational program at Salisbury TAFE had one month earlier been closed down—the very program that gave these women their skills. And very skilled they are, with one artist currently having her paintings displayed in Paris. These women have not given up. Despite being dispossessed of their learning facility for over six months, they have continued to work towards their aim.

They have undertaken a range of business studies and prepared a business plan. They continue their training with the help of volunteers but remain desperate for a venue in which to establish their venture. On 1 May I made the Minister aware of premises at 9 John Street, Salisbury, which had been vacant for approximately two years—a venue that no other Government body wanted to occupy. What has happened since that time? On 7 July the Minister again reiterated her Government's commitment to ensuring that Aboriginal people have education and employment opportunities, but still we have no decision about 9 John Street.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I am delighted to speak today about the announcement made earlier by the Premier concerning the establishment of new secondary schools focusing on vocational education. Whilst I have not seen the detail of what will be provided within these schools, I speak as a former student of Goodwood Boys Technical High School. This year the Old Scholars Association celebrates its forty-ninth anniversary. Indeed, this Friday night sees the dinner for the old scholars. Members need to realise that, whatever form these two schools take, they should not simply seek to replicate Goodwood. Whilst Goodwood was good (if members will pardon the pun) in its time, it is not necessarily the way of the future. In saying that, I am suggesting that any vocational school needs to have a focus on a wide range of technological areas, not simply the woodwork, metalwork, technical drawing and related subjects that were offered at Goodwood.

Goodwood as a school went through various phases and in its later days, before it was closed by Labor, was providing an alternative education for students from around the

metropolitan area. But times have changed, and in my view any new school must offer a technological focus embracing computer training and aspects related to modern-day electronics as well as the more traditional areas. I suggest strongly that such a school not be called a trade school or vocational education school but either a TAFE high school or a technology high school. Indeed, when I was Minister I was pushing very hard to set up TAFE sponsored high schools. It is important that in establishing such a school we do not take the view that these sorts of schools are for people who are not able or talented. In our society we have a view that suggests that people who are technically inclined are somehow less capable and less intelligent than other people.

That is a mistake that Australia has made for far too long. We should value our technical people and our tradespeople, and we should encourage more women to go into the technical areas, which for them are non-traditional areas. Countries such as Germany and Japan value their technical people, but in Australia it seems as if you have to be a medico or a lawyer to achieve status and recognition, unless you play football or some other major sport. That is to Australia's great cost. Our technical people and our tradespeople are very important. The people who service jet engines and high performance equipment are intelligent, capable people, and we in this country must change our attitude to them.

In particular, we must focus our attention on providing training and education that will generate enough of those people to take us well into the next century. Whilst we need to develop the skills of those people, we should not develop too narrow a focus in our technical skills. In my view, if you are a tradesperson or a technical person you still need to have a liberal education. We do not want highly skilled robots who do not have feeling, empathy and understanding of the world in which they live. If we are not careful, there is a danger that we will create training facilities that turn out highly skilled people, but people who lack other aspects of the human condition. It is a very dangerous path to go down.

You cannot be a good motor mechanic, tool maker or any technical person unless you understand the world scene, the export market, interpersonal relationships and those areas that go beyond the basic skills. As a Minister I was very concerned with our apprenticeship training, because in many ways it is too narrowly focused on skills that relate to a particular trade. It is not enough in this day and age to turn out a tradesperson who may know the skills of the trade but who is not a fully functioning member of society. You must be able to articulate, to participate in society, to be able to understand company structures and processes, to write reports, to provide briefings to management, and so it goes on. In terms of these new facilities, I urge that we do not simply go down the path of a narrow skills focus.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): We have all been given the run around from time to time and we get rather exasperated and annoyed, but the series of events I am about to relay is one of the most petty and disgraceful situations I have ever encountered. It has not only caused a constituent of mine frustration but put her in a threatening situation. Mary (I will not use her real name) came from another State with her children to escape a domestic violence situation. She has moved and she changes her bank account regularly to avoid detection.

In October 1996 Mary was contacted by a friend from her home State who mentioned that she had lost her home telephone number, but was able to get it from Telstra.

Naturally, this caused the family some concern because Mary had a silent number. She telephoned and complained to Telstra and was told it would be sorted out. However, in December 1996 Telstra gave out her telephone number again. When she queried this, Telstra staff said again they would fix it. Giving out a silent telephone number twice is outrageously inept, but for it to occur on a third occasion as it did in December 1997 is absolutely reprehensible. On three occasions Telstra breached my constituent's privacy by divulging her silent telephone number.

Mary complained again and was given an assurance that compensation would be made. She understood that it would be for six months worth of free calls and, with this understanding, as her accounts came in she paid for the rental but not for the calls. In February 1998 she was contacted and told that her telephone would be disconnected if she did not pay the full account. Since then she has had her telephone disconnected, has been given a \$58.25 credit finally as compensation for the rental, has been stuck with a \$50 reconnection fee, has been sent some four accounts demanding payment (which she was told to disregard), has been sent a solicitor's letter threatening legal action (which Telstra said was a computer error), and, in her own words, was coerced to accept an agreement even though she was unhappy with it.

I wrote to Frank Blount, the CEO of Telstra, in July to complain about this shabby treatment and asked him to waive the \$50 reconnection fee because, even though they had credited the \$58.25 to her account, had they done that in the first place and not disconnected her telephone she would not have been stuck with the \$50. I have never had a reply from him, but I have certainly had a royal tour of the Telstra machine. They have been extremely dismissive of my inquiries, responding with such comments as, 'Our records show that a third party is unhappy, but the customer is happy.' I would have been the third party and, if my constituent had been happy, so would I. My constituent was not happy. I have had two curt letters, one advising me the matter was closed and finalised even though it is still ongoing. I find this an appalling situation.

It gets worse, because during a telephone conversation with a Telstra officer I was asked, 'Are you a State member?', to which I replied 'Yes'—not that I could understand what that had to do with the situation. I understand that telecommunications are a Federal matter. So, that being the case, Telstra telephoned a Federal member of Parliament and asked if my constituent had ever made a complaint to that member. No complaint was lodged with the Federal member, so case closed! Not only have they breached on three occasions my constituent's privacy by disclosing her private telephone number but they have gone on then to breach the right of privacy between myself and my constituent. They have now disclosed her telephone number on three occasions to the public that we know of. They have disclosed her home number to a solicitor's office (and I am sure the solicitor's office will do nothing about it), but they have also disclosed both her telephone number and new address to the Federal member. I know his office will not disclose it further, nor will his staff, but that is not the point.

This is all over a \$50 fee! I simply ask for that \$50 to be credited back to my constituent, because she cannot afford to pay it and I absolutely demand an apology to both Mary and myself because Telstra has continued over a long period to breach privacy. To check up when a State member makes a complaint to Telstra or any organisation, and for it then to

contact someone else to see whether it is a valid complaint is absolutely appalling. It breaches privacy and gives our constituents no faith that when we make a complaint to a public utility it will be treated seriously.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): On 9 July I received a nice letter from the Minister for Primary Industries informing me that Greening Australia and Trees for Life respectively had a grant of \$9 950 and \$5 500 as part of a \$90 000 grant for revegetation projects. Both Greening Australia and Trees for Life are in my electorate in Campbelltown, so members will understand how pleased I was to hear about the receipt of these grants. I take this opportunity to congratulate both organisations. I am a member of both Greening Australia and Trees for Life. I congratulate Michael Wilson, the President of Greening Australia, and Karen Possingham, the State President of Trees for Life.

This is very important information to note, and it is important also to acknowledge all the good work the many volunteers do in connection with the revegetation of this State. It is often said that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent, and that is true. The more revegetation projects we can implement the better off we will be. The famous historian Herodotus said that Egypt was the gift of the Nile. If we put it into an historical context, South Australia is the gift of the Murray. If Egypt were to forget the importance of the River Nile both to Egypt and to that part of North Africa, it would go down the shute, as would we if we were to forget how important the River Murray is for South Australia. We depend on it for our drinking water, irrigation, and so on.

The important point is that we cannot have a river system and sustained agriculture if we do not have revegetation. With the good work that Greening Australia and Trees for Life do in collecting local seeds to regenerate indigenous plants, grasses, and so on—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Two million seedlings a year.

Mr SCALZI: Two million seedlings a year play a very important part in providing a sound environment not only for us but for future generations.

I was fortunate enough on 20 July 1998 to be able to present cheques to Peter Lehmann, the Education Co-ordinator of Greening Australia and to Karen Possingham, President of Trees for Life. It was a great occasion. We took a photograph of the kangaroo grass in that area of Campbelltown, and looking at the photograph one would think we were out in the rural areas, in the bush, but it was in the centre of Campbelltown.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Do you mean that we have lost the bush, or is the member for Ross Smith bushed because he does not know where the bush is?

Ms Breuer interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The honourable member would not know that I came from a rural background. I was born 50 miles north-east of Naples and I am proud that I come from a rural background. I congratulate both Trees for Life and Greening Australia. I am proud to be a member of both organisations and commend the good work they do. I am sure the grants they have received will be put to good use for all South Australians and for future generations.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): A great event happened today: Ian McLachlan discovered Mount Gambier. Indeed, he has opened his campaign office, which is in a former

flower shop in Commercial Street, Mount Gambier. That is rather appropriate, his being the Minister for Defence and the office being a former flower shop, because we now have a McLachlan *Guns and Roses* version of a rock group in Mount Gambier.

Mr McLachlan is very worried about his seat, and so he should be. I spent some time in Mount Gambier last week campaigning for a very fine Labor candidate in David Detchon. The message that I received very clearly was that Mr McLachlan will be beaten at the Federal election, if not by Labor certainly by an Independent, at the very least, which is what occurred in Mackillop and Gordon at the last State election. Part of the reason is that Mr McLachlan is so arrogant that, in eight years as the Federal member for that district, his electorate office has remained on the twelfth floor of the Commonwealth Bank building in Adelaide. He prefers to view his electorate from that level in Adelaide rather than open an office in, say, Mount Gambier and provide three local people with full-time employment as his electorate staff in that office and being able to more effectively represent the people of the South-East.

Indeed, he is so worried about his seat that the Federal Treasurer (Mr Costello) is to attend a fundraising dinner for Mr McLachlan this Friday night in Mount Gambier, in a seat that the Liberal Party holds with over 20 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. Surely Mr Costello should be spending more time raising money for marginal Liberal seats in this State than in Barker, but clearly Mr McLachlan is worried. The campaign office that has been opened today has been leased not just for a few months but for three years. Why has it been leased for three years, when the Federal election will be well and truly over with?

It is being established for the Hon. Angus Redford in another place. A source close to the State leadership of the Liberal Party has informed me that the Hon. Angus Redford is unlikely to get in the first four on the Liberal Party ticket for the next election for the Legislative Council. He will be put in the death seat of No. 5, or even No. 6 as he was in 1993, so they may choose to wheel him out as a potential Liberal candidate for the seat of Gordon at the next State election. That is why the campaign office has been leased for the next three years.

The Hon. Angus Redford has been appointed as the Government spokesperson for Government business in the South-East. He apparently knows all; but he knows very little about matters in the South-East. He speaks disparagingly of the Independent member for Gordon, who has one of the three votes on which this Government relies to stay in office. It is the height of treachery by this State Liberal Government towards one of its own members, albeit not a formal member of the Party, whose vote it relies on to keep it in office and get its legislation passed for the next 3½ years.

This campaign office has been established ostensibly to support Mr McLachlan but it will be passed on to Mr Redford so that he can continue to campaign for the Liberal Party to try to unseat the member for Gordon as the Independent member for that district and to assist in campaigning against the member for Mackillop, another member of this House on whose vote the Government relies.

It is no secret that the Hon. Angus Redford has little time for the present member for Gordon. It is no secret that in the Party room this week the Hon. Angus Redford spoke in the most disparaging terms concerning the member for Gordon. I would have thought the Government would want to be a lot more careful in the way it treats the member for Gordon in

this matter: if it pushes him too far, he may well turn, as might his colleague the member for Mackillop, because in 3½ years time, they want to be re-elected to this House.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last Thursday, 29 July, I was privileged to be present in Kadina at the launch of a booklet entitled *Breaking the Cycle*. Launched by my Federal parliamentary colleague Neil Andrew, it comprises an edited version of a series of articles on domestic violence written by award-winning *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* journalist Noel Rait. In fact, the coordinator of the Northern Yorke Peninsula Domestic Violence Action Group (Heather Franklin) told us that Noel Rait's articles, which appeared in the *Country Times* in 1993, had subsequently earned the author a 1994 International Year of the Family, Family Court Media Award. The project to publish the articles in booklet form was initiated by the Northern Yorke Peninsula Domestic Violence Action Group and was made possible by funding from the South Australian Health Commission with the support of the Wakefield Domestic Violence Action Group.

I would like to compliment Noel Rait for writing the articles and the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* for printing them some years ago. I extend my congratulations to her on receiving the award. In the brief time that I have available, I would like to refer to a couple of articles in the book. The first article, which is entitled 'Terror behind closed doors' concerns two young mothers going into town with their children and waiting at the bus stop for 40 minutes. One young mother who had three preschoolers and a daughter who had just started school was celebrating her twenty-sixth birthday that day. She spoke haltingly of her baby's ear infection, another child's bronchitis, sleepless nights and the worry of trying to make ends meet and pay the doctor as well. The story continues:

She seemed eager, yet frightened, to confide in someone of her own age. When we were on the bus she said abruptly, 'I'm scared to go home. The place is in a mess. My husband hits me if the kids are sick and tea isn't ready. I get so tired after I have been up with the kids night after night, but he says it's all my fault. He goes out and gets on the booze and then he kicks and punches me in front of the kids. I love my kids, but sometimes I could just run away from it all.'

Her stop was before mine. As she got up she said, 'It is no use me telling Mum anything. She doesn't want to know about it. Nobody understands. You've got to go through it yourself to really know.' The next morning, a small piece in the local newspaper reported the death by drowning of a young woman in my suburb. She had left her children with her mother, ostensibly to visit the dentist. Later in the day her body had been found in a deep part of the river.

The story goes on to identify other factors that relate to that case. The whole issue of domestic violence is well portrayed in this booklet *Breaking the Cycle*. As Noel Rait says:

Violence in the home is the most common form of assault in Australia today. Contrary to popular belief, it cuts across all sectors of society. The belief that wife batterers all come from the lower socioeconomic groups belongs up in the attic with great grandma's buttoned boots.

I say to all members and to people generally: if they want a small booklet that identifies aspects of domestic violence, I thoroughly recommend this book by Ms Noel Rait.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (BOOKMARK BIOSPHERE TRUST) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Bookmark Biosphere Trust is a development trust established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*. It is also part of a network of over 320 Biosphere Reserves throughout the world, of which 12 are located in Australia.

Biosphere Reserves are established under the 'Man and the Biosphere' program, an initiative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) dating from 1971.

The 'biosphere reserve' is about a concept rather than a place. The concept of the biosphere reserve is to recognise the pragmatic interrelationship between humans and the natural world, and to foster an environment in which this relationship can thrive. The program aims to ensure:

- that the success and future of the biosphere reserve are in the hands of the local people;
- that there is a commitment to management for long term goals;
- that there will be 'inter-generational equity', namely, that the next generation will not pay the debts of the present generation.

The program's objectives promote international networking, conservation of species, environmental and social research and monitoring, sustainable land use, landscape planning, community involvement, education and training and improved management.

One of the identified strengths of the biosphere reserve concept is that it allows for the conservation of core areas, yet at the same time allows for human exploitation of surrounding areas to varying degrees. The Australian National Committee for UNESCO released a brochure in 1992 which describes biosphere reserves as comprising the following components:

- core area—wholly natural and little affected by man's activities;
- buffer area—a largely natural area with some economic use;
- transition zone—the main economically productive area;
- environmental research zone—where we focus our attempts to learn from the interaction of the elements that make up the biosphere; and
- research training facilities—the back-up centres for the study of the biosphere.

The Bookmark Biosphere Trust was created in November 1996, replacing the Murraylands Conservation Trust. The Bookmark Biosphere Trust was given responsibility over management of the same reserves as the former Murraylands Trust.

The duties assigned to the Bookmark Biosphere Trust under the Act included, in a broad sense:

- advising on the management of the reserves for which the Trust was established under the Act;
- the achievement of the objectives of the Man and the Biosphere Program in relation to those reserves; and, more generally;
- coordinating and developing the Bookmark Man and the Biosphere program.

The Bookmark Biosphere presently comprises 21 areas of reserves under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act*, pastoral leases, National Trust land, local government reserves and private land adjacent to and throughout the Riverland area, and is approximately 6 060 square kilometres in area.

Of this area, there are land use types which encompass each of those envisaged by the Biosphere program. 'Core' conservation areas are included in parts of the various reserves established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act*, as well as in some of the land owned by other 'partners' in the program, such as Gluepot Station, a property recently purchased by Birds Australia, which plays an integral part in the recovery program for the endangered Black-eared Miner.

Much of the land in the other categories included in the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve is owned by private citizens and public organisations including the Commonwealth (Calperum Station), local

councils, and philanthropic organisations such as the Chicago Zoological Society and Australian Landscape Trust.

The Bookmark Biosphere Trust has gained considerable support for its activities from State, Commonwealth and local governments, and from private persons and philanthropic organisations, not only by way of land-owner partnerships. This support has included funding support, and the Bookmark Biosphere Trust has now gathered sufficient funds to build and operate an Environment Centre near Renmark. This Centre will be used to inform, engage and empower the community of the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve to undertake sustainable land uses and conservation of natural resources through:

general education—by delivering relevant information using interactive media to educate, entertain and engage visitors; accessible tools—by developing a ‘user-friendly’ Geographical Information System (GIS) and other data bases; and a wet laboratory—by providing facilities for freshwater studies by community, student and professional researchers contributing to the management of natural resources.

Apart from the proposal to develop the Environment Centre, the Trust also undertakes other activities related to the Man and the Biosphere program. These include bidding for and utilising Natural Heritage Trust funding in various projects within the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve, including, for example, the recovery of the endangered Blackeared Miner. The Trust also provides assistance to private landowners who are partners in the Biosphere Reserve to achieve their land management aspirations or address other matters of significance.

The Government fully supports the role of the Bookmark Biosphere Trust in coordinating the Man and the Biosphere program in and around the Riverland area.

Specifically, the Government supports the Trust’s proposal to operate an Environment Centre in relation to the Biosphere Reserve as a whole, and to carry out the numerous other activities associated with the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve program. These sorts of activities are entirely consistent with the objects of the United Nations Man and the Biosphere programme.

The Bookmark Biosphere Trust is a body corporate under the existing provisions of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act*, and already has the power to own land in its own name. However, the Trust is constrained by the current provisions of the Act to deal only with the reserves for which it is responsible under that Act, rather than the Bookmark Biosphere as a whole. For example, the Trust could own land in Renmark that was intended as a shop-front for the various reserves in the region, but not if it included activities or objectives relating to private or other landholder partners in the Biosphere Reserve.

As I have said, the Trust has a much broader role than advising on management of the reserves that are situated within the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve. The Trust advises on and facilitates management of a range of different parcels of land, many of them privately owned. The Trust is also engaged in activities which raise public awareness about sustainable development and the environment generally. The Bill now before the House will remedy the current shortcomings of the Act which prevent the Trust from carrying out many of these activities.

The proposed amendments broaden the potential scope of the Bookmark Biosphere Trust’s functions through amending section 45F of the Act. The amendments will operate to ensure that the Trust can exercise its powers in relation to land ownership and other activities, where those functions relate to the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve as a part of the Man and the Biosphere program, or where they otherwise benefit plants, animals or ecosystems that are outside of the Trust’s reserves as established under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act*. This will enable the Trust to, for example, provide assistance to landowners or others who are presently not partners of the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve program.

The ability of the Trust to exercise these powers will depend on the Minister having first assigned them to the Trust. This safeguard will complement other measures already contained in the Act which ensure that Trusts are subject to an appropriate level of Ministerial control.

The other amendment contained in this Bill has been included to clarify an issue relating to the manner in which the Trust can acquire land. Obviously the preferable way to acquire land in any circumstances is to do so by agreement with the landowner. It had previously been assumed that the Trust would naturally have this ability. However, in the past, Courts have thrown some doubt on that.

The amendment makes it quite clear that a Trust may purchase land through a normal agreement with the landowner.

Bookmark Biosphere Reserve receives national and international attention as one of the most significant Biosphere Reserves operating in Australia, and it has been extremely successful in attracting investment, both public and private, and in engaging in partnerships with local landholders. The success of the Bookmark Biosphere Reserve is an important demonstration of South Australia’s commitment to the Man and the Biosphere program. The Trust’s activities have beneficial social and environmental impacts through the Trust’s focus on community partnerships and education in ecologically sustainable development.

The Bookmark Biosphere Reserve deserves the strong and continuing support of this Parliament. I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 45A—Interpretation

Clause 2 adds two new definitions to section 45A of the principal Act for the purposes of the Bill.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 45F—Functions of a Trust

Clause 3 amends section 45F of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection (1a) which enables the Minister to assign duties to the Bookmark Biosphere Trust related to the Trust’s participation in the Man and the Biosphere Program or that will benefit any plant, animal or ecosystem.

Clause 4: Substitution of s. 45I

Clause 4 replaces section 45I of the principal Act. The principal reason is to ensure that land can be acquired by a Trust for the purposes of carrying out its functions and is not limited to purposes of, or to enlarge, a reserve. The opportunity is also taken in the new provisions to make it clear that land can be acquired through private negotiation as well as under the Land Acquisition Act 1969.

Mr HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

A quorum having been formed:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the seventieth report (final) of the committee on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium—Stage 2—be noted.

It is my personal opinion that this project is a botch. It has been from the outset when you were the Public Works Committee Presiding Member, Sir. You saw the incompetent manner in which information was provided to the committee during our inquiries into Stage 1. Subsequently, when the committee became aware that there was a Stage 2, I must tell you and the rest of the House that it has been no better: indeed, it has been worse. The Public Works Committee commenced its inquiry into the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium Stage 2 works on 4 March this year. As the inquiry progressed, committee members began to develop very serious concerns regarding certain aspects of the proposal, indeed, almost every aspect.

As a result of those concerns the committee repeatedly requested information it considered necessary to qualify and substantiate the oral evidence provided and, although the committee was advised during the hearings that the documents containing the information that was sought by the committee would be provided, virtually without exception that was not done. As a result, after waiting eight weeks, the committee chose to present an interim report to the Parliament on 30 April 1998 outlining those concerns and stating that the committee could not and would not lodge its final report to Parliament until the requested information was received to enable it to discharge its responsibilities as established in law.

However, on 4 June, the House of Assembly directed the committee to produce a final report for this project within 12 days by 16 June. The requirement to report by this date prevented the committee's hearing further witnesses and adequately addressing outstanding issues, and it is with regret and reluctance that the committee has presented this final report to the House in that the protection of the public interest, through the committee's work, is therefore not possible, that is, the Public Works Committee has been unable, indeed prevented, from doing the job it is required to do in law.

As stated previously, the Public Works Committee requested either sworn evidence about the provisions in contracts which may have a direct effect on the consolidated accounts of the State, or copies of the clauses in those contracts and other documents relating to the financial commitments, obligations or guarantees in the arrangements and specifications which SOCOG was supposed to have insisted upon where they relate to Stage 2 of the works. The material evidence was sought because the committee was told

by the witnesses that they would provide the information the committee needed to fulfil its statutory obligations.

It was promised copies of various documents only to be told that those documents could not be provided as they formed part of Cabinet submissions, which the Government (Cabinet) then said must not be given to the committee as a matter of policy. We never sought those documents: we sought the information. We were promised the documents because they contained the information. Frankly, personally, I could not have given a fig whether or not we saw those documents. We only ever sought the information they contained. Following the committee's interim report, the then Deputy Premier provided heaps of paper for us which was irrelevant and, as such, an insult to the intelligence of the committee. I seek leave to incorporate into *Hansard* a table which outlines the information which was provided to the committee by the then Deputy Premier's office.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member give an assurance that the information is statistical?

Mr LEWIS: It is, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium
Summary of evidence received since the Committee completed its Interim Report

Title of Document	No of Pages	Contents of Document
Summary of the Memorandum of Understanding (dated 10 September) signed between the State of South Australia and SOCOG	9	Provided the Committee with a summary of the South Australian Government's and SOCOG's legal obligations regarding the provision of facilities and the hosting of Olympic soccer matches in Adelaide. There were no relevant quotes from the Memorandum of Understanding document.
Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium Stage 2—Department of Treasury and Finance Acquittal	1	Contained qualified statements confirming: (1) The effect this project will have on the consolidated account and (2) The outcome of the SA Centre for Economic Studies financial analysis of the project. This document provided no new information for the Committee.
Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium Stage 2 Development—Attorney-General Acquittal	1	Contained a qualified statement advising that there were no legal impediments associated with the undertaking of Stage 2 of the development of Hindmarsh Stadium.
Letter from Mr Ian Kowalick—Department of Premier and Cabinet acquittal	2	Contained a qualified statement regarding the prudential processes followed for the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium project.
Olympic Football questionnaire	55	Outlines the specifications of the existing stadium at Hindmarsh and details how the stadium can alter to accommodate the Olympics. This document provided no new evidence relevant to the Committee's inquiry.
Letter from Hon. G.A. Ingerson to Mr Bob Elphinston of SOCOG	2	Confirms the South Australian Government's commitment to the redevelopment of Hindmarsh Stadium. This document contained no new information for the Committee.
Letter from Mr. David Hill, Soccer Australia	2	Provides a history of the events that transpired leading to the Stage 2 redevelopment. This document contains no new information for the Committee.

Mr LEWIS: Substantial crucial information remains outstanding. This project has no business plan and no financial analysis—at least, none was provided to the committee. No maintenance cost provisions that we could discover were included in the figures. We could find no requirement of SOCOG for Stage 2. We were anxious that the Belorussian Church, having decided that it wished to remain in Hindmarsh Place when it was told about the extent of Stage 1, was then not told about the implications of Stage 2 as it would affect its building—and, indeed, at that time it was told that the original offer of compensation and/or relocation would not be available. However, we now understand that has changed and that original offer is now available.

After extensive inquiry, the committee was provided with information about car parking, but the figures on that are so rubbery and, indeed, make so many assumptions, as to be irrelevant. The committee sought information about the ownership and security of both the land and the stadium, but we were not satisfied on those points. The committee sought details about the nature of the contracting arrangements but was unable to obtain them.

In relation to financial analysis, as no cost-benefit study has been provided to the committee, it is unable to satisfactorily evaluate the project on that criterion. Prior to the committee's interim report, the Department of Industry and Trade provided the committee with excerpts from a study carried out by the South Australian Centre for Economic

Studies, which simply stated that the benefit cost ratio was .4 and the net present value was minus \$20.898 million. But the basic data and the underlying assumptions used in this evaluation were not provided, so the committee has no way of assessing the veracity of the calculations or the data or the underlying assumptions. For all the committee knows, it could be totally irrelevant: figures simply plucked out of the air.

We could not test it in cross-examination of the people who prepared it or the witnesses who accepted it and presented it to us. We would otherwise have done so if due process could have been followed by the committee in its inquiries. Due process was not followed, and I ask you, Mr Speaker—indeed, I ask all members—why not? One wonders just exactly what it was that drove the decision forward to establish Stage 2. We could find no evidence of it being a requirement from SOCOG. So, clearly, office-bearers in Soccer SA must be able to explain that.

Without the additional information requested and access to the assumptions used in the completion of any study, the information provided is of no use to the committee at any time in evaluating this aspect of its statutory obligation for this or any other project. However, from the sketchy evidence at the committee's disposal, it appears that Soccer Australia, not Soccer SA, stands to get most of the money—that is, revenue—from the staging of matches involving national league teams and any international teams, without bearing any of the risk.

We know that attendances at local league matches and the local derby are low: that information was provided. Wherever there is anything like a reasonable level of patronage in the order of 3 000, or maybe 4 000, where revenue is likely to be in some measure significant, Soccer SA, to service its debt to the State of over \$4.5 million, receives a capitation fee of only \$3 per seat in the stand and \$2 per seat elsewhere in the ground. People can do their own sums on that but I can inform the House that it does not amount to very much.

From the sketchy evidence at the committee's disposal, as I have said, and to the best of my personal knowledge, gleaned from reading all the information that I could discover on the project which we were given, all the risk is carried by the South Australian taxpayer. Stage 1 reveals that the Government loan of \$4.5 million (or just over that) to Soccer SA is guaranteed by the Government—that is, by the lender, the taxpayers. So, it is not really a loan at all because, if there is a default on the loan, the taxpayers who lent the money simply pick up the tab.

We looked at the maintenance costs and found that no information had been provided which would have enabled the committee to understand who will be responsible for the costs associated with ongoing maintenance of the facility, and the capacity of whoever that is to meet those costs. This leaves the committee very concerned about whether maintenance costs have been accounted for in any of the financial analysis completed for this project and, consequently, whether the facility will be maintained in serviceable condition and good repair over the longer term. The City of Charles Sturt owns the facility outright but bears no responsibility or obligation to maintain it. Neither could the committee discover any other party, corporation or person who has any such obligation to the Government—in other words, the taxpayers, who are ultimately, as I have pointed out, carrying the investment and carrying all the risks.

The committee looked at evidence in correspondence between SOCOG and the South Australian Government, but

what we received during the Stage 2 inquiry exposed serious discrepancies in relation to the core reasons for Stage 2 works. It is a fact that the committee has received no evidence from SOCOG which indicates that it requires the Stage 2 works to be completed for Adelaide to host any Olympic soccer matches, even though we sought that information many times. Equally, it is a fact that, even after completion of Stage 2, there is still no guarantee and no commitment or obligation on SOCOG that any soccer matches will be scheduled to be played in Adelaide. Furthermore, based on what the committee has been told, almost all the dealings between the South Australian Government and soccer have been oral and, although the committee has been persistent in requesting written evidence of the requirement for Stage 2, it has not been provided. I personally do not believe that it exists.

Given the scope of this project, the committee questions whether due diligence was given to the process followed, given that the South Australian Government—that is, Cabinet—has been prepared to use verbal advice from SOCOG as the basis for committing proposed expenditure of \$18.5 million on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. By the way, I can say that the committee is aware that the cost to taxpayers will be substantially greater than that.

As stated in its interim report to the Parliament, the committee has very serious concerns regarding several aspects of the Stage 2 proposal. It should be noted that since that time the committee has received additional information relating to some of those concerns—and I can detail instances of where that information has been provided, one of which was the Belorussian Church, as I have already pointed out. Happily, I can inform the House that the former Minister has done what the committee felt needed to be done and has given serious consideration to the option to relocate the church. The committee is now aware that, shortly, Hindmarsh Place is to be closed, and arrangements are being bedded down for that work to be undertaken.

In relation to car parking, the Public Works Committee Stage 1 report and the interim report on Stage 2 points to the inadequacy of car parking arrangements for the stadium. We recommend that they be addressed as a matter of urgency—as we did in our report on Stage 1. If Soccer SA's claims about attendances are credible, that is a very serious matter. I doubt that they are. We were told that the City of Charles Sturt intends to implement some of the major recommendations made in the traffic report, which we were also told was prepared by Murray Young and Associates. However, the committee has not been provided with any of the background details of those recommendations, or which of them are to be implemented. We stress that arrangements should be made to secure additional car parking space prior to the project's completion.

In relation to future ownership, in both Stage 1 and the interim report to Parliament the Public Works Committee said that the future ownership of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium should reside with the Government or a caveat should secure it. The committee has subsequently been advised that meetings have begun with various parties with a view to resolving some of those ownership issues, but they have not been concluded. However, members stress their concern over the fact that the City of Charles Sturt will be the key beneficiary of the project if it retains ownership of the land on which the facility is built and, therefore, the facility. Accordingly, the committee is very concerned as to whether the interests of the public and soccer are protected in the longer

term. The committee strongly recommends against proceeding with construction until this issue has been resolved.

The only contracting arrangements that the Public Works Committee has looked at are a summary of the memorandum of understanding. However, we have not seen any of the explicit clauses and we wonder why. Subclause 11.7 of the summary of the Memorandum of Understanding between the State of South Australia and SOCOG contains reference to an agreement by the State that the State shall in good faith consider the use of goods, services and materials from SOCOG's sponsors. The State may be unable to come to satisfactory arrangements with any such sponsor but, if the State accepts any such 'value in kind' goods, services or materials from elsewhere, the State agrees it shall reimburse SOCOG for the value of those goods, services or materials, and that is unfortunately a great risk.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I believe that every member of this House recognises the need in this State at this time to develop opportunities that give the State a sense of purpose, activity and direction. At various times in the history of this State, and very visibly at the moment in the history of New South Wales, sporting facilities have been important as a symbol of a sense of excitement and direction in a State.

I was privileged last week to have the opportunity to tour the Olympic sites in Sydney with all other members of the Public Works Committee, save unfortunately the member for Mawson. There we were able to see a facility that really does give a city a sense of purpose and a sense that it is able to achieve and accomplish. Not only did we see that but also we were briefed considerably and given backgrounds into the business-like way in which the whole Games event has proceeded. People know how those facilities will be used for the Olympics and later as important community facilities. Business plans are evident.

With many of the facilities, there have been joint ventures between the public and the private sectors in order to maximise the spread of the risk that might be inherent in the development of major construction facilities and to inject more ideas and opportunities for the ongoing use of those facilities. Truly, Sydney will have a legacy from the Olympic Games. It extends throughout the city but particularly focuses on the sporting arena that it has.

One simple example of this is the aquatic stadium, a large and exciting building developed at a cost of \$25 million. It contains a diving pool, a swimming pool with access for underwater photography so we can all enjoy the sight of our athletes winning gold again and again, and extensive recreational facilities. Some of the recreational facilities include a movable floor of the pool so it can be used for many events, from learn to swim campaigns for very young children to training pools. This facility shows a sense of vigour and purpose, something that we in South Australia desperately need to achieve.

I believe that some members of the South Australian community thought they might be able to capture some of that by bringing Olympic soccer to South Australia. I for one am pleased that there will be an opportunity for us to participate in the excitement of the Olympics. Unfortunately, there ends any similarity between what has happened at the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and what is happening in Sydney today. What we in our extensive investigation through the Public Works Committee found in relation to the Hindmarsh

Soccer Stadium was a bright idea, an idea that, if we could capture some Olympic events for South Australia, it might feel good and we could get a nice sporting facility that maybe somebody might be able to use.

But what is happening instead? We have Stage 1, under which we spent \$9.6 million, to supposedly up-grade Hindmarsh to an Olympic level, or to a sufficient level at least to obtain the Games and to meet the basic criteria. In past years, Labor and Liberal Governments have considered whether Hindmarsh was the best site for developing a facility for soccer. However, it does not seem that this was extensively considered as part of this new proposal for soccer in South Australia. It was a quick upgrade: 'This will probably do', and then, 'My goodness, it does not seem as if it will. We had better spend some more money and fix it up.'

How much more money is the Government proposing to spend, because it is the Government that is doing this? A further \$18.5 million is to be spent, making nearly \$30 million to upgrade a facility which will look nothing like the world class facilities that I saw during the World Cup throughout France and which will look nothing like the sorts of facilities that are being established in Sydney for the Olympic Games. The comparison between the \$25 million aquatic centre in Sydney and the more than \$30 million Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium is odious for me to even contemplate.

What we will have in Hindmarsh is a bit of a facility with some colour matched chairs all on the same level; very little protection from the elements; a facility that has crowded into the amenity of the area, pushing aside some poor unfortunate members of our community who have worshipped nearby, and closing access to a community venue in Hindmarsh Place; and something that does not in any way resemble the facilities that will be provided for Olympic events throughout Australia.

We have other opportunities. We have not been able, through our extensive inquiries in the Public Works Committee, to establish in any way that our spending that money on the Hindmarsh Stadium was the only way that we could obtain Olympic soccer. What we did have was a press release at the time of the exciting announcement about the 2000 Olympics being held interstate, dated 19 December 1996. It was announced that five Australian cities had been awarded the opportunity to host Olympic Games soccer competition in the year 2000.

We were also told of the venues which would be involved in this process: Melbourne, Docklands Stadium; Canberra, Bruce Stadium; Brisbane, Lang Park; Adelaide, Hindmarsh Stadium; and Sydney, Sydney Football Stadium. It appears now that two of those States have decided that the venues named are not, in fact, the best opportunities for hosting Olympic soccer at all. The Docklands Stadium, with a capacity of 52 000 people, may not be ready in time, so already negotiations are in progress for Olympic soccer in Victoria to be held at the MCG, with the small capacity of 110 000. Already the MCG has hosted 87 000 people to witness the soccer match between Australia and Iran as part of the World Cup matches.

The Bruce Stadium in Canberra holds 26 000 people, and that has the advantage of having the right boundaries and sight lines for soccer as it is a rugby stadium. Lang Park in Brisbane, another rugby facility and therefore very compatible for soccer, holds 40 000 people, but at the moment it appears that this will not be the venue for soccer in Brisbane. The Gabba is almost certain to host soccer in Brisbane, again

where at least 40 000 patrons will be able to enjoy the excitement of the event. Then we look at Hindmarsh. With the expenditure of all this additional money, we will have 15 000 seats, with 5 000 temporary seats and, at an absolute squeeze, maybe another 4 000 temporary seats can be added.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: And get drenched in the rain. Down the road we have Football Park, which holds 46 600 people, and the people of Adelaide have demonstrated that they are regularly committed to filling that venue. It has an exciting new scoreboard which carries very boring ads from the South Australian Government and—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: Yes, I have been to soccer games. I have seen several international matches. Adelaide people will fill this venue. There are problems with the pitch but the cost of upgrading the pitch at Football Park to make it match the requirements for soccer is nothing like the amount of money required to upgrade Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. It is important that the Olympics leave a legacy for football in this State.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the seventy-fifth report of the committee on the Education Development Centre—Training and Development Unit—be noted. If ever there was an instance where there is a stark contrast not so far apart in time or so far apart in location, this would have to provide it for us as a Parliament in South Australia at least. The location of the training and development centre is only a few metres away from the location of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. The report is only five reports later and the manner in which it was prepared, the manner in which the information was then presented and the manner in which inquiries from the members of the committee were answered by the advocate proposing agency in each case could not have been more different.

In this instance, the proposed training and development unit project forms part of the Education Development Centre to be created on the site of the digital precinct at Hindmarsh. The precinct is being developed by the City of Charles Sturt in partnership with the Department of Education, Training and Employment. It is a classic example of cooperative effort between local government and State Government, with great benefits accruing to the local residents and the regional residents in consequence not only in terms of what will be available at the centre but also in terms of the enhancement of the environment of the immediate precinct and also incorporating and retaining heritage items as part of it. This project proposes to purchase the cinema-skating rink portion of the main town hall building on the site and redevelop it into a training and development centre. It is intended that, once complete, the training and development centre will replace the Orphanage Teachers' Centre and various other campuses around Adelaide.

The proposed Education Development Centre will be an integrated development with four main components: the training and development unit; the library and information service; the technology school of the future; and the curriculum resources unit. There is one other element, that is, the close proximity of this complex to private sector industry

which is aligned with, complementary to and supportive of what is being done there. Some of these components, though already operational, are scattered throughout the metropolitan area. However, under the Education Development Centre proposal, they will be consolidated onto this one site. The training and development unit, which is the main focus for this inquiry, currently is located on dual sites, being at the Orphanage Teachers' Centre and Palmer Place, North Adelaide.

Currently, the Orphanage Teachers' Centre provides conference and meeting facilities for six to 150 people, administration functions, a resource centre, information technology training and a retail outlet for the department's publications. Overall, the training and development unit is the focus for the professional development of the Department of Education, Training and Employment staff and teachers and provides a venue for seminars, both small and large meetings, conferences, product and service launches, technology training sessions, receptions and expos. This project proposes to construct a new facility that will allow for the consolidation of the functions carried out at the existing training and development unit sites into the three floors of the new accommodation in the southern (skating-rink cinema) end of the Hindmarsh Town Hall building (as it has been known). It is proposed that this portion of the building be purchased from the council by the Department of Education, Training and Employment.

Maximum usage of the facility is paramount and considerable flexibility has been incorporated into the design brief to enable the unit to support a broad range of current and future training and development programs. These programs will be able to cater for a variety of group sizes using teaching methodologies ranging from traditional classroom models to those using advanced technological resources. This facility will be an important part of the training and development unit facilities and can be used for departmental purposes and hired out for private functions. It will be as good as any in Australia and probably better than all.

On Wednesday 8 July, the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection on the site proposed for the training and development unit and the surrounding area. We received a presentation—amongst the pigeons and everything else—from the proponent detailing the proposed plans and functions of the unit. This presentation provided us with a clear understanding of the interrelationship between all facets of the Education Development Centre with one another and with the digital precinct from the private sector generally—much of which is located in the immediate vicinity.

Members were able to walk the site to gain an appreciation of the piazza and park type atmosphere which will be created once this development is complete. The committee believes that the establishment of the centre will provide directions for the Department of Education, Training and Employment well into the twenty-first century and achieve operational, educational and economic benefits by relocating several key sections into these consolidated and purpose built facilities at that precinct, and it is done in a way which is flexible, enabling it to migrate across time and across changing technologies: that is to be applauded. The Public Works Committee considers that this proposal will provide a unique opportunity to create a state-of-the-art, high technology, educational environment for developing people, teaching resources and materials, and education and technology in a manner which is consistent with industry best practice and

which provides opportunities for the future economic development of the State—a great benefit indeed.

We know it will provide a new departmental training and development venue for all educators, care service providers and their support staff, and it offers an exciting and effective learning environment and facility in a central, accessible location. That digital precinct to which I have already referred has many private enterprise tenants engaged in information technology, multimedia and communications enterprises. The committee notes that the City of Charles Sturt council is actively encouraging this mix of technology, and the committee applauds that. We note that there are related activities in the area which will benefit the educational sections to a very marked extent—and the committee applauds that.

Finally, the committee commends the Department of Education, Training and Employment and the City of Charles Sturt on the professional and cooperative manner in which this project has been approached and presented to it. This professionalism has been evident to the committee from the time the matter first came to our attention. So, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, it gives me great pleasure indeed to point out to the House that the Public Works Committee reports to the Parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): After the contribution of the Presiding Member of the committee, I find it a little difficult to say much else, because I would really like to say ‘ditto’ to all his comments. I will make a few points highlighting the areas where I absolutely concur with his remarks. First of all, the Education Development Centre was presented in an exemplary fashion, as the presiding member has outlined. We could not have asked for more: it was clear and concise; the visit to the site was managed well; the information was there; the questions were answered; things were followed up quickly and accurately; and, in fact, we were able to look carefully at this, come up with our report and present it within about two weeks.

I would like to endorse the remarks of the member for Hammond, because to be part of assessing this matter was a delight. I would like to pass on my congratulations to the officers of the Department of Education, Training and Employment on their excellent efforts. The project itself is totally worth while. It is a great concept of collocation of training and development, library and information, Technology School of the Future and a curriculum resource unit in a digital precinct where Government departments can link with private sector enterprises that will also be looking at information technology, multimedia, educational psychology and technology.

It is a brilliant concept brilliantly presented. The placing of the Training and Development Centre at Hindmarsh will benefit teachers from the northern suburbs who in the past have had to travel right across town to the Goodwood Orphanage. This is a much better arrangement. Of course, the old Technology School of the Future was located at Salisbury.

Mr Lewis: In fact, it wouldn’t be a bad idea if they reopened the North Adelaide railway station.

Ms STEVENS: Perhaps the Government or the member for Adelaide—Lord Armitage—should look at that next. The Technology School of the Future will mean a greater travelling distance for students from the northern suburbs, but I hope that the added advantages present at this new site will

outweigh the disadvantage of the greater travelling distance. I also wish to congratulate the City of Charles Sturt for its vision and for the steps it has taken in establishing this digital precinct. It will be a very exciting venture.

We were able to spend time talking with council members about it and about their plans for the future in the collocation of these facilities with new industries. I congratulate them for that and wish them well. I totally support the comments of the Presiding Member and look forward to this project’s completion.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I know we are pressed for time today, but it is worth spending a little time to celebrate the fact that this project represents a real achievement in South Australia of the sort at which we have traditionally been very good. What has not been noted so far is the export development opportunities that are available through the Education Development Centre. South Australia has an excellent record of achievement in the export of educational services in many different ways, one of which is the export of curriculum materials. Our Department of Education has for many years sold curriculum materials throughout the Asia Pacific region and to North America.

The opportunity afforded by this bringing together of many innovative sections of the Department of Education, Training and Employment, putting them together, getting a critical mass for more exciting ideas to develop and locating them in the visionary precinct developed by the City of Charles Sturt is the type of development this State needs. It is not big and grand and spectacular. We do not drive down the road and say, ‘Isn’t that amazing!’ But it is giving us opportunities to develop the skills of our people through ensuring that the education all our children receive is of world standard, and to demonstrate to the rest of the world just how good South Australia is in many areas, especially in the export of education services.

The way in which the department has gone about thinking through this project is demonstrated both in what it hopes to achieve through the project and in the details relating to the construction of the new premises. There is some risk in what the department expects to achieve: it does not know exactly how many curriculum packs and what revenue flow will come from the extra vitality of the collocation of several services. But it has been able to assess exactly what the revenue flow is from the operation of the new facility in terms of its domestic market over a 10 year period. It is planning on a sound basis of achievement; it is taking some risks; it is showing some vision; and I am confident, as I believe are all members of the Public Works Committee, that it will succeed. The department knows what it is doing and it is doing it well.

A matter that has not been mentioned is that the department has really thought about who will be using the facility, what their needs might be, and has sought to meet them. We have noted car parking, and the department has looked at the fact that it will be using the facilities at different times from the users of the major surrounding venues, and thus will be able to share car parking activities. It is also concerned that car parking should not just be masses of asphalt, and is designing it in small blocks surrounded by trees so that we do not have the vista of many cars just sitting there throughout the day. But it also thought of the child-care responsibilities of the users of this facility.

It did not rush in and build a child-care centre in the facility: it looked around and saw that there was a nearby

child-care facility in difficulties, given the assaults that have recently been experienced by child-care centres, and has worked with this centre to provide occasional child care for the casual users of the new Education Development Unit and the people who work there on a regular basis. It is also cooperating with the South Australian Library Services, which are located close by, to provide the best facilities there.

In all, this is the type of project I would like to have seen in relation to Olympic soccer in this State: one where people know what they are doing, where they make the most of the facilities around them, develop them appropriately, look at the opportunities for use, demonstrate the opportunities for use, not just a wish and a hope, and can really establish something of a model for how this State should be going about its business, both in the public and in the private sector.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: AQUACULTURE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That the twenty-ninth report of the committee, on aquaculture, be noted.

(Continued from 22 July. Page 1522.)

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I commend the committee for its comprehensive report on aquaculture, which has been an opportunity to take stock of this very important emerging industry—where it has come from, where it is currently and where it is going. It has particularly concentrated the attention of all the participants on where they perceive that improvements need to be made. Of the recommendations, some have already been implemented and, obviously, the need is just for better communication. Such appears to be the case with recommendation 23, relating to the public availability of data collected in environmental monitoring programs. All data currently collected is publicly available.

The report is of particular significance to my electorate of Flinders, which encompasses Eyre Peninsula, where the majority of the State's existing aquaculture is based and where the potential for the future is impossible to imagine. I am regularly approached by people with new ideas, the most recent involving the use of algae as a replacement fuel source.

There is a great need for funding to assist in the development of the emerging industries, which must be addressed. The Seafood Industry Development Board has identified product quality and marketing as top priorities and has initiated research proposals. Work is currently under way to identify market opportunities for aquaculture species in this State so that potential investors can be advised, and abalone, scallop, marine fin fish and mussels are being studied. In addition I have been advised that a number of client managers have been employed by the Department of Primary Industries through the farm seafood industry development initiative and part of their role is to service investor inquiries.

The other side of this coin is the purchaser, and a customer needs analysis is suggested in recommendation 31, which is an excellent idea and I understand it will be implemented. In the abalone industry alone there are large regional differences in product requirements. For example, some customers prefer black lip, some green lip, some large and some small. The possibility of supplying domestic and overseas markets with seafood, coupled with the prospect for employment in regional areas, highlights the great economic benefit that the aquaculture industry offers to the State, particularly on Eyre

Peninsula. There is considerable frustration, not least in my own office, as this new and diverse industry, often with competing industry interests, struggles to take its place in the existing order as a major industry.

Offshore aquaculture development applications are currently assessed as part of a rigorous process outlined under the Development Act. Aquaculture applications undergo internal Government and external public consultation. For most marine aquaculture developments the Development Assessment Commission is the relevant authority for the purposes of the development assessment in accordance with the provisions of the Development Act 1993. For aquaculture development, the DAC has delegated this responsibility to its aquaculture committee. It has representatives from relevant Government departments, the aquaculture industry and the conservation movement. It is important for the good development of this industry that this committee not only be well qualified but be seen to be fair and above reproach in all its dealings, while proceeding as quickly as possible.

Offshore development applications are assessed in accordance with the policies of aquaculture management plans and a statewide offshore plan amendment report. The offshore application process for aquaculture is the subject of review. It is likely that the three components of the application—licence, lease and development approval—will be separated. Additionally, the actual development applications are the subject of review so that all necessary information is supplied in the initial application. The rate of application for development leases is escalating rapidly as people learn more about the potential of aquaculture to support a profitable business.

Over the past few years aquaculture management plans have been developed to facilitate the planning and development of aquaculture. Primary Industries and Resources South Australia, via its Aquaculture Unit, has become the lead Government agency for the management and development of the aquaculture industry; in addition to the Integrated Management Committee for Aquaculture, there is an industry based committee which advises the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development on issues affecting the aquaculture industry in South Australia. The Seafood Industry Development Board advises the Minister with regard to long-term strategies for the seafood industry.

A review is under way concerning the powers of delegation and attached conditions between the Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs and the Director of Fisheries, which has relevance to the Native Vegetation Act 1991. As well, the aquaculture management plans are being reviewed. These reviews will be prioritised by Government and hopefully help to expedite long outstanding approvals requiring environmental site assessment through the system.

The resources available to the Department of Fisheries for management plan reviews limits the number of reviews undertaken. The level of environmental assessment undertaken determines the cost of the management plan review. As only a finite amount of money is available to the department from Treasury, a decision must be made of the rate at which planned reviews will be undertaken.

There have not been many cases where R&D permits have been transferred to full commercial status, and while this has occurred there has been a requirement to submit a further application to the Development Application Committee. R&D licences are issued on the understanding that they are

indeed just that—for research and development. The applicant takes the risk that the licence cannot or will not be converted to a commercial licence. However, any undertakings given by the Government while an industry such as the oyster industry was emerging and guidelines had not been put in place must be honoured if possible, particularly where significant investment of time and money has been committed on such undertakings.

Codes of practice are one of the methods being developed to oversee aquaculture. Codes of practice have been prepared by the freshwater crayfish, oyster and tuna industries, and these are currently in the process of being endorsed by PIRSA. I believe these codes are very important to the industry, as poor operators can quickly give a particular industry a bad name, affecting not only markets but also development and therefore jobs within their own and even within other industries.

Aquaculture workshops have been undertaken in conjunction with local government. Local government councils are consulted during preparation and review of management plans. In future more work needs to be undertaken to identify the on-land infrastructure support requirements. Onshore aquaculture is also developing, and a vast range of species can be farmed onshore. As there are a limited number of marine aquaculture sites, onshore aquaculture should be encouraged, as it is much easier to monitor.

This Government has been a strong supporter and activist in relation to new technologies, especially in the use of computers. Databases on various aspects of aquaculture have been set up, some of which can be accessed on the Internet. A major aquaculture upgrade of the fisheries and licensing management system database (FLAMS) is under way.

Cabinet has determined that aquaculture leases when issued will be charged an annual rate that covers the cost of administering those leases. I hope that emerging industries would be allowed some flexibility as often practical, expensive problems have to be surmounted as a new industry finds its way. Theory should be modified in light of practical experience.

A substantial project in Port Lincoln to produce an attractive, artificial diet for tuna to replace frozen pilchards has had success in the marketplace. Japanese tuna buyers have approved the Port Lincoln farmed southern blue fin tuna fed with pellets instead of pilchards. In a taste test during a visit to Port Lincoln the buyers were unable to tell the difference between pellet and pilchard fed tuna. The pellets must replicate pilchards as much as possible in the diet to give the fish the same taste, smell, colour and fat content. They were developed by the Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia in conjunction with the South Australian Research and Development Institute.

The committee recommends that if marine feed stocks such as pilchards are to be used for food in aquaculture projects the size and sustainability of the fishery and the impacts on other species should be first thoroughly researched and monitored to determine appropriate quotas. Stock assessment and monitoring programs are currently in place for commercially fished species. PISA and SARDI are working closely on addressing this issue. The Australian Science and Technology Council Report published in 1998 states that aquaculture has several advantages over wild fisheries. I quote from page 109 of the report as follows:

Insufficient volume of catch, lack of uniformity of product and unpredictability of supply are consistently identified as major obstacles to developing the processing and marketing sectors of the

wild fishing industry. Aquaculture allows producers to plan their harvest in such a way as to not only exploit the variabilities of market demands but to fit in with the processing capacity and storage and transport availability.

There is a need for the Government to support this new industry in the allocation of funding for data gathering and training, as well as for building infrastructure. It is unfortunate that it has come at a time when we are faced with the Asian economic crisis, coupled with an overwhelming State debt, for which the Opposition has taken no responsibility and given no assistance or support to the Government for repayment options. I have therefore been very grateful for the extra staff and funding allocated to aquaculture development over the past 4½ years by the current Government.

South Australia has a special advantage in marine aquaculture due to the relatively pristine nature of our waters and our long coastline. The challenge for South Australia is to encourage this industry's development while ensuring that it is ecologically sustainable and not prone to failure due to inadequate research or finance. At the same time we must balance the competing uses for marine resources such as conservation, fishing, tourism and general amenity.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I conclude the debate by thanking all speakers who spoke in support of the report and the ERD Committee's endeavours in this respect. Aquaculture is an important industry to South Australia and an important issue for a member of Parliament representing a regional area. This is one industry that is not a Cinderella industry and one industry that can sustain employment in country regions of our State. Indeed, it can sustain such employment for a long time into the future. It was a very interesting reference for the ERD Committee.

This is a very good report and I recommend that any member who has not read it should study it, because it is a very in-depth and quite professional report. This is a blossoming industry but it needs guidance, as the member for Flinders has just said, and it also needs encouragement. With any new industry there are problems, and there always will be, and that is because guidelines are not laid down and often there are no precedents for many of the industry's practices. We need to limit the problems that will always occur in industries like this.

This industry has a huge future. It knows no bounds, particularly when one considers that aquaculture is being carried out on land and that it can cater for all sorts of species. I am sure that we have only just touched the surface in relation to suitable species. Aquaculture on land has a huge future, as does further aquaculture in our waterways, whether it be oysters, shellfish or many species of fish. I also note the increase in whiting via the Playford Trust. This industry knows no bounds.

I thank all those people who appeared as witnesses and those who sent in submissions. The problems that we have experienced in many instances are the growing pains of a youthful, fast-expanding industry with a very exciting future in a world that is increasingly looking for clean, fresh, high quality food. This report has been a very timely and valuable exercise in assisting the industry's future development, and I thank the member for Flinders for her assistance in that wording. I thank all those who participated in the review. It has been a very interesting, educational time for me as Presiding Member, and I am sure for committee members,

because many of us thought this industry to be a cinderella-type industry, one of those that is easy come, easy go. It has a viable, sustainable future in South Australia, and this Government has done the right thing by supporting it with resources—\$5 million in recent days. This Government has shown its support by putting its money where its mouth is.

I thank the officers of the committee, our secretary (Mr Bill Sotiropoulos) and our research officer (Ms Heather Hill). I also thank all members of the committee. I remind members that one of the better areas of parliamentary work is to serve on a committee which is truly bipartisan and which works for the common good. The ERD Committee comprises six members representing four Parties, and two Party Leaders serve on it. It is an honour to chair the committee.

The final word on this subject can be left to Mr Brian Jeffriess, who is President of the Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia, so I will read a letter that he sent me just a few weeks ago, as follows:

Dear Mr Venning, we would like to congratulate the committee and its staff on the aquaculture report. The report is concise, balanced, informative, specific in its recommendations, and follows a logical thread. We will use it. Yours sincerely, Brian Jeffriess.

I could not have said it better.

Motion carried.

POLICE BILL

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

- | | | |
|--------|---|--|
| No. 1 | Page 3, line 20 (clause 6)—Leave out ‘the’ (first occurring) and insert: any written | |
| No. 2 | Page 3, lines 26 and 27 (clause 8)—Leave out ‘in relation to enforcement of a law or law enforcement methods, policies, priorities or resources’. | |
| No. 3 | Page 4, lines 32 and 33 (clause 11)—Leave out paragraphs (c) and (d). | |
| No. 4 | Page 6, line 12 (clause 13)—After ‘Minister’ insert: (which must be consistent with the aims and requirements of this Act) | |
| No. 5 | Page 7, line 14 (clause 16)—Leave out ‘Commissioner’ and insert: Premier | |
| No. 6 | Page 7, line 19 (clause 16)—After ‘Commissioner’ insert: and published in the <i>Gazette</i> | |
| No. 7 | Page 7, lines 27 to 36 and page 8, lines 1 to 4 (clause 16)—Leave out subclauses (4) and (5) and insert new subclauses as follow:
(4) If, immediately before a person was first appointed as an Assistant Commissioner, he or she held an appointment under this Act or the Act repealed by this Act (the person’s ‘former appointment’), the person is, on not being reappointed at the end of a term of appointment, entitled to an appointment at the same rank as the person’s former appointment.
(5) If, immediately before a person was first appointed as an Assistant Commissioner, he or she did not hold an appointment under this Act or the Act repealed by this Act, the person’s contract must provide that the person will be entitled to some other specified appointment in SA Police in the event that he or she is not reappointed at the end of a term of appointment. | |
| No. 8 | Page 8, line 20 (clause 17)—Leave out ‘satisfactorily or to’ and insert: in a manner that satisfies | |
| No. 9 | Page 10, line 11 (clause 22)—After ‘divided’ insert: or consolidated | |
| No. 10 | Page 10, line 14 (clause 23)—Leave out ‘of an officer, or an appointment’. | |
| No. 11 | Page 10, lines 19 and 20 (clause 23)—Leave out ‘, including conditions excluding or modifying a provision of this Act’. | |
| No. 12 | Page 10, lines 21 to 37 (clause 23)—Leave out subclauses (2), (3) and (4) and insert the following:
(2) A person must not be appointed for a term under this section except
(a) where the person has special expertise that is required but not available within S.A. Police; or
(b) in other cases of a special kind prescribed by regulation.
(3) A person must not be appointed for a term under this section more than once and the term of any appointment under this section must not be extended. | |
| No. 13 | Page 11, line 22 (clause 27)—Leave out ‘two years’ and insert: one year | |
| No. 14 | Page 11, lines 34 and 35 (clause 27)—Leave out ‘two years’ and insert: one year | |
| No. 15 | Page 12, line 14 (clause 28)—After ‘Commissioner’ insert: and published in the <i>Gazette</i> | |
| No. 16 | Page 12, line 17 (clause 29)—Leave out ‘must not resign or relinquish official duties unless’ and insert: may resign or relinquish official duties if | |
| No. 17 | Page 12, line 22 (clause 29)—Leave out all words in this line. | |
| No. 18 | Page 14, line 11 (clause 35)—Leave out ‘must not resign or relinquish official duties unless’ and insert: may resign or relinquish official duties if | |
| No. 19 | Page 14, line 16 (clause 35)—Leave out all words in this line. | |
| No. 20 | Page 18, line 5 (clause 42)—After ‘seniority’ insert: or relocation to a place so distant as to unduly disrupt the member’s family life | |
| No. 21 | Page 18, line 23 (clause 43)—After ‘determined’ insert: (in a non-discretionary way) | |
| No. 22 | Page 21, line 3 (clause 47)—After ‘position’ (second occurring) insert: (and such transfer may be permanent or for a specified term) | |
| No. 23 | Page 21, lines 8 and 9 (clause 47)—Leave out ‘, subject to subsection (5) and any general orders of the Commissioner,’. | |
| No. 24 | Page 21, line 10 (clause 47)—Leave out ‘general orders’ and insert: regulations | |
| No. 25 | Page 21, lines 11 to 14 (clause 47)—Leave out subclause (5). | |
| No. 26 | Page 22, line 2 (Heading)—After ‘TERMINATION’ insert: , TRANSFER | |
| No. 27 | Page 22—After line 19 insert new clauses as follow:
Reasons for decision
49A. The Police Review Tribunal must, at the request of the applicant before the Tribunal or the Commissioner made within seven days after the Tribunal has made a decision on a review under this Division, give reasons in writing for the decision.
Appeal from decision of Tribunal
49B. (1) Following a decision by the Tribunal under this Division, the applicant before the Tribunal or the Commissioner may appeal to the Court against the decision.
(2) An appeal under this section must be instituted within one month of the making of the Tribunal’s decision, but the Court may, if it is satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to do so, dispense with the requirement that the appeal be instituted within that period.
(3) On an appeal under this section, the Court may do one or more of the following:
(a) confirm the decision;
(b) quash the decision;
(c) remit the matter to the Commissioner for reconsideration;
(d) make any further or other order as to costs or any other matter that the case requires.
(4) No further appeal lies against a decision of the Court made on an appeal under this section.
(5) In this section—
‘Court’ means the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court. | |

DIVISION 1A—TRANSFER REVIEWS

Review of certain transfers

49C. (1) If—

- (a) a decision is made to transfer a member of SA Police to another position (other than under Part 6 or section 46); and
 - (b) the member believes that he or she is being punished for particular conduct, the member may apply to the Police Review Tribunal for a review of the decision.
- (2) An application for review of the decision must be made to the Secretary to the Tribunal within the period and in the manner prescribed by regulation.
- (3) The Tribunal may in an appropriate case dispense with the requirement that the application be made within the prescribed period.
- (4) If, on an application for review of a decision under this Division, the Tribunal is satisfied that the transfer is in the nature of a punishment, the Tribunal may do one or more of the following:
- (a) quash the decision;
 - (b) remit the matter to the Commissioner for reconsideration;
 - (c) make recommendations for settlement of the matter.
- No. 28 Page 22, line 29 (clause 51)—Leave out ‘general orders of the Commissioner’ and insert: regulations
- No. 29 Page 23, line 6 (clause 52)—Leave out ‘general orders of the Commissioner’ and insert: regulations
- No. 30 Page 23 (clause 53)—After line 15 insert the following:
- (ab) that the applicant for the review should have been selected based on a proper assessment of the respective merits of the applicants; or
- No. 31 Page 23, lines 20 and 21 (clause 53)—Leave out all words in these lines.
- No. 32 Page 23, lines 23 to 29 (clause 54)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause as follows:
 Determination of application
 54. On an application for a review of a selection decision under this Division, the Police Review Tribunal may do one or more of the following:
- (a) confirm the decision;
 - (b) quash the decision;
 - (c) order that the applicant for the review be appointed to the position;
 - (d) order that the selection processes be recommenced from the beginning or some other later stage specified by the Tribunal.
- No. 33 Page 23, lines 31 to 37 (clause 55)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 34 Page 25—After line 2 insert new clause as follows:
 Appointment and promotion procedures and qualifications
 60A. Members of SA Police, police cadets and police medical officers must—
- (a) be appointed and promoted in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the regulations; and
 - (b) have the qualifications or satisfy the requirements prescribed by the regulations.
- No. 35 Page 26 (clause 66)—After line 12 insert the following:
- (1a) Despite subsection (1), remuneration may not be withheld under that subsection for more than two months.
- No. 36 Page 29, lines 5 and 6 (Schedule 1)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause as follows:
 (2) The Chief Magistrate of the Magistrates Court will, on the commencement of any proceedings under Divisions 1 or 1A of Part 8, select a Magistrate to constitute the Tribunal for the purpose of those proceedings.

**VALUATION OF LAND (MISCELLANEOUS)
 AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.
 Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I move:
 That disagreement to the amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Atkinson and Brokenshire, Ms Hurley, Mr Matthew and Mrs Maywald.

**ELECTRICITY (MISCELLANEOUS)
 AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)**

In Committee.
 (Continued from 4 August. Page 1660.)

Clause 3 passed.
 Clauses 4 and 5 passed.
 Clause 6.

Mr FOLEY: I have quite a bit that I want to contribute on this clause so, Sir, you will have to excuse my preamble before I ask questions. We were here late last night debating the issue of the Industry Regulator. My recollection of the evening was that the Chamber was packed as members hung off my every word.

Last night we debated at length the Independent Industry Regulator Bill and here we are, the following day, debating it again. Truth be known, it is the same day because the debate went past midnight. Of course, much of what we did with that Bill, consequential to its being passed in this Parliament, means that we must amend the Electricity Act. As the Minister would be aware, having passed the Industry Regulator legislation, it is important that we amend the Electricity Act by this Electricity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. We did that last night, and my colleague the member for Ross Smith asked some very intelligent questions. I thought they were extremely intelligent questions.

His questions were so good that I was somewhat shamed that I had not asked the same questions. In the end that does not matter. As a team player I was keen that we properly scrutinise and canvass the wide-ranging issues that surround the implementation of the Industry Regulator. As I indicated last night, the Opposition will be asking a number of questions on the Bill, but we will have some time between the Bill’s passage from this place to another place. By that time we will know the outcome of the sale legislation and we may choose to amend, oppose, alter or simply restate some positions in respect of this Bill when it is in another place.

I do not see the need for us to necessarily go over some of the issues that we canvassed last night. As much as I might like to it would be a futile exercise. We would simply be wasting the time of the Parliament if we were to ask any questions. The Industry Regulator will have responsibility for licensing, price regulation and other functions and powers as conferred by the legislation. The Industry Regulator has many functions and we put a lot of those functions into the legislation last night.

Clause passed.
 Clause 7.

Mr FOLEY: Does this clause relate to Division 1, section 6A?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, section 6A.

Mr FOLEY: That is interesting, because I was debating something in the previous clause that was totally irrelevant. This charade of a debate is even more ludicrous because no-one picked that up. I have just spoken on section 6A. I am happy for that to be put to a vote if I can then move on to section 6B, or can we ask questions and talk about 6B in the context of clause 7?

The CHAIRMAN: I indicate to the member for Hart that this is all part of clause 7 and, at this stage, we are dealing with clause 7. The honourable member can speak on any of those issues within that clause.

Mr FOLEY: Why do we have sections 6A, 6B, 6C and 6D, etc. as part of clause 7?

The CHAIRMAN: Because they are new sections within the Bill and contained within clause 7.

Mr FOLEY: I have canvassed widely the issue of the Industry Regulator. Unfortunately, I was talking about that in the context of other statutory requirements that are not affected. However, back to the main game. The Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council—ESIPC as it will become affectionately known—is an interesting body. In discussion on this matter last night it was indicated that the planning council will have a board. I am keen to know some details about the board and the bureaucratic structure that will hang off the board. I made the point last night that one interesting aspect of this legislation is that we are establishing a whole raft of new statutory authorities, councils, boards and advisory bodies. How many members will comprise the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council? Is it five?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that the number is five.

Mr FOLEY: It is important that we do not plan or develop too large a bureaucracy for this body. Could the Minister advise the Committee the expected bureaucracy that will support this Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council, and is he able to give us an indicative budget that we may be looking at? Are we talking millions to run this particular body, or how is it expected to function?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The issues the honourable member raises are still being scoped in relation to the number, although I am advised that it is expected to be 10. The budget is expected to be approximately \$1.5 million.

Mr FOLEY: Clearly the planning council will be tasked with the strategic planning of the electricity industry. I find that interesting in the sense that, as we go into the competitive market, the ability of the Government to either interfere in the market or to direct the market as to how the Government might like it to occur, I would have thought, will be limited. Is this particular planning council more an advisory body to try to assist the Government's understanding of where the market is heading, or will it have teeth in terms of planning? I do not know what we will be able to do in future years in terms of deciding whether we have another power station, or whether that power station will be a coal-fired power station, or whether it will be—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Yes, a nuclear power station. I am glad the member for Ross Smith raised that matter. I am glad that the member for Flinders is with us because I heard the honourable member on the radio the other morning. I was unfortunately unable to accompany the Treasurer, the Hon. Nick Xenophon and the Hon. Sandra Kanck in a light aircraft to Port Lincoln to attend a public meeting. The reason for my non-attendance was that my son was playing his zone football that night. He had been picked in the primary school zone squad. He was playing at Prospect Oval. I say to the member for Ross Smith that the lighting is very bad at Prospect Oval.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: But I will ignore the—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. Anyway, I could not make it. But I woke up the next morning and turned on the radio to the

ABC, as I always do—why I had it on the ABC on a Saturday morning I am not too certain—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. I quickly went to 5AA for the football show. But I heard the member for Flinders canvassing the idea of a nuclear power station. The member for Flinders seriously thought that it would be useful to have a nuclear power plant in this State. She felt that the idea of a competitive marketplace would lend itself to some downstream processing and we would have a power station. I later heard the Treasurer say that it was just a comment made in jest, but I do recall the tape: I believe that they played the tape of the member saying at the public meeting that the idea of a nuclear power station was a very good concept, and I was amused. I thought that was interesting: I thought that a nuclear power station was a novel concept. The member for Flinders, I am sure—

Mr Clarke: Coming from this place, I would have thought wind power would be better.

Mr FOLEY: No, I believe that we have to look at the member for Flinders in the context of her electorate. I suspect that the National Party member for Chaffey might want to take note of the fact that the Liberal member for Flinders was publicly advocating a nuclear power station for her electorate. I do not know the politics of that electorate, but the National Party may want to consider that at the next State election. That might be a positive: one might actually garner votes from suggesting a nuclear power station.

The point I am getting to is—and I appreciate the Government's indulgence in allowing me to wander a bit—the notion of the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council (or, as I have termed it, ESIPC) pondering the wisdom or economics or otherwise of a nuclear power station. I just wonder what strategic planning we will be able to do for our electricity industry other than what might be a useful debate on a quiet Monday in Cabinet, given that NEMMCO has ruled that we cannot have a regulated interconnector, we cannot have an aggregated generation industry, we cannot have an aggregated transmission and distribution business and we cannot cross-subsidise: we have to have transparent pricing. It seems to me that there is not a lot of strategic planning left for us to do. Having said that, I can understand that it would be useful for the Government to have a feel for how the market is developing and to have an understanding as to where the gaps may be and where, if necessary, we as a Government may have to offer some—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I heard that, and I am offended by the word 'gallantly'.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: What worries me is who will read it between now and when it gets to another place. So, I just place on the record that this is a filibustering process by me, mainly because we have some—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Sorry?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, we have some hiccups, and I am trying to be very constructive and bail the Government out of a hole, effectively. I do not want to—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am trying to help my old mate Ian. We came into the Parliament at the same time. My money is on the junior Minister moving into Cabinet, and I do not want to bowl up any difficult deliveries and dash his chances. As

we know, last night the member for Schubert did his chances for the ministry much damage when he asked why, in relation to a Bill, we had the body report from time to time to the Minister. He thought it was a bit odd that a body would possibly want to report from time to time, until we pointed out to him that it is pretty handy that that happen occasionally. I understand that the junior Minister has an answer to my question. He may also enlighten me on what my question was.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The honourable member has entered a wide ranging debate: there is no doubt about that. In relation to the planning council, I am advised that it has at least two roles: one is an advisory role in relation to the ongoing reliability of the South Australian system; the other is to fulfil certain but ongoing planning functions that are required to be undertaken under the National Electricity Code.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the member for Ross Smith speaks, the Chair indicates to the Committee that it will show extreme tolerance again this afternoon, because members will note that there are many parts to this clause and I have determined that, rather than individual members being limited to speaking three times to this entire clause, I will show some flexibility in terms of the involvement of members of the Committee. But we are dealing with clause 7.

Mr CLARKE: I have fathomed that out, thank you, Mr Chairman. The members of the Committee owe you a great deal of gratitude for your forbearance and tolerance. My question to the Minister will hopefully be a little more succinct, if possible—but the member for Hart has done a magnificent job in covering up for the Premier, who has otherwise been detained, so that we can at least keep progressing this Bill at a snail's pace until he is eventually able to join us. I just could not match the effort of the member for Hart.

What amazes me about this Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council is the fact that we are setting up another committee, which is a body corporate and which will have board members, presumably—and I will seek more details about that later. Presumably, the members will be paid and they will each have a bureaucracy. Yet ETSA and Optima Energy have been doing all that, anyway. I assume that the reason why we have power stations, transmission lines and the like going in certain directions is that the existing bureaucracy, within ETSA, Optima Energy or the old Department of Mines and Energy, and so forth, did all the work that will now be done by this Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council in working out and forecasting the power needs of the State in generations to come. We are reinventing the wheel in establishing a separate body, with all the additional costs and bureaucracies that go with it, when this is already, presumably, being handled within ETSA itself or by another Government agency. So, my question to the Minister is—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I am still on the first one, yes. What is the need for this board in the first place, who is doing the planning now and what will happen to them?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reason you need the board is that it is involved in commercial issues. They are looking at taking it out of the industry and putting it under this independent body.

Mr CLARKE: I appreciate that this is not the Minister's portfolio, so I am not holding the brevity of his answer against him, but that just does not make sense to me. If I understood correctly what the Minister was saying, he said something about a commercial body being taken out of there and put into this planning council. What commercial body are we talking about? It is obviously predicated on Optima Energy and ETSA being sold to private interests, and I suspect that that will not be the case. That leads me to this point: do we need this legislation if ETSA and Optima Energy stay in public hands? That is one part of my question that the Minister might think about. Is this body necessary and is this legislation needed at all if ETSA and Optima Energy remain in public hands?

Why cannot those who are now doing the planning stay where they are and where they have built up the expertise? Why are we to have another layer of bureaucracy, another separate board and separate board payments? I appreciate that the Premier, who has carriage of this legislation, might want to create more boards on which to put ex-Liberal politicians as a reward for past services. I would like a more fulsome explanation.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is to provide independent advice to Government and because of the commercial implications in relation to that.

Mrs MAYWALD: Currently we have three Bills before the Parliament: one dealing with the disposal and restructuring of ETSA, this one, and the Bill relating to the Independent Regulator. As the member for Ross Smith has said, we are assuming that the sale-enabling Bill will actually be passed, or are we not? Is this Bill before us a requirement of our entering the national electricity market more so than a requirement for the disposal and sale of ETSA, and will this Bill be withstanding, regardless of whether or not the sale goes ahead?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The content of this measure would be required whether the sale proceeds or does not proceed to meet provisions of the national electricity market and, in addition, a number of provisions that I have indicated in various remarks I have made to the House about checks and balances that we would put in place to protect interests, including country consumers in relation to the pricing mechanism. The legislation with respect to the Independent Regulator, which was passed a few hours ago, meets part of that requirement, and this measure contains other provisions related to that.

Mr FOLEY: My colleague the member for Ross Smith has hit on a very good point. I will pick up that theme and steal his thunder and put it down to my thinking—which is a problem, given that I have just put it on the *Hansard* record. Fair dinkum, do we really need this? I hear what you are saying about the requirements of the national market. I can accept that you need an Industry Regulator—and we passed that Bill last night. I can accept there may be arguments regarding disaggregation and other aspects in terms of meeting it.

Is the Premier suggesting that the National Competition Council has made it a condition of further competition payments that we have to set up the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council to give us another structure, another bureaucracy? I am not debating the point whether or not you need a capacity within Government to be giving higher level advice about the changing nature, the profiles and so on of the electricity industry: it is acknowledged. But do we really need a board with directors, directors' salaries,

a bureaucracy and a structure? History shows us that these things tend to be great takers of money without necessarily delivering the output that was intended or, indeed, should be provided. Surely a more streamlined approach would be to have an advisory unit within Government at a lot less cost and quite frankly a bit closer to Government to provide high level advice?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is for a specific purpose. To embellish on my reply to the member for Ross Smith, I point out that the planning council is to be independent of any vested interest. So, advice coming in is separate and distinct from any vested interest in the industry. In addition to that, it ought to be recommending on any planning investments—whether or not they should go ahead. Let me give a practical example. Advice to Government over time in relation to Port Augusta is that, because of the environmental considerations and the cost to bring it up to environmental standards, Playford B ought to be shut down.

However, it was interesting that, when independent consultants came on board and looked at that aspect, they indicated to us that for \$1.5 million we could start up the fourth unit at Port Augusta and then start meeting some of the immediate peak load capacity. In addition to that, the refurbishment of the four units would be about \$30 million to \$40 million, or about 25 per cent of the cost of putting in place a new unit, and that came from advice independent of all that had been given to us previously.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: When you are undertaking major investment decisions, sometimes independent, stand-alone advice can at least provide some options that simply are not presented for detailed consideration. In this instance, we have now been able to make a decision and an announcement regarding Port Augusta B about bringing the fourth unit back on stream. The refurbishment cost is minimal for the four units compared with the cost of building a new generating unit.

Mr FOLEY: That is an interesting little story that the Premier has shared with us. I am not sure what it tells us about some of the advice he has been getting previously. At the end of the day—

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It might be the point. Clearly, it is sometimes useful to get outside advice, and I am not suggesting you should not. With your analogy, that advice can be sought and given to anybody. I just wonder why we would need to have such a structured, top-heavy, permanent structure in place such as ESIPC. Do we really need to have a board? Let us get down to tintsacks. How much will each of these directors be paid? What will be the remuneration band? What will the directors and the Chair of ESIPC be paid?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Those fees have not been set as yet. As the member for Hart would know from previous experience, structures are put in place and an assessment is then made independently (as is the case currently) regarding the work load, degree of responsibility and numbers of meetings and then, as a result of that, a Cabinet submission is prepared and a recommendation comes forward to Cabinet from the internal body making the assessment. Coming back to the planning council, those involved would bring in a range of expertise from different fields of endeavours to ensure that it is an independent body; that it is able to tap into a wealth of information and advice; and that it is for good planning and good decision-making. I point out to the Committee that the decisions being made in this area can cost not tens but

hundreds of millions of dollars and much is at stake in ensuring that you get it right. Having some checks and balances, independent and alternative advice on advantages and disadvantages will ensure that the Government of the day is in a better position to make a decision and, therefore, to protect the interests of taxpayers to a greater extent.

Mr CLARKE: I am still finding the Premier's answers on the necessity for this organisation to be established a bit redundant. The Premier gave the example of the Playford B plant in Port Augusta where independent advice saved the Government some tens of millions of dollars, which is excellent. Presumably, that was commissioned by either the power authorities or the Minister directly—and Ministers have always had the ability to do that, in any event. The Premier did not have to set up a bureaucracy to get independent advice. Presumably, when Governments of the day have had to consider whether they should build a new power station and, if so, where and all the rest of it, not only did ETSA commission reports on it but any of those plans would have been scrutinised very closely through the Cabinet system—because of the sheer amount of money involved in such outlays—to see what alternatives were feasible. I suspect that this is indeed exactly what happened in respect of Playford B, and thereby whoever commissioned the report—be it the Minister directly, ETSA or Optima Energy—saved the taxpayers considerable sums of money.

However, the Premier in answer to the question from the member for Hart referred to having this independent body to protect the public against the vested interests of the industry. Of course, that is also predicated on the basis of the power industry in this State being privatised. Whilst ETSA and Optima Energy could have a vested interest, in the sense of wanting to build an empire for themselves, at the moment they are still directly subject to ministerial and Cabinet control, and at any time the Cabinet can seek outside expert advice, which this Government does with monotonous regularity at some considerable cost to the taxpayer, but it has the freedom to do so.

It seems to me that the Premier does not need to set up this body about which he is talking with five members (being directors) or the advisory committee mentioned in division 4 under clause 15. We are building up layer after layer of bureaucracies that will become self-serving and pricey to do all the work that ETSA or some other body within the Government already does, and I suspect at a cheaper cost. Why does the Premier need this body? Again, I know the Premier will say that this is to protect the public from vested interest in the power industry and it is better to get outside advice. What can this body do that the Government of the day does not do already; that is, call in independent consultants to check certain facts, proposals, or whatever, to ensure that whatever alternative is finally adopted is the best on all the facts currently available? What will this body do that the existing infrastructure does not do?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The honourable member put forward a cogent argument that might well answer his own question; that is, not always is advice coming through to Ministers totally impartial, totally constructive and without another agenda and, if I understand the member for Ross Smith's remarks correctly that is the summary of his argument. Ministers cannot be expected to be second guessing quite technical issues of this nature, and that is why having independent non-vested interests with expertise to give advice to Government to ensure that we get it right—or that a future Labor Government in 20, 30 years from now gets it right—is

a basis for moving forward. Mr Chairman, you simply cannot win, can you? Here is an Opposition that has constantly carped, criticised and complained that we have not accessed the right sort of information—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:—and has no alternative plan—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Stuart will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I would have thought that this is being prudent and laying a foundation in the State's best interests. It is providing a check and balance and is ensuring that the best possible range of advice is available to the Minister and the Government upon which to make major policy decisions.

Mr CLARKE: This is the last line of questioning I will put to the Premier because I can see that this is becoming a tennis court and we are just bouncing the ball backwards and forwards. I put questions, I get an answer, but it is not much of an answer. In so far as self-government is concerned, South Australia has been going since 1857. Major infrastructure projects have been undertaken in this State; we have had huge infrastructure undertaken in this State in the power generating and distribution industry, and Ministers have had to take hard decisions and obtain advice from within their own bureaucracy and from within ETSA on a whole range of issues. That is why we have Ministers. It seems to me that this Government is so hell bent on outsourcing and privatising all the main areas of Government that we ought to have a reduction in pay for Ministers, because what will they do?

God forbid, Premier, Ministers are actually required to administer their departments; they are actually required to be on top of their portfolios, not necessarily to know all the detailed technical structure but to ensure rigorous examination of proposals coming before them.

Mr Foley: We are talking about a Liberal Government.

Mr CLARKE: I know we are talking about a Liberal Government, so it is a bit hard to use that argument. It is a bit laid back, but I think that this Premier puts in the hard yards even if he is wrong. The point is that that is the reason why we have Ministers: to give an effective oversight of the running of their agencies and to ensure that they conform with Government policies. I do not expect any Minister to have the technical grasp and detail of the running of a complex organisation such as ETSA, but this State has progressed well into the twentieth century without the need for this particular planning body.

I fail to see what this planning body will do that is so different, or that its reports and advice will be so spectacularly different from the advice which we have had over the decades in this State with respect to the power industry, and which has served us well in the main. I am not saying that every decision has been a correct one, but at the same time the Premier will not be able to find a chairman who will be Jesus Christ so that all the advice that comes to the Minister of the day will be infallible. Again—and I know that I will not get a different answer from the Premier—I cannot see any justification whatsoever for this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the member for Hart that the Chair indicated earlier that some tolerance and flexibility were being shown in allowing more questions to be asked on this clause because of its size, but the member for Ross Smith and the member for Hart have had a fair go. I suggest that this might be the last question for the honourable member.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Ross Smith has hit on an extremely important point. We talked about a body that has

no self-interest, which is able to give advice. At the end of the day, there is an interest for the Government; that is, that we have some ability to ensure that we have a viable electricity industry. If the Premier's model is followed through over the next few weeks—and, like the member for Ross Smith, I doubt very much that that will occur—let us assume that we have a private industry: the Premier has taken away the Government's ability to intervene in the market, because NEMMCO will not allow him to do so. If the Premier has this highly paid group of directors and bureaucracy that is giving him high level, independent advice, what are they advising him about?

If the power stations are owned by the private sector, the transmission business is owned by the private sector, then we no longer own anything; we cannot build anything any more; we cannot duplicate anything any more; we cannot interfere or cross-subsidise or do the things that Governments used to enjoy doing. What the Premier is saying is, 'Let us at least have a highly paid board to give us strategic advice on where the world is heading.' That is probably pretty useful, and probably important, but I am not sure that at the end of the day it needs to have a five person board, a 10 or 15 person bureaucracy and an ongoing recurrent budget in order to be giving the Premier that advice.

Perhaps the Premier is seeing someone on the Labor Party side arguing for smaller Government. We might actually be arguing for that in this instance against a Premier who seems to want to leave us a legacy of bureaucracy. I have come to the conclusion that this is probably an unnecessary structure to have in place and that the Premier can achieve his goals from within Government. Let us not be afraid of a little bit of self-interest, because at the end of the day the Premier's strategic planning for the future should have a degree of self-interest. As the elected Government of the day, its self-interest means that we have to deliver power reliably, on time and at a competitive price, to ensure that both the consumers and the industry of this State have a viable electricity supply.

My colleagues on the cross benches might want to think about this, but I am inclined to oppose this clause tonight and hope that the Independent members may also give some consideration to that. At the end of the day, I will not die in the ditches over it. If the Premier wants to create a bureaucracy, Governments can do those things, and I am not sure that it is something of great moment in terms of divisions. But a symbolic gesture on this clause may be that we in the Labor Party are inclined to support less Government than more and to show confidence in our bureaucracy, as against the need to have highly paid people from outside on the payroll to give us advice that should be able to be provided from within Government itself.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The council will work with NEMMCO and with other bodies, and it will look at the planning requirements. I cannot add anything further. It might be that the Opposition does not want to accept the answer, but the simple fact is that we are attempting to put in place checks and balances, and where you get the State having to consider the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars and you get a range of professional advice, that range of advice enables any Minister of the day to make a judgment as to which advice he will accept. In the past we have seen advice that protects an interest rather than giving a range of options, and it is in the State's interest, I would have thought, to protect that. That is simply what we seek to do.

Mr FOLEY: If the Opposition wanted to oppose the establishment of the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council, Division 2, what is the process for that?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair would suggest that if the honourable member wished to oppose it he should do so by opposing the clause. I do not intend going through section by section as far as the vote is concerned, so it would be necessary for the honourable member to oppose the clause.

Mr FOLEY: We can oppose that clause, because it is only about that body.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Mr FOLEY: Why are we amending the existing legislation to remove 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The reason for that is that the Minister will do it because of the reduced functions and the clear legislative requirements on the Regulator.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

Mr CLARKE: How will the Industry Regulator go about establishing the advisory committees? How will the Industry Regulator know to whom he or she is to direct his or her attention, towards whose representative of consumers, whether they be commercial or domestic? How many will there be? How often would they meet? Would those advisory committees be paid for their attendance or would it be on a *per annum* basis? If so, what sort of money are we looking at? Will they be provided with a secretariat? If so, how many will it comprise and at what cost? What statutory functions will they serve, and will they also have the ability to report directly to the Minister of the day and/or to Parliament?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In relation to the honourable member's question, I canvassed much of that information in considerable detail last night when answering questions from the member for Hart. For the benefit of the Committee, I draw the honourable member's attention to *Hansard*.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 to 22 passed.

Clause 23.

Mr WILLIAMS: I move:

Page 14, lines 23 to 25—Leave out 'at least equivalent to the actual levels of service for such customers prevailing at the commencement of this section' and insert 'that are at least equivalent to the actual levels of service for such customers prevailing during the year prior to the commencement of this section and take into account relevant national benchmarks developed from time to time'. This clause, relating to the licenses authorising operation of transmission or distribution network, is to my constituents and to me one of the most important clauses in this Bill and in the three nuts and bolts Bills involved in the sale process of the electricity assets. As the Premier pointed out in answer to a previous question, this Bill is necessary mainly to take our electricity network into the national electricity market. It is not necessarily predicated on the sale process, although it is my belief that the sale process has enabled certain provisions to come into this Bill which may not have been there otherwise.

My amendment deals with clause 23(1)(j)(ii) and ensures that any future owner, whether that be a public or private owner, of electricity assets will live up to certain levels of service standards. My amendment strengthens the clause. There are two parts to the amendment: first, to insert in lieu of the words at the commencement of this clause words relating to the previous 12 months from the commencement

of this provision; and, secondly, to take into account national benchmark standards so that, over time, if the national benchmark standards increase and reach a level above the standards that prevailed in South Australia in the 12 months before the provision comes into being, we will keep abreast of those increasing standards of service. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Government is happy to accept the amendment moved by the member for MacKillop. It is interesting to note that the service standards in the past year have improved. The honourable member has effectively selected the year with the highest service standards for some time, and by benchmarking that against other standards set from time to time is okay from the Government's perspective because it reinforces the original intent of the Government.

Mr CLARKE: If there is a breach of the legislation, what penalties apply and is it only the Government that has standing before the courts to enforce the breach or can any consumer initiate action and have standing in the courts so that they do not have to rely on the Government of the day to do something?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Fines of up to \$250 000 focus the attention of any commercial opportunity, I assure members. For repeated offences the capacity exists for the Regulator to remove the licence, that is, stop the business.

Mr CLARKE: I lay London to a brick that they will not stop the business if it means that they do not generate power. Is the Industry Regulator responsible for the enforcement of these provisions? Can separate actions be undertaken? If the Industry Regulator chooses not to do so but a consumer feels aggrieved, do they have standing in the courts to initiate action themselves and, if so, is there any provision for legal aid assistance with respect to individual consumers who feel that the Regulator is not doing the job by enforcing contractual agreements? This is not fanciful. We have an 800 page document in the water contract and all sorts of breaches have been brought to the attention of this Government and not once has it enforced any of the fines or penalties provided for in the water contract.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As the Committee has been advised, United Water picked up a fairly substantial bill last year along with costs associated with that bill. My understanding is that that advice has been given to the House.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We are talking about half a million dollars worth of costs. I understand the honourable member has not run a business but, if you have half a million dollars worth of costs applied to you, it focuses your mind and attention, I assure members of that. As to whether the Regulator is independent and can take this action on the Regulator's own initiative, the answer is 'Yes'. As to a consumer whose complaint has not been picked up by the Regulator and whether that should be the case, the consumer has an Electricity Ombudsman who also has the capacity to take action against those who do not apply the service standards. It is covered in both respects.

Mr McEWEN: I refer to the implications of this customer service standard. Should the restructuring and disposal Bill not be successful, I am not sure of the implications for the Electricity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. It is a chicken and egg argument. Should this Bill pass and the restructuring and disposal Bill not pass, what are the implications? If the ownership remains in public hands, some of these things are not enforceable in that scenario any way, but, should that be the case, are we then saying that these customer service

standards will be imposed irrespective of the final ownership of the entities, in this case, particularly the transmission and distribution entities?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am advised that the answer is 'Yes.' Whether or not the sale enabling legislation is passed, these packages of Bills before the Parliament contain a number of measures to meet the requirements of the national electricity market. In any event, the Government wants to put in place a base service standard. The Government has been concerned that there is a view, particularly in some country and regional areas, that service standards have not been maintained. In any event, we have the 1.7 per cent promise to maintain country and regional pricing. As the member for Gordon would appreciate, come 1 January 2003, if we do not legislate we lose as a State the right to set transmission and distribution pricing. That is set by the ACCC. By putting through this legislation, we effectively carry forward the commitment for equality of price in country and city areas but for the maximum 1.7 per cent.

Mr McEWEN: My follow-up question, which is one of detail, concerns subclause (1)(j)(v)(A), which refers to how one examines the financial implications of any expansion of the distribution network. One of the potential scenarios is that ownership might still be in public hands. There is still no opportunity to meet any community service obligations in terms of expanding the distribution network. In effect, the clause provides that the investigation that must proceed with the expansion of the network is on a cost efficiency basis.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am having difficulty grasping the point that the member for Gordon wants me to clarify.

Mr McEWEN: I have written a note to myself in relation to this clause with the word 'delete' written across it. I am not going down that path but I can see why I wrote that note to myself. The clause provides for a requirement on the electricity entity, as follows:

to investigate, before it makes any significant expansion of the distribution network or the capacity of the distribution network, whether it would be cost effective to avoid or postpone such expansion. . .

Where are the community service obligations in terms of expanding the network? Under this clause, these decisions are made strictly on a commercial basis irrespective of who the owner is. The Premier has said that this Bill will apply irrespective of whether or not the ownership remains in public hands. This is a philosophical shift in the way in which this entity will be managed, irrespective of the ownership. I might be reading far too much into the clause.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is no specific community service obligation in relation to further expansions not yet identified. One would expect the competition in the marketplace to create the opportunity for that to occur. However, if there were a project of significance to the State and the State wanted to see an expansion of the network, it could designate that and then designate under the ACCC-NCC rules a CSO to enable that to occur.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 24.

Mr WILLIAMS: I move:

Page 15, lines 36 and 37—Leave out 'at least equivalent to the actual levels of service for such customers prevailing at the commencement of this section' and insert 'that are at least equivalent to the actual levels of service for such customers prevailing during the year prior to the commencement of this section and take into account relevant national benchmarks developed from time to time'. This amendment is identical to the previous amendment that has been accepted by the Committee. Clause 23 dealt with

licences for transmission and distribution and this clause deals with licences authorising retailing. The amendment has the same effect as the previous amendment. I commend it to the Committee.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Government is happy to accept this further amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 25 passed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Clause 26.

Mr FOLEY: Will the Deputy Premier explain exactly what this clause means?

The CHAIRMAN: Would the member for Hart mind repeating the question?

Mr FOLEY: I think that you are safe now, Deputy Premier. You are safe in that job, Premier; your Deputy will not threaten you. He was struggling.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Hart might like to repeat the question for the benefit of the Premier.

Mr FOLEY: I am more than happy to let clause 26 stand as printed.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 to 33 passed.

Clause 34.

Mr FOLEY: I take it that this provision, which deals with price regulation, is simply putting into this legislation the powers, roles and functions of the Industry Regulator? Is there anything new that I need to worry about?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, the honourable member's assessment is correct.

Clause passed.

Clauses 35 to 50 passed.

Clause 51.

Mr FOLEY: The issue of the undergrounding of powerlines is held passionately by many members of the Labor Party, and none more than the shadow Minister for Communications, with whom I understand the Premier has worked on a number of projects. It would be remiss of me if I did not raise this very important issue—and Senator Schacht would telephone me at midnight tonight for a short chat. Clearly, in a privatised industry structure, indeed in a competitive industry structure, Governments will not be able to put subtle pressure on players within the industry to underground powerlines. Are we now looking at that being done from consolidated revenue, or is the Premier expecting that some requirement be placed upon private transmitters or distributors of electricity to undertake the undergrounding of powerlines?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Senator Schacht and others can rest assured that programs, such as the Powerlines Environment Committee, have been put in place. The honourable member would be aware that last year we allocated additional funds to the Powerlines Environment Committee to undertake further undergrounding throughout South Australia. That program will continue. I draw the honourable member's attention to section 58A(1) under which periodic programs put in place by the Minister shall be implemented by the private sector. Planning laws require new subdivisions currently to have underground powerlines and amenities; therefore, under planning laws, the Government has a degree of control for the undergrounding of powerlines in subdivisions.

I would have thought that, under a privatised entity, you would most probably get an initiative in that a private entity would enter into arrangements with other utilities, either telecommunications utilities or others, for common undergrounding of those facilities, amortising the cost over a number of utilities. That being the case, I hope that we will see a greater capacity to underground than was previously the case. Certainly PLEC, with increased funding as promised last year and as delivered by the Government in the budget this year, will be in place.

Mr CLARKE: What sort of assurance can I get that in my electorate of Ross Smith, around Kilburn and Blair Athol, there will be equal consideration in terms of undergrounding of powerlines, cleaning up of visual pollution and beautifying of the Kilburn footy oval, for example? Will it receive equal attention in terms of the undergrounding of powerlines in, say, Burnside and other leafy suburbs held by the Liberal Party? Will the people in my electorate be treated equally? It is no good for the Government to turn around and say, 'As long as you are prepared to pay \$6 000 per property for undergrounding, we will do it', because there is no financial capacity in my community for that to happen. There should, therefore, be at least an opportunity, taking into account socioeconomic areas, for undergrounding to take place in suburbs such as in my electorate as compared with any of the leafy eastern suburbs.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I assure the honourable member that the Powerlines Environment Committee has cross-Party representation: that is, former members from both sides of the House have served on the Powerlines Environment Committee. I put to the honourable member that the expenditure of funds has been merit based. To talk about the leafy eastern suburbs is quite an inaccurate assessment. I simply draw to the attention of the honourable member the annual report tabled by the Powerlines Environment Committee in those towns and locations where undergrounding of powerlines has taken place. The honourable member will see that the allocation of funds has been quite impartial. The rejuvenation of towns and suburbs has benefited from the powerline undergrounding and beautification programs that have been put in place.

A local council really bears the responsibility, in the first instance, for raising the option of undergrounding, and a number of councils have taken up the issue on behalf of their respective designated council areas. So, the program will continue. The only point I make is that, if our Federal colleagues wish for an accelerated program of undergrounding, I would ask them to put their money where their mouth is and offer some financial support to the State of South Australia so that it can undertake a far greater—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I have noticed that Senator Schacht on a number of occasions has championed the undergrounding of the whole of Adelaide and—

Mr Hill: Just the powerlines.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I know it was a late night last night—yes, just the powerlines in the city and environs of Adelaide. That would run into billions of dollars—a program that I would support. But the simple fact is that the State Government does not have the money and, if the Federal Government is so intent on that course—and Senator Schacht in particular—I would simply ask him, at some long distant stage in the future, to give a commitment that a future Labor Government might contribute some funds towards that project.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: But alas, I believe that the member for Hart has the accurate answer: what chance of that from a Federal Government?

Mr CLARKE: The Premier referred to initiation of undergrounding by local government authorities: how much financial contribution is expected by local councils, particularly those whose income base from ratepayers is somewhat limited simply because of the socioeconomic areas that they represent? I am not certain, but I would like to think, from the Premier's answer, that there is this powerlines authority, that each council puts up its hand for the undergrounding of certain areas, that the case is judged on its merits and that, therefore, there is—

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Norwood informs me that there is virtually no money involved. She might be able to ask a question, given her deep involvement with local government in the past. It seems to me that there is precious little in resources and, depending upon the priorities of the powerlines authority and so forth, suburbs such as Kilburn and Blair Athol in my electorate will be virtually forgotten as far as undergrounding is concerned, simply because the local community does not have the financial capacity to raise the sums of money necessary to underground completely, or to any significant degree, compared with the eastern suburbs. Is the State Government prepared to put a sum of money into the overall pot to allow the undergrounding of powerlines on an equitable basis, on a needs basis and in accordance with the socioeconomic background of the relevant suburbs that are to be potentially subject to undergrounding? It seems to me that there are no such guidelines.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Powerlines Environment Committee has a set of guidelines upon which it operates. They are the same guidelines that operated under the former Labor Administration. The only difference is that we put in more money than did the last Labor Government to underground powerlines. The honourable member ought to get some facts right and look at an annual report to ascertain where the allocation of those funds has been.

Clause passed.

Clauses 52 to 74 passed.

Clause 75.

Mr FOLEY: I refer to the issue of cross ownership—and this may or may not be specifically detailed here. Should the Legislative Council not agree to the Government's decision to sell the assets of ETSA or Optima Energy, what is the issue in relation to cross ownership as far as the Government is concerned? If you disaggregate Optima, I take it that you are allowed, in a disaggregated Optima, to have the three power generation companies publicly owned: that is not an issue in terms of cross ownership?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: To disaggregate and ring fence stand-alone Government business enterprises to meet the requirements of the NCC and the ACCC.

Mr FOLEY: I am not quite sure that that answers my question. My question is, specifically, if—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: If you want to enter the debate—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr FOLEY: Assuming that you are going to disaggregate Torrens Island, Port Augusta and the third generating entity, has the NCC given approval for those three generating companies to be disaggregated under public ownership—and

not for that to have been considered a conflict in terms of cross ownership?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, the NCC and the ACCC, as I have indicated previously, have given endorsement for the structure that we are now proposing to put in place under private or public ownership.

Mr FOLEY: I believe that that is an important point in terms of whether those entities should remain in public ownership. In regard to the issue of cross ownership, clearly, there are issues relating to the reaggregation of the industry in a corporate sense. What powers do we have as a State in terms of companies owning electricity assets in Victoria (or, indeed, New South Wales, but probably more importantly Victoria) and owning strategic assets here in South Australia—that is, a company owning a power generator in both States? That is probably more likely to be an issue in terms of power generation. Do we have a role in terms of having a view as to how that may or may not be adverse to our industry here?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, there is no prohibition in relation to generators. There are restrictions in relation to distribution, because we have put in one distributor in South Australia, the purpose of which is to enable us to put a structure in place that has the maximum price variation of 1.7 per cent.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUSTAINABLE ENERGY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 July. Page 1509.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): This is an interesting Bill and one that I read with interest. The Bill was wholeheartedly endorsed by the Labor Opposition—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Hartley—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is out of his seat.

Mr FOLEY: The Bill was endorsed unanimously by the Labor Caucus. We thought it was an excellent piece of legislation. We thought that, in all of the pieces of legislation in terms of restructuring our electricity industry, when it came to this Bill the Government got it right. There was not one voice in our Labor Caucus in opposition to the Bill.

Mr Venning: You can't be well.

Mr FOLEY: No, I am well, and I have to say that this Bill was an absolute stroke of genius. If the Premier of this State achieves nothing else in his time in this Parliament, he will have given this State a great legacy in this body of legislation here. It is important that, following on from the Industry Regulator, the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council, and half a dozen advisory boards, we now have the Sustainable Energy Authority.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: We are not cynical about that at all. We think it is important that we have such a body. Some of us are at a loss to understand why we did not have one earlier. The importance of the Bill was apparent to the Opposition on our first reading. It was just a very sensible thing to do.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has he read the Bill?

Mr FOLEY: Excuse me! I do not deserve to cop it from the Chair. I come into this House every day and get criticised

by this Premier for knocking, criticising and carping. Here I am giving support for a bit of legislation and I cop it from the Chair. How can I win?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart is making an excellent contribution!

Mr FOLEY: As a former Minister for the Environment, it is a wonder that you did not think of it earlier. We will support this Bill. Even to show our green credentials on this, we will oppose just one element of the Bill, and that is clause 2. Clause 2 is referred to in the explanation of clauses as follows:

This clause provides for the commencement of the measure and excludes the operation of the provision of the *Acts Interpretation Act* that results in provisions commencing no later than 2 years after enactment.

I was not sure why that clause was included. Perhaps it was included so that, just in case we do not sell our electricity assets, the Government need not enact this legislation. We think this is so good that we should have it whether we privatise or publicly own our electricity assets.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No. We are convinced by the arguments of the Government. If my initial reading of the Bill is such that the Government wants some flexibility as to when it enacts this Bill, we will oppose that provision, because we want this body up and running as quickly as possible, well resourced by this Government. Despite the cynics in my Party, we thought this just might have been a sop to the Australian Democrats. I never believed that. I thought this was a pure piece of genius by the Premier. Let us have it—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The discussion between the member for Giles and the member for Stuart will cease.

Mr FOLEY: You would think a former Speaker of this Parliament who used to lecture us year after year about behaviour would show a little bit of class. The member for Stuart, please!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the member for Hart wish to refer to the Bill?

Mr FOLEY: I will, Sir. Had that been my behaviour, I would have been out on the pavement by now, many times over I might add. At the end of the day, in supporting the legislation, we want it enacted as soon as possible. It is a stroke of genius, and we are happy to assist the Premier.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): When I looked at this Bill, I thought that was something that a sensible Government should do. It is a new bit of bureaucracy that will look at energy promotion. It is a good thing, does no harm, and it might actually help somewhat. If ETSA were to stay in public hands and do the sorts of things it is doing now, it would be a fine thing. It would be an adjunct to the operations of ETSA and its role in energy conservation. The point is that, because ETSA is to be privatised by this Government, this is a substitution for the activities of ETSA, activities that hitherto were conducted by ETSA to reduce greenhouse gas, conserve energy, and so on. So, this is a replacement of what is currently happening in the public sector: a replacement with a small bureaucracy, I dare say with a very small budget which has limited scope and a minimal kind of effect, and I would say it would be a fairly marginalised piece of bureaucracy.

Obviously, it cannot control the power grid or the massive infrastructure that is applied in this State to produce or distribute electricity. It will be something on the margin. It will look nice and, as the member for Hart said, it will be a sweetener for the Democrats. I understand it is very similar to a piece of legislation the Democrats at one stage wanted to have introduced themselves. It is a nice little piece of bureaucracy.

Just to demonstrate that point, earlier today I had a look at the most recent ETSA Annual Report to see what ETSA itself had to say about its own role in terms of conservation and energy sustainability. On pages 27-29 of the 1997 Annual Report of ETSA, there are a number of references to ETSA's environmental credentials. I will not read all of it, but on page 28 in particular the ETSA Corporation spells out its environment policy. I will ask the Premier, when we go through the Bill in detail, whether the privatised producers of electricity will have these goals in their policy. Can we be guaranteed of this? If they do not, it means this little bit of bureaucracy created by the Bill will be fairly meaningless. For example, the ETSA Corporation environment policy provides:

ETSA Corporation will:

Produce, distribute and promote the use of electricity and other products in manners consistent with the principles of a sustainable development and integrating environment and economic considerations.

So, straight up the front, as well as making electricity and trying to return a dividend to the State, ETSA has a responsibility to the environment. Will all the corporations that take over the production, distribution and retailing of electricity in this State have similar goals in their annual reports? Secondly, the policy provides that ETSA will:

Comply with legislative requirements, licence conditions and agreements, and cooperate with relevant authorities for the development of practical guidelines based on the principles of sustainable development.

If there are legislative requirements, any corporation will have to do that. Thirdly, ETSA Corporation will:

Integrate environmental management systems with its existing business systems.

In other words, as well as trying to make a profit, it will be looking after the environment, so it has twin goals: it has a social goal as well as an economic goal. Will the private corporations which are to take over the role of ETSA have those goals in their policy documents? Fourthly, ETSA Corporation will:

Establish, measure and analyse standards of environmental performance.

I ask the same question: will that apply to the private companies? Fifthly, ETSA Corporation will:

Recognise the biodiversity of areas under its operational control and avoid unnecessary disturbance to cultural and natural sites of significance.

That is a very important goal for the corporation, because at the moment a piece of legislation has been introduced by the Minister for the Environment relating to the bookmark biosphere and only recently there was talk of putting a power grid through that environment affecting that very valuable biosphere. Will the privatised corporations have that goal? Will they have to look after the biosphere? Will they have to take account of the natural and cultural importance of sites? Sixthly, ETSA Corporation will:

Respond openly and constructively to the reasonable expectations of the community on environmental matters.

I ask the same question: will privatised corporations respond openly? Do privatised corporations ever respond openly? The seventh point is that the ETSA Corporation will:

Promote an attitude of care and responsibility and a sense of stewardship for the environment by employees.

I guess any corporation, whether it is private or public, can say that, but at least in the case of ETSA—when we know that the Government of the day can control the board of the corporation—we have some sort of hope that it will be able to deliver on that commitment. If it is a privatised company, it can have the fine words but what authority, what power, will there be to ensure that it delivers on them? The eighth point is that the ETSA Corporation will:

Promote research into environmental issues that results in a sound basis for improving environmental performance and planning for the future.

It is fine for a public entity such as ETSA to put its resources into looking at ways of improving the environment: it may not make a profit but it is socially and environmentally good. Why would a privatised corporation, which has its sole duty to its shareholders, take into account those considerations? Finally, the ETSA Corporation will:

Inform agents, advisers, contractors and consultants of this environmental policy—

in other words, it will promote it. I can imagine that, if a private company did have any environmental policy, it would be keen to promote it. The basic point is that as a public entity ETSA has not only a responsibility to the consumers of electricity but it has a broader responsibility to the society, to South Australia in general, to look after the environment. It has a responsibility to lower greenhouse gas and to look after our environment. In particular, on page 27 of the annual report, under the heading 'The year in review', the ETSA Corporation proudly talks about a number of its initiatives, with some of which the Premier has associated himself. For example, it says:

During the year a feasibility study into the construction of a . . . wind farm at Cape Jervis was initiated. Detailed wind monitoring is now in progress. The results will determine whether an economically viable wind farm can be developed from which 'green energy' might be sold into the national electricity market.

What guarantee is there under a privatised system that any of the individual components of the electricity grid would be able to put resources into that? Will they be big enough to be able to take on those big infrastructure projects? In addition, under the heading 'Energy efficiency', the annual report talks about the monitoring of domestic energy usage and appliance efficiency in relation to New Haven and Unley where a couple of housing developments have occurred. The report states:

The information obtained will help identify the most energy efficient domestic electrical technology options.

Why would a privatised company in competition with other corporations, where its role is to maximise the use of electricity so that it can maximise its profit, be looking at technologies that would reduce the amount of electricity used? That simply does not make sense. A public corporation such as ETSA can have that goal, because its job is not to maximise profit but to look after the resources of the State and the public good. In addition, the annual report states:

A prototype 'energy roof', incorporating solar water heater, photovoltaic panels, insulation and skylight has been installed on a new home at New Haven and will be monitored over the next 12 months. It is anticipated the roof will produce a significant amount of the energy required by the occupants while reducing the cost of its renewable energy components.

In other words, ETSA is looking at ways in which to reduce the use of energy and electricity. In relation to the matter I raised previously with which the Premier was associated, ETSA proudly talks about the Wilpena Tourist Centre in the Flinders Ranges where a solar system was introduced to

reduce greenhouse gas emissions by up to 250 tonnes a year over conventional grid connected power supply. There is a range of ways in which ETSA in the past and up until now has been involved in looking after the environment. That is why up until now we have not needed a Bill to introduce sustainable energy.

The reason why we have this Bill in front of us now is that we know that, after ETSA has been broken up into bits and sold off, no-one will be interested in looking after the environment. None of the corporations involved in the electricity grid will be interested in looking after the environment. So as a sop to the Democrats, as the member for Hart says, we have a piece of legislation before us which is a mickey mouse attempt to do what ETSA has done. How can a small bit of bureaucracy subject to minuscule Government funding possibly do what a large corporation like ETSA can do with the billions of dollars of assets at its disposal? How could it possibly compete with the job that ETSA is doing now? I am not saying that ETSA has done as well as it could have done, but at least it is going in the right direction. It has the resources to do it and, if it had strong commitment from Government and its board, it could do some fantastic things in this area.

The Bill before us sets up a small bureaucracy which will have absolutely minimal impact on the use of electricity and power. It will look good. It will look good in all the publications, and all the corporations that have been privatised can refer to it and say, 'That's not our responsibility: it's the responsibility of the Sustainable Energy Authority.' If there was any doubt in this regard, I refer members to a reply to question No. 67, which I put on notice to the Minister for Environment and Heritage, as follows:

How will the Government ensure that a privatised ETSA continues research into renewable energy through projects such as the wind farm at Cape Jervis, the Wilpena solar installation and the New Haven energy roof?—

the projects about which I have just talked. The Minister for the Environment replied—and I think this is very telling because she understands what a privatised ETSA would mean:

It is anticipated that market mechanisms will continue to drive such projects particularly in view of the Prime Minister's commitment of 20 November 1997 'to work with the States and Territories to source an additional 2 per cent of their electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010.'

In other words, the Minister is saying that there is absolutely no mechanism to ensure that a privatised ETSA will continue those goals. That is why the Government has come forward with this Bill. We do not oppose it. It is obviously better than nothing and, if it is introduced in conjunction with ETSA, it may well do some good but, without ETSA having those commitments and without the privatised bodies which take over the role of ETSA having those commitments, it will have very little impact indeed.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I commend the Government and the Premier for this Bill, which is an innovative measure. I was disappointed with the contribution by the member for Kaurana, because he sounded a little too negative, while this Bill is something that is very positive. As with many initiatives, it is not perfect, but it goes a long way towards helping us use energy much more efficiently and, as we know, energy is a critical part of the total environmental equation. Members might like to think of the origin of the words 'ecology' and 'economics': they both come from the same Greek word 'oikos' meaning housekeeping. In a real

sense what this Bill does is try to bring the two together to get greater efficiency and improved economics, if you like, but also bringing about improvement for the environment. What we are trying to do through this measure is ensure that what is good economics is also good ecology and *vice versa*.

Therefore, I commend this Bill. We know it is not easy to promote sustainable energy. If members look at the use of solar power, questions such as the aesthetics of panels arise, but nevertheless we need to keep moving down that path. Whilst members might argue that energy is readily available in an absolute sense, in a relative sense it is a scarce commodity—the same with useable water. In a country which is in many ways wasteful of energy because we have had it literally given to us on a plate, we need to start changing our ways, and in so doing we can increase economic growth. We can have more from less by being more efficient, and that is what this measure will help achieve. New South Wales has a sustainable energy authority and it has achieved magnificent savings in many areas by encouraging the private sector as well as public organisations to be more efficient in the use of power. I think even within Parliament we could follow some of the initiatives that have been undertaken in that State. So, this is a good measure.

Although it is not central to this measure and whilst it has not been canvassed much in recent times, I believe that in perhaps 20 or 25 years, or maybe a bit longer, Australia will embrace the use of nuclear energy. There is an unnecessary fear about it, since we live with many things that are potentially dangerous: it is how you handle and use them. Similarly, we should be looking to be part of the uranium enrichment industry. I know that this Bill is not specifically related to that issue. Nevertheless, we have our heads in the sand if we are not prepared in probably 20 years to envisage going down the nuclear path as part of our energy source.

I commend the measures that this Bill will promote: greater efficiency of energy and the development of alternative energy sources. But, as I indicated earlier, it is not easy to come up with all the answers, other than using some of the traditional methods of energy generation we currently have. The Government is to be commended. The Opposition should not see this as some sort of cynical means of attracting political support: it is a measure whose day has come. As I indicated at the outset, the Premier should be commended for implementing it.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I commend the Government. I support the measure and I commend the Premier. I think that it is a great move forward for us in South Australia at long last to have put into legislation, something relevant to sustainable energy. Members may not know, but I am a foundation member of the Australian Solar Energy Society, going back to the days before I became a member of Parliament, in much the same way as I am on about good civic manners by having become a foundation member of the Civic Trust some 30-odd years ago. This measure does what I suggested needed to be done in 1984: it provides the means by which it will be possible to at least test some of the alternative technologies that are available to us. Whether efficient or otherwise by comparison with burning fossil fuels, nonetheless, they are available to us as a source of electricity.

They are listed for the benefit of members under the definition of 'ecologically sustainable energy'; that is, energy derived from non-depletable sources such as the sun, wind, geothermal sources, biomass, tidal and wave motion, ocean

thermal gradients and hydro-electric sources. Of course, none of those is non-depletable: they all depend on the biggest nuclear reactor available to us—the sun. There is no question about the fact that the power that comes to us on this planet and all the energy that is stored as fossil fuel was originally nuclear energy that radiated from that huge nuclear reactor at the centre of the solar system, the sun. We are shielded from the detrimental consequences of that radiation by the ozone layer at the outer edge of our atmosphere. Nonetheless, it is a thermonuclear reactor and not controlled in any way other than by its own physics.

The geothermal sources available in South Australia are much greater than they are in many other places on earth. Indeed, we have hot rocks caused by the close proximity to the surface of radioactive material in the earth's crust in the whole of the Cooper Basin. There is no reason at all why the spent gas wells in the Cooper Basin could not have artesian water pressurised at greater pressure than is available at the surface—because it is artesian—back down some of the holes that are already there, into an area in the hot rocks that have been simply shattered by explosion, and then back up again as superheated steam. In any location even if the water is pumped down, heated up and brought out as liquid, it does not matter: so long as there is still an energy gain and we can use that heat energy to generate electricity, we win. It is a source of power, and it does not generate greenhouse gas emissions. I think that that is what was meant when we went for this definition of 'ecologically sustainable energy'.

I happen to agree with the member for Fisher's view that included in that definition should be nuclear energy, because that is ecologically sustainable. There is no reason for us to fear the use of uranium. Such fear is as rational as the fear that existed in the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe at the time that steam trains were first mooted something like 200 years ago, when it was said that they would frighten the hens off the lay, curdle the milk in cows' udders or send them off dry because of the fear that it would strike into the hearts of those animals; that it would disturb the natural pollination processes and destroy crops, and so on. A great deal was said about the damage that could be done by allowing these huffing, puffing monsters to tear across the landscape. It would displace people from work. Of course, they were the people who shod the horses, who drove the horses and looked after the drays, and so on. The way in which it would reduce the number of people required to shift a ton of freight from one point in the countryside to another would be terrible.

These are the same sorts of things we have heard said about a good many advances that have been made in the technology of industrialised society. But if we had not made those advances, there would not have been an improvement each day in the efficiency with which we get the tasks done that have enabled us to set aside childhood and adolescence for the purposes of education and training of the next generation. If we had not done that, we would not be the civilised society that we have become. It would not have been possible for us to develop those things that we probably all take for granted but which, when this very Chamber was established, did not exist or had only just been invented, such as the electric light, the telephone or, more particularly, flight. When this Chamber was first occupied for the purpose of making law, human beings could not fly. That is less than 100 years ago. I say to members opposite—

An honourable member: And Port Power still can't win!

Mr LEWIS: You have that coming on Sunday; but that is an aside. Let me get back to the seriousness of this. It is part of the technological advance.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I am not crowing about anything: I am just telling members the scientific truth in terms that I hope is possible for all members and others to understand. The geothermal sources that I have spoken about in the State's north need development, and they are really not much different from the geothermal energy that is generated by nuclear power plants. In any case, all the technologies that are available ought to be examined, considered and tested. One of the things that is not thought of by most is the kind of solar energy that we could be getting, because we have not done any research into it since the initial thesis was written by a PhD student about five years ago.

We have photovoltaic silicon cells, and now we have amorphous silicon cells that are much cheaper although less efficient because you cannot direct the sunshine into them as neatly and cleanly as you can on the older but more precise silicon photovoltaic cells. It does not mean that they are therefore more or less cost efficient. As time goes by, further advances will make amorphous silica more competitive. Even so, changing the way in which the sunlight is directed into the panels will improve efficiency from what it was just 10 years ago. But in considering that kind of photovoltaic process for the generation of electricity, which occurs right there in the photovoltaic cell, there is another source in sunlight energy, that is, to use the nitrogen/hydrogen/ammonium cycle in pressurised vessels at three atmospheres and seven atmospheres respectively.

It is a closed system, and the energy comes from the sun in lineal parabolic mirrors that are pitched at the sun from the morning, elongated in the parabola so that they will get the focus of the sun's rays into the central tube that runs along the front of that parabolic mirror. It converts the nitrogen and hydrogen to ammonia and back again. That is how the energy is derived from the process.

It ought to be set up in selected locations in our climate where there are extended periods throughout the year, and even during winter when we have low cloud cover near at hand. Large areas of land that is otherwise fairly useless with no vegetation on it, such as salt pans or other soils that are adversely affected and do not produce much vegetation, could be used to place these mirrors on great farms to collect the solar energy in the fashion in which I have just described and turn it into electricity, such as Australia Plains. I understand from that thesis that on a sufficiently large enough scale, using just that technology as it stands now, it would be a fraction of the cost of photovoltaic solar energy production, which brings it then into market contention with the main organic sources of fossil fuels and the like.

Before I go any further I want to acknowledge how much I appreciate the work that has been done in the development of appliance efficiencies and the awareness of the general range of alternative technologies available, both in her professional life and in her private life, by Monica Oliphant. This House, this Parliament and this State ought to acknowledge the work done by Monica Oliphant over more than two decades. She has been there and doing it as part of good science and not snake oil. She has counselled people who have come up with some really weird ideas at times of what is real and/or possible as opposed to what is simply dream-land.

I want members to recognise that, in attempting to use alternative sources of energy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we need to remember that we can also reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the amount of energy that we use, not just producing it from alternative sources. Ms Oliphant has looked at more efficient appliances, as well as encouraged people to focus upon better home designs. It has now become the good sense of what architects take into consideration in their ultimate design of the envelope of a dwelling or building for office purposes or for a factory.

Those of us who went with the Chairman of the Environment and Natural Resources Committee and myself as Chairman of the Public Works Committee to the national conference last week visited the Sydney Olympic Village and saw how architectural design is improving the efficiency of the use of energy and cutting the use of energy in each of those homes quite substantially compared with the current use of energy in conventional homes with an equivalent floor space. Incorporated into the roofs of those homes are a large number of photovoltaic panels which, during the course of the day, will generate electricity and sell it on credit into the grid through the meter, where it will be used elsewhere in the grid by factories or offices that may need the power in other locations during the day. When residents return home at night they will be able to buy back through the same meter in the opposite direction, the power they need for their cooking and whatever else it is they use for cooling, food preparation, ironing their clothes or heating their water, although that is provided for with solar gas at this stage.

I could discuss the other things mentioned in the definition at some length, but I will not detain the House in so doing. I refer to the remarks made by the member for Fisher about the desirability of taking a more rational view and stripping away the emotive nonsense relating to the use of nuclear energy. If I said to all members present, 'I will give you the means by which it is possible for you to travel in one hour more than 100 kilometres from here at an expense which will be only a fraction of the value of your day's work, so long as you agree to allow me, every year that I do that (if I am to be seen in this context as something of a demagogue) to take at my own random selection 300 lives every year', would they accept that as a deal? Is that an offer that members would accept, because all of us have accepted it? That is the road toll every year, and none of us denies the fact that statistically it will go on: for every million drivers there will be 300 deaths every year, and none of us knows whether it will be one of us next—tonight, next week, maybe not until next year, but it could happen at any time: some fool could take us out.

I am saying that the risk of death from the use of nuclear energy is far less than the risk of death from using motor vehicles, yet society embraces the use of motor vehicles and says it is good. Society may yet have to embrace the use of nuclear energy if greenhouse gas proves to be a problem; where warming of the earth's surface begins to dramatically change the climate. We do not know whether it is happening yet—the jury is still out on that, if one is capable of a valid statistical analysis of the variations there have been in temperature, rainfall and other things like that around the globe. Do not tell me now that the loss of the ozone layer is a problem and a phenomenon that did not occur before, because it has occurred before—just over 100 years ago at the time Krakatoa blew its top. There is clear evidence that the ozone layer was reduced to much less than it is now. What

that means is that at any time volcanic eruptions can wipe out or almost wipe out the ozone layer, but it regenerates.

We seem to accept that it is okay if the ozone layer is depleted by natural phenomena but that if something else takes it away it is not. I am not saying that we ought to allow the use and release of those compounds that destroy the ozone layer in a continuing way when we know it is a danger, but I am saying that the concern we have may be misplaced and that it ought not be directed so much at people who are the entrepreneurs of industry but at each of us. In the morning when we rise to take our shower we need to remember that we are burning fossil fuels that have been set down in time in an ambience that is entirely different from now.

Mr Venning: Solar heating.

Mr LEWIS: Even though honourable members near and far cry out 'solar heating', I tell them that it does not provide all the heat you need to ensure that you have the hot water you need every morning. It is not economical to put in solar panels of such large scale as would do that. It is wiser and more economical to get the bulk of the hot water needed from there and on the days when you cannot be sure of it have the back-up system to bring it up to temperature in the volume you require.

The House should understand the lie that we are teaching our children whereby if we leave, untouched, all the old growth rain forest—whether cool, temperate, tropical or anything in between—it will solve the greenhouse problem. That is crap because every square metre, every hectare, every kilometre of rain forest, one day, year or century to the next, is absolutely neutral in consequence on the numbers of grams or tonnes of carbon in the atmosphere. For every leaf that grows, every twig that is produced by a tree, every branch, every root, every trunk—eventually it falls over, rots and goes back to the atmosphere as carbon dioxide, whether it is respiration in the rotting process caused by fungus, bacteria, insects or any other life form. It eventually returns to the atmosphere, and in every unit area of rain forest the amount of carbon fixed every day by the chloroplasts in the leaves of the trees and other plants that are there is exactly equal to the amount of carbon that goes back. There is no difference. They are entirely carbon neutral.

If we teach our children to plant more trees to soak up the carbon dioxide that comes from our motor cars, then we are lying to them. It is not so. I am saddened that teachers at the present time are teaching that kind of piffle in schools, because it is not a solution. There might be aesthetic reasons for planting trees (I believe there are), but there is no good reason in any other respect as far as managing greenhouse gas is concerned. I leave that bit of information with the House. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table which shows greenhouse gas emissions of Australia, Canada, China and other countries in tonnes per capita each year. I point out that China is not part of the protocol to limit those emissions and, if members look at it, they will see that, as China's economy improves, it will swamp the world in atmospheric carbon terms if nothing is done about it. China shows no inclination to be part of the treaty. We could shut down Australia tomorrow and it would not make any difference.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr LEWIS: Do I have leave to incorporate this table?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it purely statistical?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Total Atmospheric Carbon Emissions from the Consumption of Fossil Fuels (Millions of Metric Tonnes)
 Taken from: A Compendium of Data on Global Change
 Published by: Carbon Dioxide Information and Analysis Centre,
 Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee USA

Country	1990	1994	Per-centage Change	Population estimates in millions	Tonnes of atmospheric Carbon per Capita
Australia	69.1	75.9	+9.8	17.9	4.2
Canada	111.4	121.7	+9.2	29.1	4.2
China	638.3	828.4	+29.8	1192.3	0.7
France	96.6	88.2	-8.7	56.0	1.6
Germany	268.2	220.3	-17.9	82.0	2.7
India	185.8	236.4	+27.2	913.7	0.3
Japan	288.1	303.3	+5.3	125.0	2.4
United States	1 293.2	1 387.3	+7.3	261.0	5.3

Population Data, taken from: 1995 Britannica Book of the Year, Events of 1994

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I will not use all of my time.

An honourable member: You always say that.

Mr CLARKE: I know that I always say that, but I will not use all of my time, because the member for Kaurna has summed up this debate fairly well. This is another example of the Government establishing a small piece of bureaucracy to serve no good purpose in reality, with no real work to do other than try to placate the Australian Democrats with respect to the sale of ETSA and Optima Energy. The reality is that all the things that are set out in the objects of the Bill with respect to sustainable energy can be done and ought to be done now through the Government with respect to ETSA and Optima Energy in public ownership. Indeed, that is being done to the degree that has been outlined by the member for Kaurna in the annual report of ETSA, but more can be done.

ETSA and Optima Energy in private hands have an absolute incentive to create greater use of consumption of our resources simply because it means greater profits. Greater profit means bigger return for private shareholders. I am not saying anything startling or new; that is just a fact of life. It is something that any director of any private company is required to observe by law. What makes it even more laughable is that, when you look at the Bill itself, and what it is supposed to do—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE:—we can see that this Government cannot even operate effectively the Environment Protection Authority that was established through the legislation of the former Labor Government under the Environment Protection Act 1993. The EPA is seriously under-resourced and has always been under-resourced. It does not carry out its functions as well as it should or meet its charter, because the Government of the day has not provided it with the necessary resources to do so. I do not believe that the EPA has more than two inspectors under the Clean Air Act to cover the entire State and both public and private sector employers.

It is an absolute furphy to suggest that this Bill will promote in any meaningful way the saving of renewable energy resources or will do things which could not already be done through the existing authorities with existing resources. It is simply window-dressing for the sale of ETSA and Optima Energy. It will provide a job for a CEO, but I do not know what that person will do, because we do not know at this stage what resources or budgetary allocation there will be. Will there be a board of directors, all pulling reasonable

attendance fees or annual fees? It is another way of putting former Liberal politicians onto boards at Government expense and to pretend to do something for the benefit of the State. This Government's environmental record is a very poor one.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will resume their seats.

Mr CLARKE: They do not distract me, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: They distract the Chair.

Mr CLARKE: The environmental record of this Government is a very poor one in terms of the resources that were allocated to your former department, Sir. Despite the fact that as Minister for the Environment you were very well meaning and very honest, the reality is that your hard-nosed colleagues in Cabinet rolled you repeatedly when it came to fundamental issues concerning the environment and the resources that the department and, in particular, the EPA needed to carry out its function effectively. Yet the Premier has introduced a Bill and has tried to be pious about how this will help the environment of South Australia and, in a much smaller way, the global impact resulting from greenhouse gas emissions.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The Minister for Local Government should be very careful about chipping in and interjecting at this stage after his thrashing last night on the City of Adelaide Bill. The Minister concerned had two monumental victories last night on that major piece of Government legislation, that is, the retention of the two-term limit for the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and keeping Barton Road closed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about the Local Government Act in this piece of legislation.

Mr CLARKE: I was diverted by the interjection of the Minister for Local Government. That was his sole victory on that legislation, so he should keep quiet. In any event, whilst the Bill does no violence as far as the environment is concerned, in one sense if one wants to use it as a warm comfort blanket, if it passes into law, it might allow some people to sleep easier at night, and it will no doubt please an unemployed CEO who will find a job as Chief Executive of this toothless tiger. It might also please those people who will be appointed to the board and draw some form of remuneration from it.

In terms of what it will be able to achieve, it is no more and no less than what the existing public authorities can already do in this area. It depends on the resources and the political will of the Government of the day to increase its concerns and awareness of environmental issues. Whilst it is nice window-dressing, it is of little meaningful effect.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I support the Bill. It is a good piece of legislation and an important part of the total electricity legislation package. I congratulate the Premier and the Government on a good Bill. It is not perfect and it probably could go further, but it heads in the right direction and it gives the right messages. I am sure that, if the economy was stronger, we would have a stronger commitment here.

Much has been done already, especially in the development of energy efficient housing right across Australia. The former MFP did a lot of work in relation to energy efficient housing, and it built models in the western suburbs, which the member for Hart would know about because they are in his electorate. The New South Wales Sustainable Energy Society was mentioned by the member for Fisher, and it is also doing a fine job.

Last week I travelled to Sydney as the Presiding Member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee to attend the national ERD conference. The committee was very lucky and privileged to be shown the Olympic Village, which has marvellous examples of energy efficient housing. All houses are fitted with not only solar cells for the hot water service but also photovoltaic cells to generate electricity so that, during the day, power is generated and stored on the grid. Credits are earned so that, in the evening, power can be drawn back. It is very efficient. These energy efficient houses have been very well done and, during the Olympic Games, they will be a great advert for Australia. I think that a good job has been done and that we can learn a lot from the example.

I support, quietly, an investigation into a nuclear option. I have always been in favour of that. I mentioned that when I first became a member eight years ago. I was probably told to shut up, and so I have. I still believe that, in the long term, the nuclear option must be a consideration for Australia because we have fantastic supplies of very good quality uranium and we have a huge open space to locate this facility. South Australia is centrally located within Australia and the nuclear option is extremely efficient, acknowledging it is politically sensitive.

Today one can buy a system off the rack from, say, Westinghouse, America. They are extremely efficient but, by the time we had them fitted, we would have the very latest atomic nuclear technology, which is very efficient. Five years ago I was a guest of British Nuclear. I went to England and looked at the stations. People were building their homes right up against the fences of the stations. The newer stations are no threat. There will be no more Chernobyls. It cannot happen. The members for Fisher and Hammond both mentioned that option. It must be a consideration in the future, although I am loath to go out onto the pavement and make too much public noise about it. We need a public education program on this option.

The member for Hammond says that he has solar panels on the roof of his home. Seldom does the power have to be switched on for a hot shower. If it is an overcast day, the shower is warm rather than hot, but seldom in South Australia would we need to turn on the electricity. Even on an overcast day we have enough latent heat to warm the water. I do not agree entirely with the member for Hammond.

I also disagree with the member for Hammond with respect to tree planting. I happen to know that you can earn carbon credits by planting trees, and it is becoming very big business. In fact, I planted 60 trees last weekend on land on which I could not put my tractor. I thought, 'This will earn me carbon credits one day in the future.' Much more will be heard about carbon credits. The member for Hammond said that a tree takes only what it puts back. I do not agree. In fact, huge companies throughout the world are buying carbon credits. I think that the member for Hammond was wrong, but no doubt we will debate that in time to come. We are all getting greener by the minute, whether or not we realise it, and this Bill is living proof. I support the Bill.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Of course, the objects of the Bill are laudable. Everyone would agree that we should be more energy efficient, particularly when it comes to natural resources which, by their very nature, must diminish when they are used. However, there is one matter of particular concern which I think needs to be borne in mind when we debate this Bill, and I refer to nuclear developments and, in

particular, uranium mining in South Australia. I will not go into all the contentious history, but constituents in my electorate and those who are passionately committed to the environmental cause, I am sure, would agree with this Bill.

However, they have also brought to my attention serious concerns about the mining which is set to take place at both Beverley and Honeymoon, and I will quote from some information provided by the Anti-Nuclear Coalition. Obviously, a wide range of people from all walks of life and all parts of our economy and society would support that organisation. I first highlight a couple of non-contentious points in an article, which states:

Every official health organisation in the world, including Australia, states that there is no safe level of ionising radiation. The point is that radiation itself is not something about which to be afraid. Radiation is everywhere. Radiation comes from the sun, but ionising radiation is a danger. That is the starting point. Human beings, like a lot of other animals and plants, are not able to cope with ionising radiation. It destroys our human system. In particular, I want to address the issue of uranium that is proposed to be mined by acid on site leaching at Beverley, which is near Arkaroola in the Flinders Ranges. The information that has been provided to me states:

Acid ISL [in situ leaching] involves injecting sulphuric acid into the aquifer in order to leach out the uranium. The liquid is then pumped to the surface where the uranium is extracted. . . . Acid ISL mining trials carried out in 1982 at Honeymoon in SA were discontinued after the occurrence of blockages which affected the ability of the operators to control the movement of the leach solution. Obviously, when one talks about the leach solution, one talks about a substance which is potentially very harmful to the flora and fauna of the area. Further, this document provided by the Anti-Nuclear Coalition states:

These wastes contain radioactive uranium, thorium and radium. They also contain toxic substances such as selenium and molybdenum. A full analysis of the waste has not been given, but it is likely to contain arsenic, aluminium, titanium, zinc, chromium, vanadium and copper.

The point again is that we are dealing with very dangerous substances, and I do bear in mind that certain safeguards are in place with the trials that are currently taking place. If full-scale mining proceeds, I am sure that some safeguards will be put in place, but the question is whether they will be enough? I do not want to refer only to documentation from a group that has a clearly defined stance against uranium mining: I also refer to the summary document of the environmental impact statement in relation to the Beverley uranium mine. Although that document gives some reassurances, a number of concerns are also spelt out. If we are talking about sustainable energy development and promoting a variety of energy sources for our economy and our population, these things must be borne in mind. That document at page 10 states:

Some gamma-emitting radioactive material will be brought to the surface in solution and may accumulate, in filtration solids, in solids in ponds, and as deposits in pipes and equipment. As well, drummed yellowcake will be a gamma source.

The purpose there is to identify the most dangerous aspects of the procedure. Again, the point I wish to highlight is whether or not the proposed safeguards and those currently in place are sufficient to reduce the risk of harm to flora and fauna and human life to zero. That is the question. The EIS (page 11) states:

The main exposure pathway by which members of the public might receive an increment of radiation dose from the mine site is through inhalation of radon daughters dispersed in air.

To paraphrase that, the fact is that in some areas of the Outback there are very small areas of uranium solutions or

compounds which occur naturally but the point is that, where there are ponds full of leach solution, inevitably there will be some of the odours from that pond in the air, and one would hope that they do not form in such concentrations as to cause harm to the humans who might visit the area. And bear in mind that we are talking about a place not far from a very popular tourist destination, Arkaroola. There is also the possibility of animals quite naturally looking to ponds or water holes of any type to drink from, and very special care will have to be taken if these ponds are accessible to animals that might want to drink from them.

One other issue, which is referred to in the EIS document, involves Aboriginal heritage. I note that the EIS summary reports that the Beverley mine site is covered by four native title claims. It is not subject of any determinations and, of course, we are a long way from judicial determination in relation to native title claims in South Australia. I note that agreements have been reached with three of the groups but there is one group which, according to this document, currently is not the subject of an agreement. I believe that, if we are going to be developing the Beverley mine, for example—and there are many other examples in South Australia—the responsible Minister should be able to advise us of the concerns which are sincerely put by Aboriginal people in the area. One further quote to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is on page 16 of the EIS document, as follows:

There are some areas within the retention leases that are considered as environmentally sensitive for reasons such as unusual vegetation, good faunal habitat, gibber-gilgai landforms posing erosion hazards or because they are flood-prone areas.

Of course, the EIS document therefore calls for care and sensitivity in dealing with the area but, if that is one source of energy for our society and our economy in the future, I would like to hear from the Minister as to what safeguards are, in fact, being put in place to take care of all those different concerns.

Of course, the Bill is broader than one involving only uranium mining and development but I believe that, whenever we are talking about energy sources for our society and for our economy, we need to bear in mind that we do have uranium mining in South Australia, that there must be constant scrutiny of the safeguards that are put in place and that a constant questioning must occur of whether those safeguards are sufficient to reduce risk to human life, animal life and plant life to zero, because if that assurance cannot be given we have to question whether that mining should be taking place.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I thank members for their contribution to the second reading debate. I also thank those who have endorsed and supported the Government's measure, and I thank members for, in the main, the bipartisan support they have indicated. However, there are two matters that I need to take up. The member for Kurna is quite wrong. His contribution today was based on a false understanding and premise, and I ask him to look at the package of Bills before the House.

I refer the honourable member to the licence conditions, clause 24(2)(h)(i) of the Electricity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 1998. There is a requirement on these private sector companies to contribute to and report on the implementation of a greenhouse reduction strategy and sustainable energy resource strategy. So, clearly, the whole basis for the member for Kurna's contribution is wrong and, had he had a cursory

glance at the other pieces of legislation, he would have understood that he was, in fact, wrong. However, having said that, I am sure that the honourable member at least supports the thrust of the measure.

In addition, the member for Hart has put forward an amendment: 'clause 2—Page 1, line 14—Leave out subsection (2)'. The Government will not support this amendment, for a couple of reasons. First, we would want to ensure that this legislation came into force within a period of two years of its passing. The reason for that relates to the establishment of the authority, putting in place the business plan and the employment of people, etc. Secondly, and importantly, this involves an annual cost of—and I am not quite sure of the amount—\$4 million to \$6 million. These matters are predicated on the sale of our power utility. It is all very well for members of the Opposition to say that they will have this component and that component, that they will spend money here and there but will not support you in the major policy thrust to free up money to enable you to do so.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, because under the ACCC and the NCC—we have discussed this during debate on the other two items—they are required structures, whether they involve public or private ownership. Suffice to say that I welcome the member for Hart's contribution, and for a piece of legislation that had, as I understood it, almost the unanimous support of the House it has taken us a while to get to the point where we can now move into Committee. However, I thank members for their support, in the main, of this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2

Mr FOLEY: I was somewhat taken aback when the Premier indicated to the House that the cost of the South Australian Sustainable Energy Authority will, indeed, be \$4 million to \$6 million per year. I would like to know what will be the site of this authority and what will be the approximate staffing level. At \$4 million to \$6 million, given numbers quoted earlier tonight, this could be three or four times the size of the Industry Regulator.

The CHAIRMAN: I wonder whether the member for Hart might like to move his amendment first, and then general questions can be asked in relation to the clause after that.

Mr FOLEY: I move:

Page 1, line 14—Leave out subsection (2).

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Government opposes this amendment, for the reasons that I outlined in closing the second reading debate.

Mr FOLEY: This is a very important amendment because, as we said tonight, when members of the Opposition read this Bill, we were somewhat taken aback by the logic of the measure and the importance of this body, although I must say that that was prior to knowing that the recurrent cost could be as much as \$4 million to \$6 million, but it is a bit late now. We thought this idea of such an authority was a very good idea.

We have heard the Premier tonight say, 'It's a good idea but we don't want to it to be in operation for at least two years; therefore, we'll delete from the legislation the Acts Interpretation Act's requirement that if the body had not been proclaimed within two years it would automatically be so.' We did smell a bit of a rat there; we thought there was

something amiss. Clearly this was initially a sop to the Democrats. The legislation was drawn up, the ideas were ready to roll, and it was there to announce in the Parliament that day. But the Democrats, after their 1 000 hours of research, beat the Premier by a day or two. However, it was too late: the Bill was printed, the second reading speech was written, and the Premier had to roll with it. He slipped in that clause, and has confirmed it tonight when he said that we will go ahead with it only if we privatise our assets.

We were convinced by the arguments in terms of the merits of the case, not in terms of whether or not we were to privatise, and I think the Premier does himself a disservice to put forward such a grand piece of vision as this body, but only to make it contingent upon the sale of ETSA. I was prepared to give him kudos for what I thought was some vision. Now he is letting me down by saying it is only contingent upon selling the assets.

We have debated for the past two days the establishment of a number of statutory authorities. The Industry Regulator, which will cost us a couple of million dollars a year to operate, will be in operation within a matter of months. There is no provision about two years or about saving one or two year's recurrent costs as we work our way through. I accepted in that instance that there would be requirements under the national electricity market and the NCC.

My recollection of the debate earlier about the establishment of the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council, which I might add the Opposition opposed on the voices, was that it was not a requirement stipulated by the National Competition Council: it was something that the Premier thought was a good idea. As a result of what we have already passed tonight, that body will be established very soon, I would suspect—perhaps by the end of the year. That body is not required to be in place to meet national competition guidelines, so the Premier's argument is defeated by his earlier legislation. Now to be simply saying he wants to keep this legislation in abeyance—wait and see what happens, save a couple of years of recurrent costs, and if we sell ETSA we will do it—is a nonsense.

You either want this body or you do not. We were prepared to back the Premier on what we thought was some degree of vision, the one ray of light, that we thought the Premier was showing out of this entire ETSA restructuring but, as I said, he is letting us down. He cannot now say that we will have this body but we will have it only on his terms. We either have the body or we do not. If we are going to have it, let us have it as soon as we can get it up and running.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart deliberately misinterprets my reply to the Committee. The proposal the Government has put to the Committee is that it shall be established—not if but shall be established. It is the operational date that we are talking about. If the Labor Party has its way, we will not be able to sell our assets upon which funds will be generated to reinvest. That is why, if the Labor Party has its way, we want this two year time line put in place. As to the question of it being put in place, that is not in doubt.

Mr FOLEY: I know that the Premier gets a bit narky with me when I tend to differ from his views, but there is no commencement date in this legislation. This measure will come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. The only device we have is under the Acts Interpretation Act, whereby if you have not proclaimed this Bill within two years it will automatically be deemed to have been proclaimed. The Premier wants to eliminate that. We all know of instances

where legislation has sat without being proclaimed. He is making this contingent upon the sale of ETSA.

Nowhere in the second reading explanation could I find any reference to this Bill or the establishment or operation of this body being contingent upon the sale of ETSA or Optima. The Premier's own argument is defeated by his own second reading explanation, which states:

The authority will at least initially be funded out of Consolidated Account but over time may, to some extent, become self-funding. I will believe that part when I see it. At the end of the day you have it coming out of Consolidated Account. There is no line there saying, 'However, we will proclaim this statutory authority only when or if we sell ETSA and Optima.' I ask the Premier to support our amendment and back his own judgment initially. It is a good initiative, a decent piece of reform, and let us have a nice end to much of the controversy over ETSA by all agreeing to the quick establishment of this very important body, the South Australian Sustainable Energy Authority. I can think of no logical, sustainable reason why we would not want such an important body up and running by as early as the end of the year.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (19)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Ciccarello, V.
Clarke, R. D.	Conlon, P. F.
De Laine, M. R.	Foley, K. O. (teller)
Geraghty, R. K.	Hanna, K.
Hill, J. D.	Key, S. W.
Rankine, J. M.	Rann, M. D.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M. G.	White, P. L.
Wright, M. J.	

NOES (23)

Armitage, M. H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Brown, D. C.
Buckby, M. R.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Gunn, G. M.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Matthew, W. A.	Maywald, K. A.
McEwen, R. J.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W. (teller)	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

PAIR(S)

Hurley, A. K.	Hall, J. L.
Koutsantonis, T.	Lewis, I. P.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr HILL: During his comments on my contribution to the second reading debate, the Premier directed me to a clause in the Electricity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill and, if I am correct, it was new section 24(2)(h) on page 16.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: Yes.

Mr HILL: The Premier made the point that, if I had bothered to read that, I would have realised that my contribution was totally invalidated. I have had an opportunity to read that section and, rather than invalidate my contribution, it strengthens my position. Paragraph (h) provides that the Industry Regulator must require the electricity entity to investigate strategies for achieving a reduction of greenhouse gas and so on. All the Regulator has to do is to cause the

electricity entity—and this is the retailing entity—to investigate strategies. There is no mandate or goals: all it has to do is to investigate strategies and then presumably it can ignore them. Paragraph (h) further provides:

such levels as may be binding on the entity from time to time, including strategies for promoting the efficient use of electricity and the sale, as far as is commercially and technically feasible.

Even if it decides that it wants to do it, its commerciality is a limiting factor. Do the objects of the legislation in any way allow the sustainable energy authority to bind and to cause the various electricity entities to do anything?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Once again a member opposite is very selective in his quoting. I refer the honourable member to subparagraph (ii), which is a requirement and which provides:

to prepare and publish annual reports on the implementation of such strategies.

I also refer the member for Kaurana to the other item of legislation, Industry Regulator, where the Regulator has licensing powers to fine and the capacity to direct, control and influence the performance of these companies.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Mr HILL: Clause 7(1)(e) provides:

to perform any other function assigned by or under this or any other Act.

Is there any power of compulsion? Is there any way that this energy authority can compel anything to happen or is it merely advisory and educative?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I refer the honourable member to clause 7(1) and the phrase 'The authority has the following functions'. That clearly is a basis for performance, promotion, use of sustainable energy technology and to provide information, education and training; and, also, to advise persons on matters relating to the development, commercialisation, promotion and use of sustainable energy technology and to accredit schemes for the generation of energy from sustainable sources.

Mr HILL: I make the point that while all these are admirable goals—and I am not disputing them—there are no teeth in this set of powers. The authority can do all those things but, at the end of day, if the various entities choose not to comply, that is it. Does the Premier believe that these powers include the capacity of the authority to set specific goals or targets for the various entities? For example, does it have the capacity to say that entity A should reduce greenhouse gasses by 10 per cent, 5 per cent, or whatever?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The legislation is modelled on the New South Wales Sustainable Energy Authority. It has a record of performance and capacity that we would like to see introduced into South Australia. It is a policy driven document, and we want to achieve policy outcomes that achieve the objectives designated in this Bill. As we have discussed in previous clauses on questions and points the honourable member has raised, the Industry Regulator has the capacity to influence a private sector company. I have highlighted the fact that I moved amendments increasing fines from \$100 000 to \$250 000; and for repeated offences, such as ignoring advice from the Regulator, the penalty is licence removal.

Mr HILL: In relation to the budget of \$4 million to \$6 million on which the Premier advised previously, will the Premier give a general outline of how that budget will be expended? For example, how much of it will go to the

bureaucracy and how much of it will go towards innovative programs and so on?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The majority of the funds would go into programs; the minority of the funds would be related to recurrent expenditure.

Mr CLARKE: By way of comparison, what are the resources of this body compared to those of the EPA? The Premier is talking about this having a budget of around \$4 million.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: With programs.

Mr CLARKE: What is the EPA's, by way of comparison?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I simply do not have that information available to me. I will arrange for it to be made available to the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 18) and title passed.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I move:
That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): It is important to acknowledge the disappointment of the Opposition that as this Bill comes out of Committee all we have done tonight in legislative terms is agree to have an authority that may never come into existence, simply because, as was highlighted during the Committee stage, the Government is not serious about this authority. It is clearly a little bit of window dressing that as I said earlier was an attempt to persuade the Australian Democrats in another place to support the Government's sale process. It is disappointing. Perhaps I will be proven wrong in years to come, but I suspect that we may never see the Sustainable Energy Authority come into existence under this Government.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The member for Hart calls into question the *bona fides* of the Government on this measure. That is totally inappropriate. We have put the measure before the House with the full expectation of the establishment of the authority, and it will be established. I pointed that out to the member for Hart when he moved his amendment. To suggest that this is no more than window dressing without the commitment of the Government is simply wrong.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.
Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 2 to 25:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 2 to 25 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 26 and 27:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 26 and 27 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 28 to 35:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 28 to 35 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 36:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 36 be agreed to.
Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 July. Page 1231.)

Mr CONLON (Elder): It is my intention to break a record for a second reading contribution here by keeping it under 30 seconds, including the preamble. We agree with the first half of the Bill and disagree with the second half concerning wasps. It is a further indication of the Minister's inability to deal with wasps, and that is all I will say on the matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to speak very briefly on this legislation and refer only to the area relating to European wasps. I am concerned particularly about this issue because I believe that if action is not taken in regard to this pest then we can wave goodbye to tourism, particularly in the Adelaide Hills. It is a very serious situation and one that all members need to consider. Members would be aware that I placed on notice a motion on this issue, which reads:

That this House commends the Government on its decision to maintain funding to assist in the control of European wasps and also its commitment to further research issues relating to their eradication—

That part of the motion is still in place. The Minister has indicated, however, that he does not support the second part of the motion, which states:

... and urges the Government not to support the imposition on property owners of a removal fee for wasp nests as this could discourage people from reporting the presence of wasps and would therefore be to the detriment of the program.

I feel very strongly that that should be the case. I have discussed this matter with the Minister, who has indicated that he recognises the need for incentives to be in place. He recognises the need for individuals to take responsibility on this issue, and I am prepared to support the Minister as far as that is concerned. I just want to indicate again to the House the problem that we have with European wasps in the Hills.

The latest statistics indicate that in the Mount Lofty and Manoah wards of the Adelaide Hills Council we have seen an incredible increase in the number of wasp nests that have been destroyed: 396 in 1991-92; 465 in 1995-96; 472 in 1996-97; and 857 in 1997-98 to March this year. In East Torrens, there has been an increase from 131 in 1996-97 to 152 in 1997-98; in Gumeracha, from 12 in 1996-97 to 114 in 1997-98; and in Onkaparinga, 150 in 1996-97 to 372 in 1997-98. That indicates quite clearly how serious the matter is.

I received a considerable amount of representation from constituents in my electorate and in other areas in the Hills outside my electorate. I have received representation from a number of organisations, particularly those representing wine grape growers and the Apple and Pear Growers Association of South Australia. I received correspondence only in June, as follows:

The Apple and Pear Growers Association of South Australia recently conducted a survey of apple and pear growers to obtain

current information on the problem of European wasps. The following is a breakdown of the results:

1. Of the 38 forms returned, 30 growers indicated European wasps were a problem during the 1998 harvest.
2. Of the 38 returns, 23 rated the problem as between five and 10.

There were no returns that suggested that it was not a problem of any kind. In 1994 there were three nests located on growers' properties and it went up to 19; in 1995, five properties and 32 nests; in 1996, 14 properties and 77 nests; in 1997, 21 properties and 103 nests; and, this year, 32 properties and 168 nests. The other information provided in this correspondence is very concerning.

I am aware that the Minister has taken this matter to the Local Government Association. I was interested in the latest *LGA News*, Issue No.4 of July, in which it is indicated that the State Executive Committee considered the matter of European wasps at a recent meeting and resolved not to support the introduction of the order making power, which is contained in this legislation. It is stated in the magazine:

The Minister and the LGA are seeking to establish a formal agreement between the State Government and the LGA regarding an ongoing joint program of funding, research and education/awareness raising within the community on the management and control of the European wasp, which may feature the use of an order making power. The LGA's Interim European Wasp Liaison Committee is actively assisting the State Executive with this matter. It is suggested that, if more information is sought, the contact person mentioned is available. I was also aware of a recent article in the *Advertiser* headed 'Wasp attack may hide new sting'. The article states:

New legislation giving councils the power to order landowners to remove European wasp nests may hinder the fight against the wasp, the Local Government Association claims.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This is claiming more. It continues:

With each removal costing about \$30, the legislation might discourage property owners from reporting nests, the LGA President, Mrs Rosemary Craddock, said yesterday. The legislation introduced to Parliament by the Local Government Minister, Mr Brindal, dictates that, if landowners fail to act within a certain time, council inspectors could enter their property to search for and remove wasps nests. They could then send the bill to the property owner. Mrs Craddock says: this legislation raises the potential for the State to walk away from the issue in the future.

I have made perfectly clear to this Minister that I will be watching this situation very closely indeed. I have no intention while I am in this place of allowing any future State Government to walk away from this issue.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister indicates that I have made that point very clear to him.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member for Ross Smith can rabbit on over there in the corner. The concern I have about this is the matter raised in the motion I brought before the House, namely, that it is essential that incentives be provided for individual people to want to remove nests from their properties. It would be totally wrong for there to be any disincentive or for any barrier to be placed in the way of people doing that. I am aware that many older residents find it difficult, have tried to remove the nests themselves and have got into all sorts of terrible trouble as a result.

I support the power in this Bill whereby the council can go onto a property if in the past the property owners have refused entry to the council, and that has been a problem. Some property owners have refused to allow the council to go onto their properties to investigate whether there are nests

and, if so, to remove them. I strongly support that measure in this legislation.

The Minister knows full well my concerns about this matter. I mentioned some time ago that it is a similar situation to the one we faced with millipedes. I can recall vividly saying in this place, when millipedes first appeared in the Hills, that nothing would happen about millipedes until they started falling off the bedroom ceilings of Ministers in marginal seats. That is exactly what happened, because very little was done until millipedes started falling off the ceilings in Mr Mayes' house. He was the member for Unley and, when he started having a problem with millipedes, some action was taken. That situation has been improved considerably.

We are expecting big things of this Minister. We expect that he will take action to ensure that all people recognise the responsibility we have and that the State does not walk away from what is a very serious situation. I am talking about the Hills because of the effect that European wasps are having on tourism and in other areas. I know it is a concern also for people in other parts of the metropolitan area. I support the legislation but I make the point that, if it seems that the State is appearing to walk away from this problem or if too much pressure is placed on individuals by way of costs for removing nests, I will have no alternative but to introduce a private member's Bill to amend this legislation.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I am under strict instructions from my colleagues, so I will be brief, but I want to comment on the two measures under this Bill. The shadow Minister indicated that the Labor Opposition will support the first measure and oppose the second. The Minister's second reading explanation stated that the reason for these two clauses was the necessity to amend the Local Government Act 'for practical purposes pending revision of the entire Act'.

The first measure comes about because the 30 September 1998 deadline that the Government set for the work of the Local Government Boundary Reform Board will not be met. It is required that the Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel be set up. I am pleased to note that the number of members on that board will be reduced, and the Minister said in his second reading explanation that the panel will have streamlined administration and restricted powers. I am continually frustrated about how long it takes to do things in this State.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: So am I. I agree with you.

Ms WHITE: I have an indication from the Minister that he is, too, and I make that comment because, although the Government has set a deadline, it has not been met. The second matter of substance in this Bill deals with European wasps. The member for Heysen has just spoken in explanation of the fact that his motion urges the Government not to proceed with this measure. So as not to misrepresent the member for Heysen, I will read from that motion. The honourable member urges:

... the Government not to support the imposition on property owners of a removal fee for wasp nests as this could discourage people from reporting the presence of wasps and would therefore be to the detriment of the program.

That is what the Opposition fears and it believes that the member for Heysen is correct.

The test will be whether the member for Heysen has the courage of his convictions and supports the Opposition in doing what he, in his motion, has indicated is his wish to do.

However, the honourable member essentially explained away his motion. He indicated that he will beat his chest a lot, he will talk to the Minister but he will not do what some weeks ago he urged this House to do, and that is disappointing. One of the concerns of the Opposition is that the cost that will be imposed on people will act as a disincentive.

I urge the member for Heysen to stand by his convictions and not dilute them to a watching brief on the Government. He should do what his motion indicates is his intention, and he should join with the Opposition in opposing the measure in the Bill.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I would like to speak briefly on the Bill, particularly in relation to the provisions dealing with European wasps. Earlier this year, in speaking to the motion moved by the member for Heysen, I made a number of points in relation to European wasps in the northern suburbs. Just as they are a problem in the Hills, they are an increasing problem in the northern suburbs. There are problems with the way the Bill stands at the moment, and I agree with the member for Heysen that we need to create incentives for people to do the right thing rather than disincentives. Charging householders for this service at this time would be a disincentive rather than an incentive to do something about the problem.

I recall that earlier in the year in our local Messenger Press publication the Minister likened the European wasp problem to the snakes and bees problem. That is erroneous. Indeed, it is a different kettle of fish, so to speak. It is quite a different matter altogether, and it would be silly for us not to take a concerted approach, with the Government playing a very strong role. That means that we have to put money into eradicating this pest straight away. We have to do that otherwise we will suffer much greater consequences in the future.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I, too, will be brief and I will deal with the wasps issue. I recently heard of an example of the cooperation that people can get from a council. The Port Adelaide Enfield council is usually very good, but two elderly pensioners who live in my electorate complained to the council about the wasps in their area. They were not sure exactly where they were located but they believed that they were in the near neighbourhood. The advice they received from the Port Adelaide Enfield council was that the council would destroy the nest if they found it. It is a bit hard for two 78 year old pensioners to go climbing through other people's backyards when they have no authority to do so to look for wasps.

The problem with the Bill, as has been adverted to by the member for Taylor and the member for Heysen, is that it essentially permits councils to pass on the cost of the eradication of those nests. We all know it will act as a disincentive for people to report wasps on their property if it means that they will have to meet the cost. It will have a mixed reaction and it will not be effective. I urge the Government to adopt the view that will be put forward by our shadow Minister.

Like the member for Taylor, I urge the member for Heysen to stick up for the proposal that he moved in a private member's motion. The member for Heysen might honestly believe that the Minister for Local Government has seriously taken on board what he has said, and I do not doubt that the Minister for Local Government is sincere when he says, 'Yes, I hear what you say. I will do the right thing.' However, as we saw with the City of Adelaide Bill, the Minister for Local Government cannot do two rounds of a revolving door with the North Adelaide Residents Society. So in terms of doing anything concrete about local government imposing fees on ordinary ratepayers so that it will not act as a disincentive, I have no faith that the Minister will be able to do it.

As the member for Heysen knows only too well, if he proposes the introduction of a private member's Bill because he is so outraged by his Minister's action and because the legislation does not work as he believes it should, it will not see the light of day. If the member for Heysen believed in decisive action, he would not support the Bill as it is. He would not be prepared to accept the word of the Minister who is in the portfolio but for the time being. I know that the member for Heysen was a very honourable Minister for the Environment, but he would also know from that experience just how difficult it is to get Cabinet to take decisions in certain areas to give effect to the best intentioned views that individuals may have from time to time.

I close my contribution by urging the member for Heysen to stick to his guns with respect to his motion before the House. I do not doubt the sincerity of the Minister for Local Government, but if the North Adelaide Residents Society can do him over I am sure that the Local Government Association, generally, will have no trouble with him whatsoever.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I thank all members for their contributions, especially the very erudite contribution from the shadow Minister. I wish some other members had followed his example. I will not touch on areas in which the Opposition concurs because that would be a waste of time. I want to give the Labor Party a break in a bipartisan effort to explain something about this provision about which I know they worry and which I have discussed in detail with the member for Heysen, and that is the wasp destruction provision.

It is important that members understand that there is no further proposition which involves the collection of moneys for the destruction of wasps on an individual's property. That is already within the common law. If a person telephones the council, the council is quite at liberty to say, 'Yes, we will come around and destroy your wasp nest—'

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Yes, they can. A council can say, 'We will destroy your wasp nest and it will cost you \$30.' You say 'Yes' or 'No'. That is something that can be done now. Councils can negotiate a price, like a plumber—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: No, I know they have not. Councils can negotiate a price like a plumber or anyone else, and they can negotiate whatever price they want. Councils have kept that price down because of this problem. Councils will do it sometimes for free and sometimes for as little as \$30, but generally never more than that. Councils have been providing this service, and that is not changing. In fact, we are currently in negotiation with the LGA to announce not only a continuation of the subsidisation program but also a very necessary ramping up of the program because of the

problem about which every member of this House is telling me.

I have been told, 'You can't continue with \$150 000 when the nests are increasing. You must ramp it up.' We will do that. So, if a little old lady telephones her council and it finds the nests, those nests will be destroyed and the owner will be subsidised as presently occurs. I am really explaining this because I would not like members to make a political mistake. The only area that this power involves is that, if the little old lady finds that wasps are on the property next door and the council contacts the owners of that property and says, 'You have got wasps. We will come around and get rid of them for you. It will cost you nothing or it will cost you \$30', and if then the owner refuses, and only if the owner refuses, this power comes into effect. If the owner says, 'I like European wasps, I want to keep them', the owner can go to the ERD Court—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: They do. This is the point: they do. The owner can then go to the ERD Court and if the court upholds the owner's case the owner can keep his wasps. If the ERD Court says 'No', then, and only then, the council can send its inspectors onto the property, destroy the wasps and charge the owner. It is not an increase in anything: it is an additional reserve provision which solely allows councils, in the case of intransigence by people who just refuse to assist their neighbours to remove this problem, to actually force the owners to do so. I do not think that is unreasonable at all.

I can absolutely and honestly argue this in the press and in every media outlet in South Australia. If the Opposition wants to knock it out, it can knock it out, but I will go out and sell this as members opposite knocking out a plank in an eradication measure. I am putting it right on the table.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am honestly putting it on the table in this House because to vote against it, I think, is wrong. I am not condemning the Opposition: I am saying that I think it misunderstands the intention of the clause. I am explaining it in an effort to reach a good debating position. I thank the Opposition for supporting those parts it does support. I hope it changes its mind on other parts of the Bill and I look forward to further contributions in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I move:

Page 5, line 24—Leave out paragraph (f) and insert:

(f) by striking out from subsection (6)(b) ', or a deputy member, of the Board' and substituting 'of the Panel'.

This is purely a technical amendment to correct paragraph (f) so that it removes a reference to a deputy member. It was a pure drafting matter. The amendment removes the words 'a deputy member' because the panel does not have deputy members. The panel, for the benefit of the shadow Minister, consists solely of members. There are no deputy members so there should be no such reference. We are deleting those words.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 22 to 34 passed.

Clause 35.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I move:

Page 7, after line 22—Insert:

(5a) The operation of an order is suspended pending the determination of an appeal under this section.

This amendment makes it clear that when an appeal is lodged the operation of wasp nest destruction orders is suspended pending the determination of the appeal. Again, I say to members opposite that, if someone objects to a determination to remove wasp nests, they can go to the ERD Court at that time. It is obvious that, while a matter is before the court, the council should not be able to march onto property and destroy the wasp nest. This is purely an amendment to make it clear that while an appeal is pending the wasp nest cannot be removed: it must stay there. I make that point because I believe it shows that we are trying to exercise *bona fides*: we are not talking about marching onto and inspecting properties and running around like the Gestapo.

Mr CONLON: The Opposition supports neither the amendment nor clause 35, for the reasons so intelligently put forward by speakers on this side and by the member for Heysen. I indicate that, if the Minister thinks that we do not understand it, I am quite prepared to listen to him again outside this place so that we do not keep people from their homes.

Ms WHITE: This clause is the result of a significant public campaign to kick the Government into action in relation to the destruction of European wasps. As the member for Elizabeth indicated earlier, the northern suburbs have had their share of problems with European wasps. My electorate has an equally serious problem which I have been raising with this Government for some time now, and there has not been the benefit of a statewide campaign designed to kick the Government into action. Certainly much media attention was generated by me on behalf of my constituents, and that is the mosquito problem at Globe Derby.

It is an extremely serious problem, and it is a health problem for the residents living there. The mosquitoes in that area are of the type that can carry the Ross River virus and other arboviruses. There have been cases of Ross River virus in that area. It is an area where there are many horses that are taken to various areas around the State—to the Riverland and other areas—and, if they do not pick up the virus at the Globe Derby Park area, they certainly can pick up the virus in other regions of the State and bring it into the area. It is an area that has a high concentration of poultry, and experts have indicated that, given its proximity to Outer Harbor and ships coming in from overseas potentially carrying viruses, the environment of the area can be particularly explosive as a health and a quarantine problem.

All the expert advice says that something should urgently be done. The *Advertiser* campaign has kick-started the Government into doing something about European wasps. I have raised this issue every mosquito season for the past few years. The residents at Globe Derby Park cannot maintain feasible lifestyles: their quality of life is affected; they are worried about their health; and their livestock affected by this serious problem are driven mad. The Minister is taking some action in relation to European wasps here: what about the mosquitoes in the electorate of Taylor in the Globe Derby-St Kilda region?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: In this Government structure, the issue of European wasps comes under the auspices of the Minister for Local Government because of the very close working relationship (which will continue) between the local government sector as a whole, as represented by its peak body, the Local Government Association, and this Government. It is a significant problem.

I reject the comments of the member for Taylor that we have been kick-started into action. The Local Government

Association and this State Government have been working in concert on this matter for some years. Both sectors would acknowledge that perhaps what we have been doing is like King Canute trying to stem a tide but the eradication measures appeared to suffice for some years. We have now got beyond that and we have to take much more decisive and incisive action: both sectors would acknowledge that. We are working together on this and we are working very well.

I acknowledge the compliment which the member for Taylor paid me. I had a letter from someone who lives in, or near, her electorate, calling on me to intervene in the matter of grasshoppers in the northern area as well. So, I seem to be getting a reputation in this place for championing the causes of eradication of pests. Nevertheless, if we can—

An honourable member: That must have been why they put you on the Privileges Committee.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Yes, there were a number of pests on the Privileges Committee, I am reminded.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I know that what the member for Taylor has raised is a serious matter. I will speak to my colleague the Minister for Health, in whose portfolio that matter currently lies. If we can get a restructured local government Bill and if we can work through this there is a chance that, under local government reform, and in the cooperative spirit with which local government and State Government are seeking to work together, in the future we may be able to look at the sorts of things about which the member for Taylor is talking. I am not making a commitment. I am saying that we are working with local government and I am saying that these issues are a problem for us both: can we work together to achieve some solutions? Wasps is a rather daunting start. I thank the member for Taylor for her contribution but I suggest that we solve the wasps problem before we tackle mosquitoes.

Ms WHITE: My constituents certainly will not be happy to hear the Minister's indication that he is willing to tackle wasps but that this problem, which has been around year after year and which is an extremely serious one, has to wait until this Government gets its act together and tackles wasps. That will take far too long. It is August, the start of the mosquito breeding season, and yet again I have to ask the Government to take some action. The Minister has said that this is the responsibility of the Minister for Health. The Minister for Health and the local council have been passing the buck between each other as to whose responsibility it is to get something done for the constituents in my electorate.

It is high time that the Government did something, and I do not accept the Minister's suggestion that he will not look at this until he has tackled wasps. I ask the Minister—and I do not care whether it is the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Health or the whole Cabinet—to please do something: take some action, sort it out. This is the Minister who is responsible for local government. This Minister has a key role, and is perhaps the common denominator between State Government and local government. Please, do not just give me a fob off, do not give my constituents a fob off: do not tell them that they have to wait until other problems are solved, when this problem has been going on for so long. It needs to be fixed, and it needs to be fixed urgently. If it is not solved and if there is an epidemic—and the experts say that that area is an epidemic waiting to happen—someone, either State Government or local government, will be responsible. Liability will rest with someone, and it may well be the State Government, and it may well cost the Government a lot of

money. I ask the Government to take some action and to solve this problem.

Mr CONLON: I indicate to the Committee that, having spoken so little on this Bill in an attempt to expedite it but realising the importance that has been placed on this Bill and discussing this issue, I have gone outside and cancelled my appointments for tonight, so I am now free to make a one hour speech on clause 35. However, given what I am hearing behind me, perhaps I will not.

Ms STEVENS: I would like some further clarification.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Ms STEVENS: I am concerned about the issue of charging residents for the removal of wasp nests. As far as I know, in my electorate, at the moment the relevant councils do not charge people for this service. Bearing in mind the exponential growth of European wasps and the need to get rid of them as quickly as possible, can the Minister assure us that the Government will make an adequate contribution to the arrangement with local government so that local government bodies do not have to allocate to this matter large sums out of their budgets, bearing in mind that things are pretty tight all the way around?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I apologise to the member for Elizabeth, but on certain areas I will have to be a bit woolly, because we are in the process of finalising negotiations with the Local Government Association. Until both segments are happy, I cannot give specific figures. The honourable member will know that the State Government has signed off on a three year commitment for \$200 000 a year towards research. We realise that the \$70 000 contribution from both State and local government sectors towards eradication should at least be maintained, and you can assume not only will that be maintained but we are in the midst of very profitable consultations for a significant increase in the funding available to the eradication program. That is not funding per nest but, as there are so many more nests, we might get the same level of funding.

In line with that, and with respect to tracking, there is a spatial tracking program, a computer-type tracking program which is being trialled in two councils. To get little old ladies to track wasps is unrealistic. To get councillors to do it costs about \$200 per nest, and that is uneconomic, so a spatial program is being trialled this year in Mitcham and West Torrens which we hope will be successful in helping with that aspect of the problem.

We are working with the Minister for Education and Children's Services to provide an education pack in schools. It is not a new curriculum item but a pack for education through our schools. Importantly, we are currently negotiating a heads of agreement with the Local Government Association, setting out State Government and local government joint responsibilities and in that, if my memory serves me correctly, there is a specific clause where both sectors try to guarantee to low income earners and disadvantaged people that there will be no charge. We are trying to enshrine that in legislation.

There will be increased funding for research and eradication, alternative and increased education strategies, and the electronic determination of nest tracking. We are doing work on baiting, along with a research program. This year you will find that the effort by the Government and local government sectors has not doubled but quadrupled, and we need to do that. With all of this, the problem is still out of control. The Government, Opposition and local government sectors will do their best, but it is totally beyond their control. The public must cooperate and do all that they can. We cannot solve it in here, and local government cannot solve it. The two areas of government are in bed together but, by heaven, so is the rest of South Australia.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 6 August at 10.30 a.m.