HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 12 May 2003

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WORKCOVER GOVERNANCE REFORM) BILL

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

MOSQUITOES

A petition signed by 3 092 residents of Port Pirie, requesting the house to urge the government to increase funding for the state-wide Mosquito Control Program, was presented by the Hon. R.G. Kerin.

Petition received.

HOSPITALS, McLAREN VALE

A petition signed by 222 residents of South Australia, requesting the Minister for Health to provide ongoing funding on a three year basis to the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital at McLaren Vale to maintain and increase health services at the hospital, was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

SCHOOL BUSES

A petition signed by 331 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to review the government's school bus policy to determine a fairer and more equitable policy that will provide broader access to school buses in regional South Australia, was presented by Ms Maywald.

Petition received.

CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

A petition signed by 50 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to withdraw the Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002, was presented by Ms Maywald.

Petition received.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY PORTRAITS

The SPEAKER: I inform the house that the following portraits have been removed from the chamber and the western corridor for restoration work: Sir Robert Torrens and Archibald Peake from the western corridor and from the western wall of the chamber respectively, noting that Archibald Peake has been replaced by Sir Robert Ross; and Sir Jenkin Coles from the western wall of the chamber has been replaced with a portrait of the Hon. Joyce Steele. These are the first three works to be restored, and they will be absent for up to 10 weeks. There are nine works that need restoration. That restoration program will continue for the rest of the year in order for us to be able to get it done. That will include all works in the chamber except for Sir Thomas Playford and Sir Robert Nicholls.

They will be removed for varying periods of time. Members will notice the removal of other works for restoration. They will be temporarily replaced by others that are available to us from the portrait collection. There is nothing either sinister, clandestine or covert in the decision to proceed: it is purely in the interests of retaining for posterity these extremely valuable heritage items and ensuring that in a timely manner they are restored to preserve them at the least possible cost for the longest possible time.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the *Notice Paper*, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 126, 136, 138 and 141; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

DETE RISK FUND

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

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The honourable member's question concerned the Auditor–General's Report and how much of the Department of Education and Children's Services' outstanding liability reported for fire claims at 30 June 2002 was yet to be finalised.

Of the 53 projects making up that liability only four were due to fires that had occurred since the change of Government in March 2002.

As at 31 December 2002, 33 of those projects, due to fires as far back as March 2000, had been completed. The liability for the remainder of those projects (20) was $2.34 million at 31 December 2002.

I have been advised that a further seven fire reinstatement projects have been completed since 31 December 2002, and that all outstanding fire reinstatement projects are scheduled to be completed by 30 June 2003.

SMOKE ALARMS

In reply to **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (1 April).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. Investigations have indicated that in excess of 80 per cent of homes are fitted with smoke alarms but not all of them are fitted with long life batteries or are hard wired into the homes electricity wiring as required by the legislation for new homes.

Where homes are fitted with alarms that are reliant on a standard nine volt battery it is important that these be replaced annually to be certain that the alarm is kept working effectively. The recent campaign, reminding people to check their smoke detector and replace the battery when they turn back their clocks, is known to be effective as in previous years there has been a reported increase in the sales of nine volt batteries coinciding with the campaign.

There is concern and some evidence that tenanted properties are not as well served by smoke alarms as owner-occupied houses. While there are likely to be a number of reasons for this, there is scope for a targeted campaign to raise the awareness of both tenants and landlords of the need to have working smoke alarms.

Accordingly Planning SA is developing such a campaign which will work with community groups and local councils to identify those people in tenanted properties who are most likely to benefit from advice on smoke alarms. Because the number of house fires increase during the winter months, as people use more heating appliances, it is proposed to implement the campaign before the end of this financial year so that it reinforces the message of the previous campaign.

It has now been three years since the requirement for installing smoke alarms on the sale of a dwelling was introduced. There is an increasing probability that some of these properties will be resold and there needs to be some certainty that the required smoke alarms have been installed. Accordingly the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has been requested to give consideration to adding particulars relating to the status of smoke alarms in dwellings to the

list in Schedule 2 of the schedule on Form 1 of the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Regulations 1995.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Today the cabinet received from the Economic Development Board Chairman, Robert Champion de Crespigny, the report entitled 'A Framework for the Economic Development of South Australia: Our Future. Our Decision.' This follows the presentation in November last year of the EDB's 'State of the State' report, a warts-and-all assessment of our strengths and weaknesses and of course, most importantly, it follows the deliberations of the Economic Growth Summit held over 10 to 12 April. Two hundred and eighty delegates, including business people, unions, community, environmental, indigenous organisations, university leaders, members of the government and opposition met to consider issues raised in the EDB's report about South Australia's future.

The philosophy underlying the summit was that we need a partnership of business, the community and government to build prosperity here in South Australia. The summit demanded action, not words, and today I announce the first three actions the government will take in response to the EDB report, with many more to follow in the next few weeks. We will:

1. Develop a State Strategic Plan for South Australia, which will bring all the worthwhile but separate plans of government into a single framework under the direction and leadership of the chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. This will help to get the discipline and results across government that we need.

2. Develop a comprehensive population policy.

3. Change the composition of the Economic Development Board by bringing in at least two members to reflect full community involvement in the areas of community and social welfare and regional development.

I have stated already that, although the government will not agree with everything proposed in the EDB report, I can say already that we will agree to at least 85 per cent of the report. So, I can say this this early: having received the report today, the government can back about 85 per cent of this report, and maybe more. The government has already agreed to several of the earlier recommendations. This included the appointment of the Treasurer as Minister for Federal-State relations and the establishment of the Higher Education Council under the Minister for Further Education.

I can announce today that there will be a cabinet reshuffle later this week to respond positively to issues raised by the EDB report and to better align both the ministry and the public service to the task ahead. The Economic Development Board and the summit have said that we are over-governed and I agree. Therefore, the government will also substantially reduce the number of government statutory authorities, advisory boards, committees and other boards. I have asked all my ministers to tell me what boards and committees they intend to keep, and why, and to give me a substantial list of the boards and committees, advisory bodies and statutory authorities that they intend to abolish. I was delighted, by the way, that those at the summit enthusiastically embraced the idea of a partnership between business, the community and the government to secure higher living standards for all South Australians. I also welcome the support given by the opposition to the EDB's approach, in particular, the opposition leader, the Hon. Rob Kerin and the opposition leader in the upper house, the Hon. Rob Lucas—and also others, including the deputy leader and other members who are present here today. That level of commitment, the need to put our state and community before party or ideology, is paramount and, certainly, is the key to move South Australia forward to prosperity, higher living standards and more jobs.

There is no magic recipe to solve all the state's economic challenges. The Economic Development Board's Framework report, which was released today, outlines actions that it considers are needed to address the fundamentals, referred to as the economic building blocks of growth. These are the issues that we need to make our priorities. The delegates to the summit agreed and nominated a series of priorities for the future, including increasing our population and promoting export capability. We have a fundamental challenge to us to almost triple the number of exports from this state over the next 10 years. That is a huge ask, but we are determined to meet that challenge to almost triple the value of our exports out of South Australia over the next 10 years. It is also about linking economic and social development in an equitable way; streamlining the processes of government; and funding infrastructure maintenance and development. I can announce today that one of the parts of the reshuffle that I will announce later this week will be not only the creation of an Office of Infrastructure, as recommended by the economic summit, but also a Minister for Infrastructure. Also, of course, it dealt with obtaining finance for economic growth.

I made this pledge to the summit: in one year, we will convene a meeting of summit delegates to hear back on our progress in achieving the goals that we set out in April and to meet the new challenges. Equally, I want to hear from business, the community and politicians from all parties on what they have done to create a more prosperous South Australia.

So, after we have ticked off, agreed, funded and supported each resolution of the economic summit, we will inform all the delegates, we will inform the people of this state and, bit by bit over the year, until a year from the end of the summit, we will give a comprehensive report on what we have done to chart out a better economic future for our state. There could be no clearer or stronger commitment to action and implementation. I want us all to sign up to the hard targets, such as, as I mentioned, the near trebling of our exports to $25 billion by 2013. I want us all to support the food industry in achieving $15 billion in sales by 2010, and the electronics industry in continuing its 20 per cent annual growth in sales and revenue, to name just a couple. Obviously, there is also the wine industry's challenge of achieving $5 billion in sales. The government and the Economic Development Board are determined that this report will not suffer the fate of so many reports over the years and gather dust on a shelf whilst life in government, business and the community goes on unchanged.

In the coming weeks, the government will announce its responses and actions to build upon the work of the EDB. The whole report will be considered comprehensively with certain individual recommendations being proceeded with more immediately. We must not squander the future; we must take this opportunity to build a stronger South Australia. I thank all members of the Economic Development Board—particularly the Chairman, Robert Champion de Crespigny—for their tireless work in the support of our state. It is now our job—not just members on this side of the house but all

members of this parliament—to work together to achieve the outcomes of the summit (a challenge laid down to us all) in partnership with the community.

Mr Brindal: And what employment target are we working towards, Premier?

The SPEAKER: Order!

WORKCOVER

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Today I will give notice that tomorrow I will introduce a bill, the Statutes Amendment (WorkCover Governance Reform) Bill 2003, which will make the WorkCover Corporation far more accountable and transparent. This initiative follows a range of prior announcements and statements to the parliament in relation to WorkCover. On 6 June last year I made a ministerial statement on WorkCover's financial position and financial reporting issues. I told the parliament:

> . . . the reliability of the processes used to determine the position of the scheme, as reflected in financial reports and therefore in determining policy for financial planning for the scheme, is of utmost importance.

Since I made that statement, the WorkCover Corporation has admitted that:

> The board now believes that the unfunded liability historically could have been as much as $100 million more than the figures on which it had based its levy-rate decisions.

That means that the liabilities were as much as $100 million more than the figures tabled in parliament by the former Liberal government and referred to by the Liberal opposition when they claimed that WorkCover was in good shape under their government. This understatement of liabilities was a factor in—

The SPEAKER: Order! Can I tell the minister that that is tantamount to debate. All ministers might better instruct their staff to assist them in being more effective in avoiding offence to standing orders if they discriminate between what is information and what is debate more effectively than they seem to have been able to do so to date. The minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you, sir. On 17 February, I made a ministerial statement about the receipt of the Stanley report. On 23 March, the reassessment of WorkCover's liabilities and the increase in the average levy rate was announced. On 24 March, I made a ministerial statement about the reassessment of the liabilities. I said that the Rann Labor government would fix the mess left by the former Liberal government through 'sweeping changes to the board—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted to the minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —changing the culture of WorkCover management; improvements in the governance structure of WorkCover Corporation; safer workplaces; and better rehabilitation and return to work'. On 17 April, I released a draft bill, the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare (SafeWork SA) Amendment Bill 2003. The draft SafeWork SA bill acts on some of the key recommendations in the Stanley report.

By releasing the draft bill, the government is getting on with the job of making our workplaces safer. Safer workplaces mean less deaths, injury and disease at work, and lower workers' compensation costs. I have made clear to the WorkCover Corporation the need to focus on better rehabilitation and return to work.

The Statutes Amendment (WorkCover Governance Reform) Bill 2003 is the next step in fixing the mess. The bill will change the governance of the WorkCover Corporation, making it more accountable and transparent, and ensuring that its financial arrangements are more vigorously scrutinised. This will be achieved through a number of important initiatives, including providing for the Auditor-General to examine WorkCover; applying the Public Corporations Act to WorkCover; and establishing a transparent process to set the average levy rate.

By providing a far more accountable and transparent governance structure for the WorkCover Corporation, the government will give South Australians confidence that the mistakes made under the former Liberal government will not be repeated. The government is getting on with the job of fixing the mess left by the former Liberal government.

QUESTION TIME

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Surprisingly, my question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Did the minister or any of his staff interfere, either directly or indirectly, in the setting of the WorkCover premium either this year or last year? The opposition has been informed that minister Wright was informed in March 2002 that the WorkCover premium needed to be increased to 3 per cent from 1 July 2002. The government rejected the idea. The Treasurer revealed that the WorkCover premiums—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: That was straight after you lost government.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: No, it wasn't.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You have just admitted it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Treasurer and the member for Mawson!

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Treasurer.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I will clarify that, because the Treasurer obviously does not know when they came to government. The minister was informed in March 2002 that the WorkCover premium needed to be increased to 3 per cent from 1 July 2002. The government rejected the idea and did not act. The Treasury review—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You've admitted it was your fault.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Just listen. The Treasury review of WorkCover premiums late last year then suggested that from 1 July 2003 the rate should be increased to 3.9 per cent. The opposition is informed that, following this advice, minister Wright influenced the board to set the premium at 3 per cent.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The answer is very simple: of course not. Unlike the previous Liberal government, we do not interfere—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I don't have to be careful. Unlike the previous Liberal government, this government has not interfered with the WorkCover board's decision and its right to make that decision in respect to the average levy rate. The Leader of the Opposition is having a very bad day today, and all he is doing is adding to it.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is directed to the Premier. What is the state government's response to the commonwealth government's announcement made on 9 May that site 40A Arcoona Station in the Far North of our state will be the location of the nation's low level radioactive waste dump?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): The state government's response to Friday's announcement is simply this: the battle has only just begun. For the record, I am advised that there has been no other time in this country's history that my advisers can find when a federal government has compulsorily acquired land from a state against its will.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Can I assure the honourable member that the federal government, as far as I am aware, has never compulsorily acquired Mobil against the state government's wishes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This government continues to reflect the will of the South Australian people and the majority of those we represent, who say, 'Fight on.' The most recent poll conducted by the *Advertiser* on 5 May still shows overwhelming opposition to the national nuclear waste dump, with 72 per cent of respondents stating their opposition. The Attorney-General has now taken responsibility of the state's legal position, including any challenges. Last Friday, the Attorney-General sent letters to Senators Nick Minchin and Peter McGauran, as well as to the Prime Minister, stating once again the government's opposition to the proposed dump and requesting that we be informed of any decision made during the application process. As I have outlined in the media, there are a number of legal and political steps which the government can undertake to keep fighting the Liberal federal government in relation to making South Australia the nuclear dump site. I appeal to members opposite to put their state before party on this issue.

First, the government is working to strengthen the current legislation. This is still to be debated in parliament. In addition, the government will apply through the Freedom of Information Act for documents that relate to the commonwealth's decision to locate the repository in South Australia. Most of the legal focus will be on the compulsory acquisition process and the granting of a licence under the ARPANSA act and ensuring fairness and compliance with all legislation in the process.

There are a myriad of technical processes that the commonwealth must get right. If they make any errors along the way, they can expect the state to bring appropriate legal challenges. There are complex procedures concerning the compulsory acquisition itself. The state has rights under these procedures and will take full advantage of them. If the commonwealth fails in any way to accord the state due process, the state will bring judicial challenges. I make no apology for that. We will take actions in the courts, as well as through the parliament and at a series of other tests, such as the next federal and state elections, in opposition to this nuclear waste dump. The cost of any legal challenge would be minuscule compared with the loss of export revenue for our wine, food and tourism industries if South Australia loses its clean green image.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is very interesting. Members opposite can either line up on the side of our food, wine and tourism industries and on the side of South Australians or join with their federal Liberal colleagues and go the party line rather than act on behalf of their own state.

If the federal government is truly concerned that public money will be spent on any challenge, then it could simply choose to build and license a repository by an act of the commonwealth parliament. It is open to the federal government to introduce legislation in the commonwealth parliament to see whether it can get it through both houses of parliament. That would be the fair dinkum thing to do—but I doubt whether they will. Let the elected representatives deal with the issue through democratic parliamentary processes. However, as I say, this is highly unlikely.

Other important issues, such as the native title claimants, need to be taken into account. They deserve a fair and due process. Their native title rights should not be extinguished by the signing of a compulsory acquisition order by commonwealth pens. There are also Aboriginal heritage sites and ecological issues which all need to be considered. I am advised that the Andamooka Land Council has expressed concern over the impact that a repository would have on the heritage sites on Arcoona Station. There are also biological studies which indicate that the area is of significance, with a number of flora and fauna species occurring nowhere else in the world. I understand that mining leases in the area will also be impacted, and I am told that there are currently nine exploration licences that cover Arcoona Station. Just as the legitimate concerns of the space and defence industries were noted and just as the interests of the mining industry were taken into account, I ask again that the commonwealth government listens to the very real concerns of the South Australian people and rules out our state as the location of a national nuclear waste dump.

Finally, again I make this challenge to the federal government: if you intend to go ahead but you want to avoid the legal process, introduce legislation into commonwealth parliament and see whether you can get support in both houses of federal parliament. I doubt whether they will have the guts to do so.

I appeal to the opposition to join the state government in a bipartisan approach to defend South Australia from having a nuclear dump imposed against the will of this parliament, against the law of this state and against the will of its people. I would have thought that members of the opposition would rally in support of this parliament and a law passed by this parliament on behalf of the people of this state. We will fight this dump because the rights and concerns of South Australians have been ignored. We will fight the dump because it will impact on our tourism, food and wine industries. We will fight the dump because South Australia has done enough in bearing the burden of radioactive waste. I gave my promise to the people of this state at the last election that we would fight this nuclear waste dump every step along the way, and that is a promise I intend to keep.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. How does the minister justify the two decisions to increase the recovery period for repayment of the unfunded liability of WorkCover initially from three to five years, and more recently from five to 10 years, and why has there been no public statement? The WorkCover levy includes a component to repay the unfunded liability. Insurance experts have expressed alarm that the time to fund the repayment of liability has increased from three to 10 years to take pressure off the immediate need for even higher levies, and no public statement has been made by the government to indicate the changes.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. He would be best advised to ask WorkCover.

HOSPITALS, PUBLIC

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. How have state health ministers, as participants at the Australian Health Ministers' Conference, responded to the commonwealth's funding offer to the states for the next five year agreement for public hospital funding?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for the important question. The new five year Australian health care agreement will be critical for the delivery of health services in our public hospitals over the next five years. After receiving the offer from the commonwealth government on Friday 2 May 2003, state and territory health ministers issued a joint communique rejecting the offer, which represents a cut of $1 billion over five years to the states when compared with extending the current agreement.

State ministers requested the commonwealth Minister for Health to attend a special meeting of the Australian Health Ministers' conference at the end of May 2003 to deliberate on the detail of a commonwealth offer, but this request was not agreed to by the commonwealth minister. The chair of the Australian Health Ministers' Conference, the Hon. Bob Kucera, the Minister for Health in Western Australia, has since written to Senator Patterson, on 6 May 2003, stressing the importance of the health care agreement and repeating the request for a further meeting on behalf of state and territory ministers.

On 1 May this year, I reminded the house that, after the Prime Minister announced that the commonwealth offer included an extra $10 billion, the shadow minister demanded that the South Australian government sign up to what he described as a 'significant increase'. After the shadow minister had made this claim, the Prime Minister admitted that the 'seemingly' irresistible offer was actually a cut of $1 billion over five years in the forward estimates. At that time, I cautioned against barracking for the commonwealth's offer until the detail was known. This has been vindicated by confirmation that the offer represents a cut compared with extending the current agreement. After states and territories rejected the commonwealth's offer on Friday 2 May 2003, the shadow minister waded in again, saying this time that we had 'a huge moral obligation' to accept the commonwealth's offer. During the last health care agreement negotiation in 1998, the Prime Minister called the shadow minister a 'health hypocrite' and it seems nothing much has changed. I believe there should be bipartisan support for getting the best possible deal for our hospitals, and I look forward to the shadow minister showing the same.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): Given the Minister for Industrial Relations' commitment to open and accountable government, why has he failed to release the report by Treasury and Finance that examined the financial risk, corporate governance and other practices critical to the financial and risk management of the WorkCover Corporation? This report was completed in November 2002. A briefing was provided to the Treasurer and the minister at this time, but as yet the opposition and the South Australian public have not been provided with any details or seen any resulting actions.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): We are dealing with that matter, and I would be more than happy for that report to be made public. We are looking at it. There are a couple of issues with the report. Firstly, it contains commercially sensitive information, and we need to consider that. But I am advised by Crown law that there is some—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want to hear the answer or just carry on?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is simple. There is a legal impediment to my releasing the report. That is the advice I have been given—there is a legal impediment to my making that report public. What I have to do—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am advised by Crown law as a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm trying to explain, Dean; just calm down. The Leader of the Opposition has already told us that WorkCover was the fault of the last government, having just told us today that in March 2002 there was advice that the levy needed to be 3 per cent. That clearly was the greatest own goal by a Leader of the Opposition for the past 10 years. I will come back to the question. There is a legal impediment. I have asked for advice as to what we need to do. I have received that advice. I will facilitate that release, provided we can deal with the commercial information, if that is an issue. I will be able to table the report without there being any legal redress on officers who have compiled the report. I am advised that under the WorkCover Act there are issues about disclosure of information. I do not think anyone—especially the Leader of the Opposition as a former premier—would want to put at risk any officer who has compiled that report. We will get to that. In conclusion, I remind that house of this: the Leader of the Opposition has stated in this house today that in March 2002 there was pressure on the WorkCover Corporation. For the eight years leading into March 2002, you were the government: it is your fault.

HOMICIDE VICTIMS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Will the government increase support for victims of homicide?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The costs of homicide are immeasurable. No amount of money can make up for the sense of grief and loss families feel when

one of their members is murdered. It is important that we help these people by giving them information, support and other assistance. I inform the honourable member that I have approved an additional $60 000 a year through the Victim Support Service to help the families and friends of homicide victims. The additional $60 000 will allow the Victim Support Service to improve its assistance for homicide victims. It already helps more than 100 people who have been affected by homicide. The Victim Support Service will continue to receive about $1 million a year for a metropolitan service and five regional services. I must add that those five regional services were an initiative of the previous (Liberal) government, and I commend it for that. They are in Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Berri and Mount Gambier.

The non-profit organisation has more than 1 000 members, 19 staff and 100 regular volunteers. It has been providing free services for more than two decades. The government has increased the Victim Support Service's grant from the Victims of Crime Fund by $75 000. This government is serious about improving access to services for victims of crime and we are delivering on our commitment made in the Premier's law and order contract to strengthen victims' rights and services.

Helping victims to recover from the effects of crime is an essential part of achieving justice for victims. The criminal justice system needs to recognise and support victims as well as punish offenders. Finally, I recognise the important work done by the Homicide Victims Support Group, a non-government body that was established by Lynette Nitschke after her daughter Allison was murdered.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Given WorkCover's precarious cash position, does the Minister for Industrial Relations favour a bail-out payment to WorkCover to improve that position or will he support the sale of assets or investments to ensure that enough cash is available, despite this adding to the WorkCover funding levy problems?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The Leader of the Opposition asked some 10 questions about WorkCover in the last sitting week, and that petered out to nothing. Now he is asking a range of questions again, building on what he said yesterday about selling assets. Opposition members are simply scaremongering when they suggest that WorkCover may be forced to sell its assets. The Leader of the Opposition is simply demonstrating his complete failure to understand the issues, and we must all be saddened by that.

By claiming that there may be a need for asset sales, the opposition is attempting to suggest that there is a liquidity problem. That is simply not the case. This is an embarrassment to the Liberal Party because it demonstrates that it does not understand WorkCover's liabilities. Like any large investing institution, WorkCover keeps its investment strategy under review. That means that, when WorkCover identifies a better opportunity, a way to make its investments work harder, it shifts its investments from one area to another, as we would expect it to do. That is what managing an investment portfolio is all about.

WorkCover is not selling assets other than, as it always does, in the ordinary course of business, as I have explained. WorkCover has said that there is absolutely no substance to this allegation. The Leader of the Opposition is simply scaremongering and nothing else.

ROAD ACCIDENT RESCUE CHALLENGE

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. What were the outcomes of the national Road Accident Rescue Challenge in Toowoomba, which was held from Thursday 8 May to yesterday, Sunday 11 May?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I think I am the first minister of the parliament to be accused of enjoying a junket to Toowoomba. It is a lovely town and they are lovely people, but I do not think that it would be a very common sort of accusation. I was in Toowoomba on Saturday for the national road accident rescue challenge, which is an extraordinarily good, extraordinarily important event. I can indicate that two teams, the Laura SES and the Blackwood CFS, competed on behalf of South Australia. I regret to say that, in an extremely close and competitive event, they did not win. It is with a saddened heart I have to indicate that a Victorian team from Bacchus Marsh, which I think (and I may be wrong) once won the international championship, was in fact the winner. But it was a very close and competitive event.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Was the Salisbury brigade there?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Salisbury brigade did not make it on this occasion—nor has it done so, as I recall, on any occasion in the past, Premier. I should not say that: the Salisbury CFS brigade is an extremely good brigade, even though it does carry a couple of members who I think probably would not make any competition team in accident rescue.

A very important outcome, apart from winning the competition in terms of these national competitions, is that it is the one opportunity that these teams have to train on state-of-the-art, current release modern vehicles. Obviously, as a matter of cost, most training is done on older, less valuable vehicles. Holden made a donation of a number of virtually brand new vehicles to this competition, and the teams were able to work on those. The importance of that is that, as vehicles have become safer for drivers, they have, unfortunately, become much more dangerous for rescuers, because of things such as air bags and supplementary restraint systems that operate on quite frightening explosive devices. There have been a number of injuries around the world involving accident rescue teams. So, it is very important that, after each event, the teams debrief with someone who is a training expert in those areas and that information is then, of course, brought back to South Australia and shared. It is a very important process and it is, I think, the most singular opportunity that they have to do that. It also leads us to a number of ideas that we would like to explore with vehicle manufacturers, and we may be coming back to the house on that in the future.

In short, one of the most important things that I would like to announce out of this weekend is the decision taken at the annual general meeting, I think on the Friday night, that the excellent competition will, in fact, be hosted by Adelaide in 2006. We very much look forward to hosting the event. I look forward to—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mawson will recall that he has been warned.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sure that, despite the interjection, the opposition welcomes the return of the national titles to Adelaide in 2006. We look forward to hosting them, and I look forward to raising some of the matters that I saw and learnt on the weekend with our motor vehicle manufacturers, because I think it is important that we do all we can, as a government and as a legislature, to make the job that they do safer.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Did the Minister for the River Murray, at the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council meeting in Queensland last week, support deferring the decision about increasing the flow of water to South Australia down the River Murray—an increase that both the minister and the Premier said was vital 'if we are to avert an ecological disaster'—and will the minister continue to support such deferrals should they be raised at future council meetings?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: You are not the Speaker, I am sorry. For the past year, minister Hill and Premier Rann have spoken about the vital importance of increasing the amount of water coming down the river into South Australia by 1 500 gigalitres, saying that the health of the River Murray was dependent on that increased water. At the ministerial council meeting held in Queensland last week, which minister Hill attended, the decision on increasing that flow was deferred. It will now be a year or more before any decision is made and, as you know, sir, that means at least a further two years before any more water can be expected to flow down the Murray.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the River Murray): I also attended the meeting in Toowoomba on the Thursday and Friday of last week. I did not bump into the Minister for Police; that is probably a good thing. The ministerial council did not defer the decision to which the honourable member refers. Paragraph 2 of the communique put out by the ministerial council states:

> . . . the council directed the commission to bring to its November 2003 meeting a proposal for a first step decision that will deliver measurable and integrated ecological, social and economic outcomes. This will be based on the scientific and socioeconomic evidence to be presented before the meeting and the estimated costs and benefits of the options considered.

It is true that this government—and I believe the opposition also—believes that 1 500 gigalitres of water ought to be provided for environmental flow purposes for the River Murray. It is also true that I have been arguing that that decision ought to be made at the October (now November) ministerial council meeting. It became apparent some time ago that considerable lobbying was going on—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —well, I haven't said that—across the basin, particularly from some of the irrigation communities which have been undergoing pretty severe hardship this year as a result of the drought in the eastern states. There were recommendations from the community advisory committee to the council that the whole process should be slowed down, but I am pleased to say that the ministers have agreed to have the commission develop a first step environmental package to be considered in November.

That is entirely consistent with the position adopted by the River Murray Forum, which was held in this chamber a month or so ago. The member for Unley may recall that the communique that came out of that forum suggested (I think) that there should be a first step find of about 500 gigalitres. I do not have that communique in front of me—I will correct the record if I am wrong—but that meeting said, 'Yes, we believe there should be 1 500, but in the short term there should be a first stage of 500.'

On Friday, the ministerial council agreed that we should make this first step in November, and I will argue that that figure should be 500, which is also consistent with the Wentworth group's suggestion that 450 gigalitres ought to be made available as a first step. There is certainly concern amongst a variety of ministers about the science and the economic impact and all the rest of it, but I am pleased—and I have to say that the commonwealth showed quite good leadership in relation to this—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You said that; I didn't. The commonwealth showed quite good leadership. Minister Truss (whom I commended) said at the meeting that we need to have a first step approach. I was very pleased with that piece of leadership. I expect in November that we will have a proposition before us about how much water should be found in the first instance, and over the next 12 months or so we will look at the bigger question.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Will the Minister for the River Murray advise the house who are the key stakeholders with whom he or the department consulted in determining the area of the River Murray Protection Zone? During the debate on the River Murray Bill in this house, the minister stated that all key stakeholder groups had been consulted concerning the bill and, consequently, the area to be taken into the River Murray Protection Zone. As the eastern regions of the Mount Lofty Ranges are included in this protection zone, it would be reasonable to assume that both the Adelaide Hills Council and the District Council of Mount Barker would be stakeholders. They have not been consulted. Last week, I also spoke to major Riverland irrigators who advised me that they also have not been consulted in this process.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This matter, of course, is still before the parliament. It has been through this house and is now before the other house. As the member would know, the planning zone to which he referred is, in fact, a proposed regulation and, at this stage, has not been finalised.

The government produced that in a draft form to aid the debate before the house, and that was made plain at the time. I will have to read carefully the member's question, but I think that he may well be adding two bits together. Certainly, during the preparation of the bill, there was extensive consultation with a range of stakeholders. As far as I understand it, all the key stakeholders have been consulted. I am not sure whether all those players have been consulted about the proposed regulation, but I will get a definitive answer for the member. However, my understanding is that that regulation was provided in draft form for the benefit of the debate in this house, and has not gone out for consultation with the broader community. In fact, before it is agreed upon—and we have not made any decisions in relation to the regulation—we will have appropriate consultation.

BIOSCIENCE PRECINCT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is directed to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. What

are the benefits for South Australia of the government's plans to expand the Thebarton Bioscience precinct?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Science and Information Economy): I thank the member for Norwood for her question. She has a keen interest in precincts and cluster groupings in industry. On 2 May, I announced, on behalf of the government, the purchase of 4.8 hectares of land (the former Michells site in West Thebarton). The land abuts on the current 2.2 hectare site termed the 'Thebarton Bioscience precinct'. This area has already been recognised throughout the country as an innovative precinct and the highest density location of science clustering in our country.

Currently, there are seven biomedical companies in the area, occupying four new facilities, representing a capital investment of $30 million in building activity. The area employs 200 employees. The land we have currently bought will undergo site preparation, infrastructure and road development and preparation for sale, with an expectation that business manufacturing, together with Bio Innovation SA, will be able to put 1.5 hectares of the new landholding up for investor occupation within the next few months.

This development is expected to produce 480 new jobs for tertiary qualified science and medical graduates from local universities and from overseas and interstate. In particular, it is worth noting that the employment opportunities will be for clerical, bio informatics, business leadership and project management as well. Several companies have already expressed interest in the site. It is a key location and an opportunity to be part of a working precinct for bioscience.

The demand for this occupancy is high. On current figures, we expect that, when the site is fully occupied, there will be $60 million worth of building activity over the next five years. This activity will contribute to what we have already—50 companies employing 800 people and generating $100 million of revenue annually. Particularly interesting for the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing and his new initiative on physical activity, the precinct will allow us, as one spin-off of the purchase of the land, to extend an extra strip of river frontage along the Torrens Linear Park as a possible bike track and walkway so that we have a whole of government approach to what is otherwise a bioscience innovation project.

PORT RIVER CROSSING

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Transport confirm the establishment of a toll on the third river crossing bridge in Port Adelaide? We have seen both Labor state governments in New South Wales and Victoria embracing toll roads after previously criticising them. I think the community of South Australia has a right to know whether a toll will be introduced once the third river crossing is completed.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): This has always been talked about, since the former government from day one provided briefings to us when we were in opposition. This has always been talked about as a toll road. It is no surprise to anyone. What is a surprise, of course, is what the former government was talking about in regard to redirecting traffic—and perhaps that is a story for another day. Hopefully, the honourable member will ask me another question and I will talk about that, as well.

SCHOOLS, OAK VALLEY

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the current situation in relation to the Oak Valley School?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): A new $2 million school facility has opened at the Oak Valley Aboriginal community. The work for the school was completed in July last year, replacing existing facilities and providing child care and school services for up to 35 students. Last week (4 May) I attended the official opening of the school with 30 guests and over 100 members of the local community. The resolution of that redevelopment of educational facilities in one of the remotest parts of our state became a priority as soon as I became minister. Of course, it had been sitting on the capital works program since 1998-99. This Labor government was appalled to discover how the school was left to fester and rot away during the time of the previous administration.

The new school is purpose built for the conditions. The child-care centre is fully licensed up to standards and the classroom space is flexible. The school is airconditioned, which is a very important in a part of the state where temperatures up to 50-plus degrees are experienced, and shaded areas outdoors are provided, as well. There have been many delays in the years since 1998-99, but it has been finalised. I am pleased that the situation is now resolved and the community has a school that is appropriate for its conditions. In fact, the construction method used, involving the building of the school off site, has been very successful and will be used in subsequent Aboriginal school upgrades.

The students at Oak Valley do deserve the best chance in life, the same as all other children in our state. These new facilities will give children that chance. It was a pleasure to visit the site with our Premier (Mike Rann), the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. Terry Roberts), the local member (Ms Lyn Breuer), who was a very staunch advocate for the school, and many others to witness the rebirth of one of this state's unique schools.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Notwithstanding the minister's desire to acknowledge the presence of certain people, I remind her, as well as other ministers who today have made statements in which they have taken the liberty of using the names of individual people who are, by chance, representing electorates in this place, that, according to standing orders, it is disorderly. More seriously, either we agree the standing orders are wrong and we change them—and that has serious implications—or we observe them.

OUTER HARBOR

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises confirm that the deepening of the Outer Harbor will go ahead? On Friday 2 May 2003 the Minister for Transport released the draft transport plan. Page 60 of that report states:

> Consideration is also being given to a $65 million deepening of the channel at Outer Harbor.

However, on 31 March 2003 the Minister for Government Enterprises advised that the deepening will go ahead.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): Perhaps I should explain that one of the physical qualities of deepening is that if you deepen to a certain degree you can go even deeper. So, if you are going

to ask a question, it is important to identify what deepening you are talking about.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am going to help the member for Light, because he is obviously very confused. Of course, in establishing a new grain berth, we are committed—as I understand it, both by agreement and I think by law—to the deepening of that terminal. It will certainly go ahead. It would be a very odd decision to build a deep sea Panamax grain terminal and not deepen it to allow Panamax ships to get there. That may have been something the previous government would have done, but we take the approach that if you are going to build a Panamax berth it is very important to be able to get the Panamax ships there, and that will certainly happen. If the member for Light remains under a misapprehension, we will be deepening the port sufficiently to get those Panamax vessels to the grain terminal that we are building. When are we going to do it? We hope it will coincide with building the terminal. That would be our plan. Call us 'old fashioned', but that is the way we do things.

There is also another form of deepening that we have been looking at. One of the reasons that we stopped the previous government's silly plan for the position of the grain terminal and through discussion with Flinders Ports moved it to the position that we have, is that it also provides an opportunity to grow Outer Harbor as a major port and to consider whether or not we steal a march by deepening the entire Outer Harbor by 14 metres. We will consider that further because we believe there may be very important benefits. But forgive us if we go one step at a time. We will build a grain terminal and make the water deep enough for the ships to get in there, and we will consider whether to go a bit deeper still.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STRATEGY

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What is the government doing to address the increasing concern over the decline in physical activity levels of South Australians?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I thank the member for West Torrens for his question and for his ongoing commitment to physical fitness, and I am delighted to see him looking so healthy again. In February 2003, cabinet approved the formation of the Ministerial Physical Activity Forum comprising ministers responsible for health, education, tourism, planning, local government, recreation and sport, and transport. The Physical Activity Forum will focus on the delivery of a coordinated whole-of-government approach to the promotion of physical activity and healthy lifestyles for all South Australians. The inaugural meeting of the ministerial forum was conducted on Wednesday 7 May. At this meeting the following recommendations were approved by ministers:

- firstly, the creation of a physical activity council;
- secondly, the development of a state physical activity strategy; and,
- thirdly, the use of 'Be Active' as the whole-of-government physical activity message.

The Physical Activity Council will include suitably qualified members of the community, as well as representatives from the relevant government agencies. The Physical Activity Council will provide expert advice to the Ministerial Physical Activity Forum and will lead the development, implementation, evaluation and review of a state physical activity strategy. Their first responsibility will be to present a draft physical activity strategy to the next meeting of the forum for ministers to consider. The development of a state physical activity strategy will provide a framework to ensure a coordinated and strategic approach to the promotion of increased physical activity throughout the community.

DERELICT HOUSES

Mrs HALL (Morialta): Will the Minister for Urban Development and Planning advise the house when he will take action to either demolish or upgrade the three derelict houses located on the northern side of the Magill Youth Training Complex? A number of constituents have contacted me regarding the urgency of resolving the future of these houses which are located on a main access road for the residents of Woodforde and which are in very close proximity to the junior school of Rostrevor College. My constituents believe that the houses are in an unsafe, dilapidated state and have been the subject of acts of vandalism. With the winter months approaching, the prospect of squatters occupying them has become a real concern to my constituents, as has the previous discovery of discarded needles.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I am unaware of those circumstances. I undertake to take that question on notice and get back to the honourable member shortly.

HOUSING, COMMUNITY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing. What is the significance of the opening last week of a new community housing development for homeless people in the city?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Housing): I thank the member for Florey for her ongoing advocacy, particularly in the housing area. Last week, I had the pleasure of opening six new two bedroom apartments for the Multiagency Community Housing Association (MACHA) in the city. The groundbreaking project in Morphett Street builds on the state housing plan initiative, which is being developed in consultation with the community to help increase access to affordable housing and support the state government's goal of cutting homelessness. The project has been funded by the state government through the South Australian Community Housing Authority, and these homes will provide permanent accommodation for South Australians who would otherwise be homeless.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I'm not sure of that. The apartments and the support services provided to their tenants will be managed by MACHA, made up of non-government agencies that support community, public and private rental tenants in the inner city. These apartments provide all important privacy for homeless people who have previously experienced very little privacy, sleeping rough, squatting or staying in shelter dormitories. While these homes are designed for low income people, they also are very sleek and modern, and we are sure that this will help tenants build up their self-esteem and pride, and hopefully break the cycle of depression, poverty and homelessness.

At the event I drew attention to the current state housing plan process, which aims to fulfil the government's commitment to assuring access to affordable, appropriate, safe and secure housing for all South Australians, wherever they live.

That process is in the consultation phase, with detailed option papers now being publicly available. These have been prepared by working groups made up of experts from many interest groups across the community, the private sector and government. One of these papers specifically looks at the challenges facing our social housing system, including community housing. The new development means we now have 4 000 community dwellings in South Australia, and shows the important role and contribution that community housing now plays in our housing system.

RECREATIONAL BOATING AND FISHING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Will the Minister for Urban Development and Planning consider allowing some reservoirs to be open for recreational purposes, and in particular for non-powered recreational boating and fishing? In some states such as Victoria some reservoirs are allowed to be used for recreational purposes. I understand the Victorian government currently has mixed policies on the recreational use of water catchments and in some catchments allows boating.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I am afraid the honourable member is a little too quick for me; I will have to take that question on notice and get back to him.

COMMUNITY SPACES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is also directed to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. What has been done to assist local councils to improve the quality and useability of their community spaces?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I know that the honourable member appreciates the importance of improving the public realm to ensure that people can enjoy some public life instead of just being confined to their living rooms and television sets, and not being able to interact with other human beings. Through Planning SA the government has a funding program that draws on local council applications, and it is called Places for People. The key thing about this program is that it assesses propositions put to government by council and matches them on a 50:50 basis in ordinary circumstances to assist them to draw up master plans for particular places within their communities. These are twice yearly grants, and I have recently approved almost $620 000 in grants for six council areas to do a range of projects, including making improvements to town squares and developing design plans. The Cities of Mitcham, Salisbury, Unley and Victor Harbor, as well as Clare, the Gilbert valleys and the Yorke Peninsula district council, have each received Places for People grants.

Projects that are already under way as a result of the last round of grants are: the development of a design plan for Beach Road at Christies Beach; Semaphore Road at Semaphore; development of Port Pirie wharf precinct; and works on the Salisbury and Whyalla town squares. The Places for People grants help make community areas more vibrant, attractive and lively. Importantly, it makes a contribution to crime prevention. If we can have attractive public places that enable people to move about, there is an element of natural surveillance that makes those places safer and encourages more people to use them. When we discuss these questions of built form with South Australians, we are aware that they regard the places in between buildings as important as the buildings themselves. The things that South Australians love about South Australia are the open spaces and the parklands. It is important that those places that have received less attention than they should in recent years are properly designed to attract more people into that realm.

We have also noted that there are parts of this state that might not have received the attention they deserve from local councils, and we are encouraging councils to look at areas of our state with lower socioeconomic performance. Certainly, I am well aware of some obvious examples. Areas in the north-west of Adelaide have become degraded over a period, and the consequential downgrading of a suburb and its public spaces leads to crime, and it becomes a downward spiral. While we are finding that some councils are not necessarily putting in grant applications to address those problems, we will be working with those councils, and we will also be looking at the criteria that determine how those grant applications are assessed to more tightly focus them in those areas of socioeconomic need. The limited resources that exist in council areas must be focused. We think that, by working more closely with councils, we can revitalise some of those areas and send a message to people within some of these suburbs that they count, as well.

YOURAMIGO

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. What has the government done to assist the YourAmigo company which was recently named in the top 100 companies that matter in Knowledge Management 2003?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): As members would be aware, YourAmigo has been selected by the leading publication *KM World* as one of the top 100 companies that matter in Knowledge Management 2003. *KM World* is the leading information provider on knowledge management and has more than 56 000 subscribers worldwide.

The knowledge management list is compiled by the magazine annually. YourAmigo is a search products company that is taking revolutionary information search and retrieval products to a worldwide market. YourAmigo's technology allows clients to search their intranets, extranets and the internet seamlessly. I am advised that it outperforms traditional search engines. The company is a target fast growth client of the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing's Information Industries team. The centre has worked with YourAmigo from start-up phase when the current directors decided to commercialise leading IT research from Flinders University.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not have the year but, if it is important to the honourable member, I will get it for him.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to heap praise on members opposite and the former government for their fine work in assisting this company because, as every member of this house knows, I am happy to share success. If this is the result of the work of the former government, it should be acknowledged.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As to the Premier's interjection am I prepared to share failure—absolutely! I will not be selfish on that one. Assistance from the centre has focused on assisting the company to raise private capital and develop its

export potential. In the past, YourAmigo has also been a winner in two categories in the National Secrets of IT Innovation competition held in association with the World Congress of IT 2002—an initiative again of the former (Liberal) government, which we all attended in that somewhat bizarre period when we had two Premiers, or two leaders of the opposition, or whatever it was, back in—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The two amigos!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The two amigos. It was held in Adelaide and received a Rising Star award in the Deloitte's Fast 20 Technology 2002 awards here in South Australia. I am delighted, on behalf of the house and of members opposite, in particular, to congratulate YourAmigo on its recent success. I would like to commend the officers of the Centre for Business and Manufacturing for their work with this outstanding South Australian company.

HOSPITALS, PUBLIC

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: On Friday 2 May 2003, state and territory health ministers met with Senator Patterson, the commonwealth Minister for Health and Ageing, to receive the commonwealth's offer for a new five-year health care agreement for funding public hospitals. I can confirm to the house that the offer is significantly different from the previous agreement and is capped at $42 billion nationally over five years. This represents a cut of $1 billion to the states and territories compared with what they would have received by carrying forward the current agreement. On a per capita basis, South Australia's share of a reduction of $1 billion in commonwealth forward estimates over five years would be a cut of about $75 million.

Under the commonwealth offer, states would be required to agree to match the commonwealth's proposed rates of indexation but there is no commitment from the commonwealth to match growth in state funding. If the state signs but then does not match, commonwealth payments will be reduced to 96 per cent of the state's entitlement under the formula. If the state does not agree to the offer, the commonwealth will only pay the 2002-03 grant plus the commonwealth's composite index, the WCI1, based on movements in wage safety net adjustments and the CPI. Notwithstanding the significant work that has been done over the last year on health reform, there is little evidence of a financial commitment to reform in this package.

Australian health ministers, including the commonwealth Minister for Health and Ageing, clinicians and officials have been working on reform issues including the interaction between hospital funding and private health insurance; improving rural health; the interface between aged and acute care; the continuum between preventative, primary, chronic and acute models of care; improving indigenous health; improving mental health; information technology; quality and safety; and work force issues. While the Pathways Home funding—$21 million to South Australia over five years—could address some issues relating to rehabilitation services, it is limited to five years and is money reallocated from within the current package.

In response to an invitation from the commonwealth minister, state and territory health ministers made a submission to the commonwealth in February 2003 detailing funding requirements, including indexation adjustments, provision for the payment of aged care services being provided in acute public hospitals and provision for capital investment, issues that all states and territories agreed should be addressed by the new agreement. The commonwealth ignored this submission, even though the submission was made, I repeat, at the request of the commonwealth Minister for Health and Ageing.

Senator Patterson also informed state ministers that she had no authority from the federal cabinet to increase the offer. This offer does not address the financial issues facing our public hospitals over the next five years and it fails to deal with the need for reforms that have wide support. Not surprisingly, all states and territories rejected the offer and are now considering their positions.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the River Murray): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I rise to inform the house of important outcomes from the 33rd Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting held in Toowoomba, Queensland, last Friday. Negotiating with six governments across the Murray-Darling Basin Commission can be slow going. However, I can report that progress has been achieved. The council formally resolved:

> . . . to direct the commission to prepare for its consideration in October 2003 a proposal for a first step decision towards the council's vision for a healthy River Murray system that will deliver measurable and integrated ecological, social and economic outcomes.

That means that the next meeting of the council in November will be critical to the future of the river. Three important decisions will be taken. First, the council will agree how much extra water will flow down the Murray, as a first step. South Australia's position, supported by the River Murray Forum, is for an extra 500 gigalitres over five years, a substantial down payment for a long-term solution. Although some may consider this amount to be at the higher end of the scale, it is appropriate that our state be ambitious about the target. Secondly, the council will receive recommendations on the cost of delivering this extra water and how jurisdictions should share the costs. Thirdly, the council will consider how the commitment for extra water will be implemented. The Toowoomba meeting of the council also agreed that:

> . . . over the following decade, the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council expects to see a healthy river, a more prosperous and sustainable irrigation sector, and more efficient water resource management.

The outcomes from Toowoomba are not inconsistent with the Adelaide Declaration adopted at the River Murray Forum earlier this year. State and federal parliamentarians agreed then that an extra 1 500 gigalitres is needed in the long term to save the river for future generations, and the council agreed last week in Toowoomba that ministers consider that a first step must be taken this year to put the Murray-Darling on the path to a long-term solution. The council was updated on the outlook for water availability over the 2003-04 season. It is evident that the recent drought is far from broken. At this stage, South Australia cannot be guaranteed its full entitle-

ment flow. While the assessment will be updated on a monthly basis, it is not expected to improve appreciably before September 2003, even if there is significant rainfall over the next few months.

South Australia has been on monthly entitlement flows since December 2001. Given the likelihood of reduced entitlements, significant water restrictions will be considered for all South Australian users of River Murray water in an effort to minimise these impacts. The government is currently assessing the level of restrictions that may be necessary, and will make an announcement soon. The ministerial council also agreed to an extension of the Murray Mouth dredging project to ensure that a channel on the Goolwa side of the mouth is maintained and a channel to the Coorong is excavated prior to next spring. A decision on how these dual objectives can best be achieved will be made within a month. It may well be that a second dredge is used to ensure that both the Goolwa side and Coorong remain open. The council has allocated $1.1 million to the task as part of the 2003-04 budget.

The plight of the River Murray is a concern for all South Australians. I today issue an invitation to all members of parliament to attend a briefing about the condition of the Murray and the implications for the state, including water restrictions. The briefing will be held this Thursday at 11.30 a.m. in the Balcony Room with me and the chief executive the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): As the member for Flinders, I regularly commute to and from the Adelaide Airport. While the airport terminal is long overdue for an upgrade, the inefficiency of the airport taxi pick-up is something to be experienced, and is inexcusable. Recently, a gentleman in front of me, in a very long queue of about 200 to 300 people, stated wryly that he thought he should fly back to Melbourne and take a taxi to his meeting; it could be quicker. It is very sad to see so many people waiting patiently for taxis at Adelaide Airport. Sometimes there are between, as I said, 200 to 300 people sweltering in hot sun or crowding underneath limited shelter from sun, wind or rain.

The airport is often the first impression that South Australian visitors get. They have travelled long distances and, when they finally get to Adelaide, we force them to remember us by keeping them standing in one long, tired queue. People who fly in for business and medical appointments are frustrated and anxious when, having arrived in Adelaide in reasonable time, lose up to 45 minutes, or more, waiting for a taxi. When coming from my electorate of Flinders out of one of the only two regular air passenger transport terminals left at Port Lincoln or Ceduna, they may well already have travelled by car for several hours. This is not the way that we should be remembered. We have a wonderful state and wonderful people. We should be in control of our facilities and efficiently managing them. The first impression of our state should be a positive one.

Currently, taxis at Adelaide Airport are regulated by a taxi traffic light that turns from red to white to signify spaces in the first layoff and the main rank. This system does not work effectively at present. Often this light is red when there are spaces and white when there are not. A concierge system, which apparently worked well, ran for about six weeks and then was dropped. Perhaps this system could be improved by using a shared taxi system organised by the concierge. However, if a concierge system for the Adelaide Airport is not suitable, a replacement system is essential.

One way to double the pick-ups and, thereby, relieve the congestion, would be to allow taxis to pick up on both sides of the current rank and/or from the airport internal road running parallel to the taxi rank on the car park side. A barrier should be erected to prevent queue jumping. This would further reduce tensions. In addition, an enlarged shelter from the sun, wind and rain that encompassed the walkway from the terminal as well would be much appreciated by travellers. In other states, a shelter runs between the international and domestic terminals.

South Australia currently expects our visitors to walk just under one kilometre with their luggage over a poorly defined track, catch the Skylink bus that operates every half an hour, or hour, depending on the time, or pay a taxi fare of $6 to $6.50 between the domestic and international terminals. I am sure that our visitors do not appreciate this, nor do our taxi drivers. Drivers have often waited in line for the white light for up to an hour or more, and after taking this small fare between the two terminals they have to return to the end of the queue. Everyone knows that the wait for a taxi ordered for a short trip is often longer than the trip itself, and if most people's pay depended on fares they, too, would be reluctant to take on small jobs.

Recently, I booked a taxi to meet me on arrival, as I had business guests from Melbourne who arrived at the same time. The taxi was old and poorly maintained, and so was the driver. After almost backing over one of my guests as they were putting their luggage into the boot, he proceeded to Parliament House, where he refused the fare, stating that he was a hire car and that I would be sent an account. As I settled my guests in for our meeting, the errant taxi driver then arrived at the door with a parliamentary attendant to get payment, as he had been mistaken. I am pleased to say, however, that today I utilised the services of Adelaide Impressions, and the situation was much better.

Resolution of the taxi situation is imperative, and may involve a cooperative effort on the part of Adelaide Airport authorities, the taxi drivers, their companies plus local councils, SA Tourism and government. It is important for the economic viability of our taxi industry that we make it as efficient and cost-effective as possible. It is also important for our tourist industry, our businesses and the state's economic growth.

In Adelaide City Council's 2003 development plan, the corporate goal is to have 150 000 daily average visitors by 2010. Despite the recent setback in international travel, domestic travel is improving, and South Australia is not keeping pace. I commend the Adelaide City Council (and others who are working on the development plan) for its forward thinking. However, I hope that consideration is given by them and others for arrangements to upgrade the airport situation, as outlined, as quickly as possible, as a first step. Visitors to this state are the customers of our resources, and like any other customers we must provide them with good services, otherwise they will take their money and their business elsewhere. As Mr Roger Sexton from the South Australian Economic Board stated at the Business Vision 2010 meeting last Friday, visitors should step out of the plane at Adelaide Airport and know that they are in the most

efficient state—and wouldn't it be great to start at Adelaide Airport itself.

Time expired.

UNSOLICITED MAIL

Mr RAU (Enfield): I want to raise a matter today that has been brought to my attention by an elderly constituent.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RAU: He does not ride on a scooter—I believe they are called scooters, not gophers. In any event, this elderly constituent of mine has a problem that I think many members in this house might find that their constituents are experiencing. Quite frankly, I do not know the solution to this problem, but I will explain the problem and, hopefully, the parliament in its wisdom will find some way of dealing with it. My constituent, who is 90 years of age, received unsolicited mail the other day from an organisation based in Victoria. The name on the letterhead of this organisation is National Exchange Corporation Pty Ltd. This organisation apparently operates out of Roden Street, West Melbourne, and it is an organisation that apparently has as a director one David Tweed. I have seen things about Mr Tweed and his activities in the paper, but I thought he had basically done the right thing and stopped doing what he was doing, but it appears not. This letter, which is dated 5 May 2003, is apparently based on the fact that Mr Tweed, or his company, has had resort to the share register of a company called OneSteel, which, as many members would know, is an offshoot of the old BHP. Mr Tweed has ascertained that my constituent, as part of his modest retirement savings, has a small parcel of shares in OneSteel. The letter states:

> Dear shareholder,
> Offer to buy your shares in OneSteel Ltd.
> According to the register of members provided by OneSteel, you own 3 521 shares in OneSteel.

I believe that many of these shares were simply given to people who, at the relevant time, were BHP shareholders. The letter continues:

> As a licensed dealer in securities, we are pleased to make the following offer to shareholders. On the terms set out in this letter and the transfer form [which is attached], we will pay $2 112.60 for your 3 521 shares. No brokerage is payable by you if you accept the offer—you receive in total the amount shown above. Also, no stamp duty or GST is payable. . .

Goodness me, that is different from any other share transaction. Then there is a document attached. It has all been filled out: all that is required is for this individual to sign his name. The problem is that this particular 90-year old can still read the paper, and does, and thought that he might look at the paper and see what his shares in OneSteel were worth, according to the latest information published in the *Advertiser*. The information that he gleaned from reading the *Advertiser* the other day is that, on the day he received this offer, his shares were valued at $1.77 each. The offer was worth approximately 60¢ for each share. So, had he signed his name on this document and returned it to Mr Tweed, he would have done himself out of $4 119.57. This document also indicates that Mr Tweed is going to buy up to 4 million of these shares at this price. That is a profit of 4 million times $1.17 over the current trading range of this share. This is a disgrace!

I realise that anyone can offer to buy anything from anybody at any price and that that is part of the market system. However, in this case, people are being picked out of the share register to receive what appears to be an official document in circumstances where they may not understand that this simply amounts to a scam—something like letters from Nigeria to help my friend buy a new possum that you often get. This is a scam, and the sooner it is brought to the attention of the public (particularly, elderly people who may not understand that this is a rip-off), the better. People from a non-English-speaking background or people with some sort of a disability are receiving this document and thinking they should be signing up, and they are losing money. It is a disgrace!

EQUESTRIAN EVENTS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to encourage the government to continue discussions with the two lobby groups for the Adelaide International Horse Trials and Harness Racing SA. It is my understanding that the government is looking for events where it can cut expenditure. The Adelaide International Horse Trials and the South Australian round of the Interdominion Harness Race (to be held here in 2005) are two events that the government has looked at. I do not intend to blame anyone—when governments look at cost-cutting they have to look at events which, in the opinion of some people, are not returning much to the state—but, although not many people come from overseas to attend the Adelaide International Horse Trials, 50 000 South Australians attend this event on the Saturday to watch the cross-country event. That is 50 000 members of families.

Unlike some other events which the government puts money into—I will not name them here, but they are not exactly family events—the Adelaide International Horse Trials and the Interdominion Harness Race are family events. Just because it is associated with racetracks, the Interdominion is not only for adults. It is a spectacular thing to watch harness horses going around the track at speed under the lights of Globe Derby Park. I congratulate the Harness Racing Association of South Australia for the way in which it conducts its meetings. It is looking at ways of further developing the harness racing industry.

I am reliably informed that members of the Harness Racing Association have had a favourable reception from the government and that funding for this round of the Interdominion will be reconsidered. I hope that that reconsideration goes as far as reinstating this funding. I was at Morphettville on Saturday afternoon as a guest of the SAJC for the derby, and I note the minister was also at the racetrack. Harness racing, the gallops and other forms of equestrian events in South Australia contribute well over $1 billion annually to the economy, and there are nearly 5 800 full-time job equivalents in the equestrian industry in South Australia. So, I encourage the government to rethink its priorities in these areas. I am hopeful that the word I am getting on these renegotiations for both the horse trials and the Interdominion is that they are progressing favourably.

Let me tell you about the International Horse Trials. There are only four four-star horse trial events in the world, the Adelaide event being the only one in the southern hemisphere. The others are held in Badminton and Burley in England and Kentucky in the United States. A three-day event consists of dressage on the first day; on the second day there is the steeplechase and roads and tracks section, and then there is the cross-country event with which we are so familiar. This is the spectacular and courageous part where horses jump quite large obstacles. In South Australia, with design innovation, the safety of those obstacles has been

improved dramatically in accordance with safety improvements that are being adopted around the world.

The cross-country event is what the people go to see for the thrills and spills. Having ridden in cross-country events and had a few spills, I know they are not much fun for horse or rider, but it is certainly the most spectacular part of the event. Day 3 is the showjumping section. The showjumping section is a very important part of this three-day event. It shows not only the discipline of the horses to be able to jump in a much more collected and controlled fashion but also their athletic ability.

The new three-star event that is to come in this year will be (if not the first of its kind in the world) second after a trial run that may go ahead in Athens in September of the moderated four-star event where are there are no roads and tracks and no steeplechase, just cross-country. This will significantly reduce the costs for Adelaide, so the event can go ahead with a tremendous reduction in cost. I hope the government will see fit to continue this event. It is the last chance for our athletes to compete at a four-star level before going to Athens and a very crucial part of their preselection. I urge the government not to drop the Adelaide International Horse Trials.

Time Expired.

LIBERAL PARTY PRESELECTION

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Snelling: Back on his feet!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Back, and better than ever! On the weekend, the Liberal Party was involved in a vital death struggle between two opponents seeking the leadership of the party. According to my informants within the Liberal Party, this struggle was intense, personal and bitter, and the factional fighting has produced scars which I doubt will be healed for many years. Two candidates were involved, and it was a prelude to a fight that will occur in this house for the leadership of the party itself. In one corner were the moderates or the wets (the left of the Liberal Party) headed by Christopher Pyne, the federal member for Sturt, and the member for Bragg in this house, versus the conservative faction of the Liberal Party consisting of Senator Minchin and the member for Davenport.

I refer to the two opposing candidates in this struggle. Rebekah Rosser, with whom I had the pleasure of attending high school (I was hoping an Adelaide High old scholar would get into the parliament), was defeated by Ms Michelle Lensink on her fifth attempt to enter a parliament (whether state or federal). You have to commend her for trying; she really gave it a go.

The result was 140 votes to Ms Lensink (or the Pyne/Chapman force) to 101 votes to the Minchin/Evans force. The interesting thing about this is who would Ms Lensink support (once in this parliament) in a leadership ballot? Would she support the member for Davenport or the contender? I think it is fascinating to watch two people fighting over the dead carcass of the Liberal Party. It is like watching a car accident: it is terrible to watch, but you cannot look away.

Ms Lensink, who was endorsed by the outgoing former minister (Ms Laidlaw) in the upper house will, I am sure, make a very good member of the Legislative Council and do a great deal for her party, but this says a lot about the lack of influence that the Leader of the Opposition has within his own party. Ms Rosser works for the Leader of the Opposition. To me, it seems as if the Leader of the Opposition has completely lost control of his own party. The people running the Liberal Party now are the moderates, the wet group within the Liberal Party: that is, those led by the former premier (now deputy Leader of the Opposition) the member for Finniss, and the member for Bragg.

This is a huge blow to the member for Davenport's leadership credentials. If you cannot win a ballot in your own party, how can you be the leader of the party?

An honourable member: It's humiliating.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It is humiliating for him.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens has the call, but it sounds like there are a few little Sir Echoes in here somewhere.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Just as we described the Lindsay Tanner remark as the battle of the young and the restless, this could be described as the battle between the bold and the beautiful. I am not going to say who is bold and who is beautiful, but I am sure that they will work it out for themselves. The member for Bragg, who won so convincingly in a preselection on which she staked her career, was out there lobbying with Ms Lensink, doorknocking delegates and asking them to support this candidate. One has to ask: why does Ms Chapman want Ms Lensink in the upper house so much? Why was there huge trouble between the member for Davenport and the member for Bragg? It is because there is a leadership struggle going on in the Liberal Party. I want the Liberal Party to stay exactly as it is. I do not want to see Rob Kerin go anywhere. I want him to stay exactly where he is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member will use member's titles.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise, sir. I encouraged Ms Rosser to do all she could to get elected, because I wanted to see an Adelaide High School girl get into parliament. I am disappointed with the result, as I am sure are also the members for Frome and Davenport. We will have to watch this space. This week, the member for Bragg looks like the cat that got the cream. She is very happy with herself. I have noted her bragging in the corridors. My sources in the Liberal Party tell me that her time is coming: the strike is imminent. Any moment now the destabilisation will start, and the leaking will begin. The knives are out for her to make her move on the leadership.

CONSCIENCE VOTE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It is obvious that when a member has not been given a position and is unoccupied he has to resort to speaking about others.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I assure you that I am very happy with my position. Today, I want to congratulate the Minister for Urban Development and Planning (Mr Jay Weatherill), who came out to my electorate on Saturday and gave a commitment to save the memorial tree commemorated to Harold Holt, and I commend him for that. A committee has been established to examine options before 22 May. I thank the federal member for Sturt (Christopher Pyne), who joined me and Joe Frank, the former principal of Payneham Primary School, in promoting this issue and fighting for something that is an important part of our history. I look forward to this tree being saved. Perhaps it is just the beginning of what will happen

with Lochiel Park, which is just up the road, since we are talking about green consciousness.

I also want to talk about the conscience vote, an issue about which I know members opposite do not want me talk. If only the member for West Torrens could have a conscience vote and be as forceful in his party room as he has been today—

Ms Ciccarello: It's a democratic process.

Mr SCALZI: I include the member for Norwood here as well, because I know that they want a conscience vote.

Ms Ciccarello: What a load of nonsense.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood is out of her seat and out of order.

Mr SCALZI: On 2 April, I asked the Premier whether he had had strong representations from organisations, individuals and mainstream churches.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I believe that the member for Hartley is referring to a debate in another place, which I assume is out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member was referring to a question asked in this chamber. Is that correct?

Mr SCALZI: Yes, sir. I was referring to a conscience issue, which is not necessarily anything to do with any bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All right.

Mr SCALZI: I specifically asked whether anyone had sought a conscience vote, and the Premier said that he would check. He later gave me a written reply which stated:

> I have received letters advocating a conscience vote on the domestic co-dependents superannuation bill. I have also received letters in favour of the Statutes Amendment (Equal Superannuation Entitlements for Same Sex Couples) Bill.

What a comprehensive answer that is!

Mr RAU: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! As I understand it, the member for Hartley is quoting from a letter from the Premier to himself.

Mr SCALZI: No; I am quoting from a reply to a question I asked in the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought you said that it was a letter given to you by the Premier.

Mr SCALZI: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: On a point of order, the member for Hartley has just mentioned a bill currently being debated in the upper house and referred to the way in which members in this house and the upper house are voting. That is clearly out of order, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it is a matter before the upper house, the member for Hartley needs to be careful. However, I have not heard the member infringe the rules. I took it that the member was quoting from a response from the Premier.

Mr SCALZI: I seek your indulgence as to the time permitted, Mr Deputy Speaker. Obviously, the member for West Torrens is edgy. In answer to my question, the Premier said that he would check. He then gave me an answer which was not an answer: it was more a 'Clayton' answer from a 'Clayton' Premier. I say that because we want an answer. In a letter to a constituent the Attorney-General (Mr Atkinson) said:

> Thank you for your letter of 28 March 2003 about a conscience vote on legislation before Parliament to allow the survivor of a long-standing. . . .relationship. . .

In another letter, he said:

> Thank you for your letter of 12 March 2003 to the Premier, the Hon. M.D. Rann M.P., about a conscience vote on legislation before Parliament—

It is to the Premier.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member's own words are condemning him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! As I understand it, the member for Hartley is talking about a conscience issue. He is not debating the substance of a bill, so he is not infringing standing orders. The member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI: I am not surprised that they do not believe in freedom of speech when they do not have a conscience vote.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Will members allow me to complete my grievance speech? The Attorney-General's letter, referring to longstanding same-sex relationships, states:

> As the matter raised is within my portfolio, the Premier has asked that I respond on his behalf.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would say that some of the points of order have bordered on being unfair. In fairness, I will give the member for Hartley one more minute to complete his remarks.

Mr SCALZI: The Attorney-General then goes on to say that no-one has asked for a conscience vote, and I respect that. However, I refer to the national principles of organisation in the Labor Party constitution, as follows:

> On matters that are not subject to national platform or conference or executive decisions, or their state and territory equivalents, the majority decision of the relevant parliamentary Labor Party shall be binding upon all members of the parliament.

The case of a conscience vote not being given is like saying that a child has starved because it did not come to dinner. Either it is a private member's bill and members are given a conscience vote or it is a government bill and members adhere to the Labor Party constitution. I ask members either to stand up and ask for a conscience vote or admit they were not given one when asked.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, sir. The member for Hartley rose in this place and debated whether or not members in this chamber and the other chamber were voting freely on a bill before the house. Sir, did you rule that he is allowed to debate that issue and not the substance of the bill? Is that the ruling?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The chair is saying he is not talking about the substance of the bill but, rather, as I understand it, he is talking about the issue of the merits or otherwise of having a conscience vote. It is a separate matter and that is how I rule.

MOBIL

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): It is now over a month since Mobil announced it would be closing its refinery at Port Stanvac. This has been a very difficult month for the workers in the plant. It has been quite a difficult month for the Office of the Southern Suburbs, businesses in the area and, indeed, the many members of the Premier's task force, I am sure. It is vital that a sensible answer be found in relation to what is

happening at Mobil—that it is quite clear there is not an attempt to avoid a clean-up and that the land occupied by Mobil will be used to the benefit of the people of the southern suburbs. This could be because Mobil continues refining or resumes in a relatively short period, or because some alternative use is found for that land.

I can understand the stress that the families of the Mobil workers are enduring. Not only Mobil workers but also those workers who get some of their income or business from Mobil have been finding this period very difficult, I am sure. I can only urge everyone to cooperate fully with the Premier's task force to provide all the information they can to that task force so that a realistic decision can be made in the best interests of the current Mobil workers and the general interests of the people of the southern suburbs.

In the discussions about Mobil so far there has been no mention of yet another detriment to the people of the southern suburbs that may be experienced because of Mobil's winding up—if indeed that is the outcome. This detriment is the discontinuation of the Refining the Future program by which Mobil has supported many schools in the southern suburbs. The support has been financial and with expertise, and generally in kind. This program, which has continued since 1996, has been of great benefit to the schools involved. When I asked the general manager of Mobil whether there had been any opportunity to think about the future of Refining the Future, he said that it was on the agenda—that it was not at the top of the agenda (which I could quite understand) but that it was a matter they needed to consider.

I am standing here today to urge that, if Mobil wishes to have any continuing presence in the southern suburbs, it consider its continuing support for the Refining the Future program. This program started in 1996 with a contribution of about $US50 000. In 1997, $US75 000 was spread across four local high schools—Christies Beach, Morphett Vale, Wirreanda and Hallett Cove high schools. This funding has continued with slight changes in the amount and it has also been extended to include several local primary schools—John Morphett, Lonsdale Heights, O'Sullivan Beach, Hallett Cove South and St John the Apostle primary schools. In addition to this funding, for some time Mobil has presented prizes to some of the succeeding students at our various high schools. For instance, at Wirreanda High School, it provided the Mobil Adelaide Refinery Award as a special award to an outstanding student.

The types of things that have been possible in our schools include purchase of information and communications technology which these schools, being quite poor schools, would not otherwise have been able to afford, and of great value has been access to the expertise of staff and management at the refinery. Students have been able to explore the sorts of career pathways that are involved in Mobil. They find out what qualifications they need to get and how they can extend their qualifications by working there.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the final report of the committee be extended until Thursday 15 May.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ROAD SAFETY REFORMS) 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—After line 9 insert new clause as follows:

Minister to report on operation of Act

3A. The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after the second anniversary of the commencement of section 1, cause a report on the operation of the amendments contained in this Act to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

No. 2. Page 4—After line 14 insert new clause as follows:

Substitution of s. 74

7A. Section 74 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is substituted:

Duty to hold licence or learner's permit

74. (1) Subject to this Act, a person who—

(a) drives a motor vehicle of a particular class on a road; and

(b) is not authorised to drive a motor vehicle of that class on a road but has previously been so authorised under this Act or the law of another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth,

is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: $1 250.

(2) Subject to this Act, a person who—

(a) drives a motor vehicle of a particular class on a road; and

(b) is not and has never been authorised, under this Act or the law of another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth, to drive a motor vehicle of that class on a road,

is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: For a first offence—$2 500

For a subsequent offence—$5 000 or imprisonment for 1 year.

(3) For the purposes of this section, a person is authorised to drive a motor vehicle of a particular class on a road if—

(a) the person holds a licence under this Act that authorises the holder to drive a motor vehicle of that class; or

(b) the person—

(i) holds a licence under this Act; and

(ii) has the minimum driving experience required by the regulations for the grant of a licence that would authorise the driving of a motor vehicle of that class; or

(c) the person holds a learner's permit.

(4) When the holder of a licence under this Act drives a motor vehicle on a road as authorised under subsection (3)(b), the obligations imposed by section 75A on the holders of learner's permits and qualified passengers for learner drivers apply to the holder of the licence and any accompanying passenger with such modifications and exclusions as are prescribed by the regulations.

(5) Where a court convicts a person of an offence against subsection (2) that is a subsequent offence, the following provisions apply:

(a) the court must order that the person be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for such period, being not less than 3 years, as the court thinks fit;

(b) the disqualification prescribed by paragraph (a) cannot be reduced or mitigated in any way or be substituted by any other penalty or sentence;

(c) if the person is the holder of a driver's licence—the disqualification operates to cancel the licence as from the commencement of the period of disqualification.

(6) In determining whether an offence is a first or subsequent offence for the purposes of subsection (2), any previous offence against this section or section 91(5) for which the defendant has been convicted will be taken into account, but only if the previous offence was committed

within the period of 3 years immediately preceding the date on which the offence under consideration was committed.

No. 3. Page 5, line 21 (clause 12)—Leave out paragraph (a).

No. 4. Page 5, line 25 (clause 12)—Leave out paragraph (d) and insert:

(d) by striking out paragraph (a) of subsection (2) and substituting the following paragraph:

(a) in the case of an applicant who is under the age of 19 years—

(i) until he or she turns 19; or

(ii) until 2 years have elapsed,

whichever occurs later;;

No. 5. Page 6, lines 8 to 21 (clause 13)—Leave out paragraph (b).

No. 6. Page 7, line 13 (clause 15)—Leave out 'such' and insert:

a first offence or

No. 7. Page 7, lines 22 to 24 (clause 15)—Leave out subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and insert:

(i) in the case of a second offence—3 months; or

(ii) in the case of a third offence—6 months; or

(iii) in the case of a subsequent offence—12 months;

No. 8. Page 7, line 27 (clause 15)—Leave out "in the case of the expiation of a second or subsequent offence—"

No. 9. Page 8, line 2 (clause 15)—Leave out "subsection (2)(c)" and insert:

subsection (2)

No. 10. Page 8, line 6 (clause 15)—Leave out "subsection (2)(c)" and insert:

subsection (2)

No. 11. Page 8, line 11 (clause 15)—Leave out "subsection (2)(c)" and insert:

subsection (2)

No. 12. Page 8, line 17 (clause 15)—After "second" insert:

, third

No. 13. Page 8, line 21 (clause 15)—Leave out "period of 5 years" and insert:

prescribed period

No. 14. Page 8 (clause 15)—After line 22 insert new subsection as follows:

(8) For the purposes of subsection (7), the prescribed period is—

(a) in the case of a previous offence that is a category 1 offence—3 years;

(b) in any other case—5 years.

No. 15. Page 8—After line 22 insert new clause as follows:

Amendment of s. 96—Duty to produce licence

15A. Section 96 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (1) and substituting the following subsections:

(1) The driver of a motor vehicle, if requested by a member of the police force to produce his or her licence—

(a) must produce the licence forthwith to the member of the police force who made the request; or

(b) must—

(i) provide the member of the police force who made the request with a specimen of his or her signature; and

(ii) within 7 days after the making of the request, produce the licence at a police station conveniently located for the driver, specified by the member of the police force at the time of making the request.

Maximum penalty: $250.

(1a) The Commissioner of Police must ensure that a specimen signature provided to a member of the police force under this section is destroyed when the signature is no longer reasonably required for the purpose of investigating whether an offence has been committed under this Act.

No. 16. Page 9, lines 26 and 27 (clause 18)—Leave out subparagraph (i).

No. 17. Page 10—After line 20 insert new clauses as follow:

Amendment of s. 45—Negligent or careless driving

20A. Section 45 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting "negligently or" after "vehicle";

(b) by inserting at the foot of the section the following penalty provision:

Penalty: If the driving causes the death of another—

(a) for a first offence—$5 000 or imprisonment for 1 year; and

(b) for a subsequent offence—$7 500 or imprisonment for 18 months.

If the driving causes grievous bodily harm to another—

(a) for a first offence—$2 500 or imprisonment for 6 months; and

(b) for a subsequent offence—$5 000 or imprisonment for 1 year.

If the driving does not cause the death of another or grievous bodily harm to another—$1 250.;

(c) by inserting after its present contents, as amended (now to be designated as subsection (1)) the following subsections:

(2) In considering whether an offence has been committed under this section, the court must have regard to—

(a) the nature, condition and use of the road on which the offence is alleged to have been committed; and

(b) the amount of traffic on the road at the time of the offence; and

(c) the amount of traffic which might reasonably be expected to enter the road from other roads and places; and

(d) all other relevant circumstances, whether of the same nature as those mentioned or not.

(3) In determining whether an offence is a first or subsequent offence for the purposes of this section, only the following offences will be taken into account:

(a) a previous offence against subsection (1) which resulted in the death of another or grievous bodily harm to another and for which the defendant has been convicted that was committed within the period of 5 years immediately preceding the date on which the offence under consideration was committed;

(b) a previous offence against section 46 of this Act or section 19A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 for which the defendant has been convicted that was committed within the period of 5 years immediately preceding the date on which the offence under consideration was committed.

Insertion of s. 45A

20B. The following section is inserted after section 45 of the principal Act:

Exceeding speed limit by 45 kilometres per hour or more

45A. (1) A person who drives a vehicle at a speed that exceeds, by 45 kilometres per hour or more, the applicable speed limit is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: A fine of not less than $300 and not more than $600.

(2) Where a court convicts a person of an offence against subsection (1), the following provisions apply:

(a) the court must order that the person be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for such period, being not less than 3 months, as the court thinks fit;

(b) the disqualification prescribed by paragraph (a) cannot be reduced or mitigated in any way or be substituted by any other penalty or sentence;

(c) if the person is the holder of a driver's licence—the disqualification operates to cancel the licence as from the commencement of the period of disqualification.

Amendment of s. 46—Reckless and dangerous driving

20C. Section 46 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (b) of subsection (3) the following paragraph:

(c) if the person is the holder of a driver's licence—the disqualification operates to cancel the licence as from the commencement of the period of disqualification.

No. 18. Page 10, line 27 (clause 21)—Leave out "period of 5 years" and insert:

prescribed period

No. 19. Page 11 (clause 22)—After line 11 insert new subsection as follows:

(3) For the purposes of sections 47(4), 47B(4), 47E(7) and 47I(14b), the prescribed period is—

(a) in the case of a previous offence that is a category 1 offence—3 years;

(b) in any other case—5 years.

No. 20. Page 11 (clause 23)—After line 13 insert new paragraph as follows:

(aa) by inserting "third or" before "subsequent" in the penalty provision at the foot of subsection (1);

No. 21. Page 11, line 15 (clause 23)—After "subsection (1)" insert:

(other than a category 1 offence that is a first offence)

No. 22. Page 11, lines 19 to 35 and page 12, lines 1 to 4 (clause 23)—Leave out subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) and insert:

(i) in the case of a first offence—
  (A) being a category 2 offence—for such period, being not less than 6 months, as the court thinks fit;
  (B) being a category 3 offence—for such period, being not less than 12 months, as the court thinks fit;

(ii) in the case of a second offence—
  (A) being a category 1 offence—for such period, being not less than 3 months, as the court thinks fit;
  (B) being a category 2 offence—for such period, being not less than 12 months, as the court thinks fit;
  (C) being a category 3 offence—for such period, being not less than 3 years, as the court thinks fit;

(iii) in the case of a third offence—
  (A) being a category 1 offence—for such period, being not less than 6 months, as the court thinks fit;
  (B) being a category 2 offence—for such period, being not less than 2 years, as the court thinks fit;
  (C) being a category 3 offence—for such period, being not less than 3 years, as the court thinks fit;

(iv) in the case of a subsequent offence—
  (A) being a category 1 offence—for such period, being not less than 12 months, as the court thinks fit;
  (B) being a category 2 offence—for such period, being not less than 2 years, as the court thinks fit;
  (C) being a category 3 offence—for such period, being not less than 3 years, as the court thinks fit;;

No. 23. Page 12, line 6 (clause 23)—After "second" insert:

, third

No. 24. Page 12, line 9 (clause 23)—Leave out "period of 5 years" and insert:

prescribed period

No. 25. Page 12, lines 16 and 17 (clause 24)—Leave out the clause.

No. 26. Page 12, lines 20 to 32 and page 13, lines 1 to 20 (clause 25)—Leave out paragraph (a) and insert:

(a) by striking out subsection (2a) and substituting the following subsections:

(2a) A member of the police force may require—
  (a) the driver of a motor vehicle that approaches a breath testing station established under section 47DA; or
  (b) the driver of a motor vehicle during a prescribed period,

to submit to an alcotest.

(2ab) A member of the police force may direct the driver of a motor vehicle to stop the vehicle and may give other reasonable directions for the purpose of making a requirement under this section that the driver submit to an alcotest or a breath analysis.

(2ac) A person must forthwith comply with a direction under subsection (2ab).;

No. 27. Page 13 (clause 25)—Leave out line 20 and insert new paragraph as follows:

(ab) by inserting after subsection (2e) the following subsection:

(2f) A member of the police force may not, while driving or riding in or on a vehicle not marked as a police vehicle, direct the driver of a motor vehicle to stop the vehicle for the purpose of making a requirement under this section that the driver submit to an alcotest or a breath analysis.;

No. 28. Page 13, line 25 (clause 25)—Leave out "period of 5 years" and insert:

prescribed period

No. 29. Page 13, lines 27 to 35 (clause 25)—Leave out subsection (8) and insert:

(8) The Commissioner of Police must, not less than 2 days before the commencement of each prescribed period, cause a notice to be published in a newspaper circulating generally in the State and at a web site determined by the Commissioner stating the time at which the prescribed period commences and the time at which it finishes and containing advice about the powers members of the police force have under this section in relation to a prescribed period.

(9) In this section—

"long weekend" means a period of consecutive days comprised of a Saturday and Sunday and one or more public holidays;

"Minister" means the Minister responsible for the administration of the Police Act 1998;

"prescribed period" means—
  (a) a period commencing at 5 p.m. on the day immediately preceding the start of a long weekend and finishing at the end of the long weekend; or
  (b) a period commencing at 5 p.m. on the last day of a school term and finishing at the end of the day immediately preceding the first day of the following school term; or
  (c) a period commencing at a time determined by the Minister and finishing 48 hours later (provided that there can be no more than four such periods in any calendar year);

"school term" means a school term determined for a government school under the Education Act 1972.

(10) A certificate purporting to be signed by the Minister and to certify that a specified period was a prescribed period for the purposes of this section is admissible in proceedings before a court and is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matters so certified.

No. 30. Page 14, lines 7 to 14 (clause 27)—Leave out the clause.

No. 31. Page 14, lines 15 to 33 (clause 28)—Leave out the clause.

No. 32. Page 15, line 7 (clause 29)—Leave out "period of 5 years" and insert:

prescribed period

No. 33. Page 16 (clause 32)—After line 35 insert new subsection as follows:

(9b) Where a photographic detection device is operated for the purpose of obtaining evidence of the commission of speeding offences by drivers of vehicles proceeding in a particular direction on a portion of road, a person responsible for the setting up or operation of the device must ensure that the device is not concealed from the view of such drivers.

No. 34. Page 17—After line 7 insert new clause as follows:

Substitution of s. 79C

32A. Section 79C of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is substituted:

Interference with photographic detection devices

79C. A person who, without proper authority or reasonable excuse, interferes with a photographic detection device or its proper functioning is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: $5 000 or imprisonment for 1 year.

No. 35. Page 17—After line 7 insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of Division 7A

32B. The following Division is inserted after Division 7 of Part 3 of the principal Act:

Division 7A—Speed Cameras Advisory Committee

Interpretation

79D. In this Division—

"Committee" means the Speed Cameras Advisory Committee;

"Minister" means the Minister responsible for the administration of the Police Act 1998;

"Motor Accident Commission" means the Motor Accident Commission continued in existence by the Motor Accident Commission Act 1992;

"speed camera" means a photographic detection device used for the purpose of obtaining evidence of speeding offences;

"speeding offence" has the same meaning as in section 79B.

Establishment of Committee

79E. The Speed Cameras Advisory Committee is established.

Membership of Committee

79F. The Committee consists of 6 members appointed by the Minister, of whom—
  (a) 1 must be a person nominated by the Minister; and
  (b) 1 must be a person nominated by the Commissioner of Police; and
  (c) 1 must be a person nominated by the Motor Accident Commission; and

(d) 1 must be a person nominated by the Director of the Road Accident Research Unit of the University of Adelaide; and
(e) 1 must be a person nominated by the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia Incorporated; and
(f) must be a person nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia.

Terms and conditions of appointment

79G. (1) A member of the Committee will be appointed for a term of 3 years on such conditions as the Minister determines and will, on the expiration of a term of office, be eligible for reappointment.

(2) The Minister may remove a member of the Committee from office—
(a) for breach of, or non-compliance with, a condition of appointment; or
(b) for misconduct; or
(c) for failure or incapacity to carry out official duties satisfactorily.

(3) The office of a member of the Committee becomes vacant if the member—
(a) dies; or
(b) completes a term of office and is not reappointed; or
(c) resigns by written notice to the Minister; or
(d) is removed from office under subsection (2).

Functions of Committee

79H. (1) The Committee has the following functions:
(a) to inquire into—
(i) the effectiveness of speed cameras as a deterrent to speeding and road injury; and
(ii) strategies for deciding the placement of speed cameras; and
(iii) differences in the use of speed cameras between city and country roads; and
(iv) the relationship between fines collected for speeding offences, main arterial roads and crash blackspots; and
(v) the feasibility of putting all money recovered as expiation fees and fines for speeding offences detected by speed cameras into road safety initiatives; and
(vi) initiatives taken by the governments of other jurisdictions in Australia in relation to road safety; and
(vii) such other matters relating to the use of speed cameras as the Committee thinks relevant;
(b) to carry out such functions as are assigned to the Committee by the Minister.

(2) The safety of road users must be treated by the Committee as of paramount importance in the exercise of its functions.

The Committee's procedures

79I. (1) The Committee must hold at least one meeting in every 3 months.

(2) Subject to the regulations, the Committee may determine its own procedures.

Annual report

79J. (1) The Committee must, before 30 September in each year, prepare and submit to the Minister a report on the work of the Committee during the preceding financial year.

(2) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Expiry of this Division

79K. This Division expires on the third anniversary of its commencement unless, before that anniversary, both Houses of Parliament pass a resolution declaring that this Division will continue in operation after that anniversary.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

The government opposes this amendment to the definition of 'contract work'. This definition has been included for the purposes of new Division 8, 'Duties of persons performing contract work', to be introduced in the Public Sector Management Act by the suite of bills affected by this bill. Division 8 imposes obligations of honesty in respect of conflict of interest for persons performing contract work for government. It needs to be borne in mind that it imposes different duties from employees. The amendment passed in another place is opposed because it dramatically reduces the scope of the new Division 8 and creates a loophole whereby contractors can avoid compliance with Division 8.

The definition of 'contract work' prior to the amendment was broad enough to cover not only contractors but also employees of contractors, subcontractors and directors who perform work on behalf of company contractors—basically any person who could be performing contract work for the government. It follows that anyone performing contract work for the government would have been required to comply with the honesty and conflict of interest obligations in the new Division 8. It made no difference as to who actually performed the work. The effect of the amendment passed in the other place is that only the principal contractor would be required to comply with the obligations concerning honesty and conflict of interest in Division 8. Accordingly, as long as the contractor does not personally perform the work but engages someone else to do it—which one would expect to be almost invariably the case, or certainly very commonly the case—Division 8 would have no application.

Ms CHAPMAN: The opposition is pleased to receive this amendment from the other place. Obviously, after careful consideration of some of the significant defects of this legislation, both the government and opposition parties looked at a number of amendments, and many of those with which we will be dealing this afternoon will be agreed.

In relation to amendment No. 1, it is clear that in the government's original bill the Public Sector Management Act was amended by inserting a definition of 'contract work', as the minister has outlined. The new definition was as follows:

'Contract work' means work performed by a person as a contractor or as an employee of the contractor or otherwise directly or indirectly on behalf of a contractor.

The significance of this amendment can be appreciated when one looks at the new provisions in Division 8. Clause 6ZC creates a separate duty on a person performing contract work for a public sector agency or for the Crown to act honestly in the performance of that work. I point out that this is not a new duty: it already exists in the general law. If a person—that is, any person—acts dishonestly in the performance of contract work, they are already subject to the criminal law. Clause 6ZD contains a requirement to disclose actual or potential conflicts of interest.

The opposition has lost the debate and now accepts the obligations imposed upon contractors who perform work for the public sector. Not only can those obligations be easily identified but contractors can be easily informed of their obligations because they are a known party to the contract in terms of the work being undertaken by them. These people can be clearly informed of their obligations. For example, they can be given written notice when they tender for the job, and the requirements can be set out in the contract documents. So, that is a relationship which is clear and concerning which the obligation can be clearly identified.

However, it is far more difficult to inform people who are employees of contractors or subcontractors, because they

cannot always be made easily aware of these obligations. Very often, these employees and/or subcontractors may not even be aware that they are actually undertaking public sector work and, indeed, that work could be very short lived. They may be quite transient in connection with the work they are undertaking for only a very short period or for a very specific project. Let us take an example of work which may be undertaken for the public sector. It may involve the education department in connection with the building of a school. Some of that work may be undertaken in the metropolitan area of Adelaide—in a factory in Wingfield—by a subcontractor and subsequently transported to an outlying regional part of South Australia.

An employee who might come in on a casual basis for a day for the subcontractor who is undertaking this work may not have the slightest clue that the walls he is putting together on this day are associated with work being undertaken for the benefit of the public sector by a government department. It is quite ludicrous to expect that person for this short time to be aware or informed of such an extremely onerous obligation. Therefore, we suggest that the obligation should not extend beyond the contractors themselves. The extended categories—that is, the employees of contractors or subcontractors—still continue to be covered by the criminal law and, accordingly, it is proposed that the words 'or as an employee of the contractor or otherwise directly or indirectly on behalf of a contractor' be deleted.

I think it was made fairly clear in the principal debate on this matter in the other place—and, indeed, a number of these issues were canvassed in this chamber—that the primary aim is to ensure that we do not cast the net far too wide and create an onerous and impossible obligation to inform, and we do not impose an obligation that is impossible to comply with. Accordingly, the opposition endorses this valuable addition by the amendment that comes from the other place.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In trying to grapple with the example that has been given, it should not be the case that people are surprised about having a duty to act honestly. That is not something about which one should be surprised or necessarily require direct notice. Secondly, the way in which the act copes with the conflict of interest provisions for contractors is to limit them in their scope. It takes contractors into account by limiting the scope of the conflict of interest provision. Further, one needs to have notice of the relevant interests, so the situation of the unpleasant consequence postulated in the example would not arise.

The committee divided on the motion:

AYES (26)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Caica, P.
Ciccarello, V.	Conlon, P. F.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hanna, K.	Hill, J. D.
Key, S. W.	Koutsantonis, T.
Lewis, I. P.	Lomax-Smith, J. D.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
O'Brien, M. F.	Rankine, J. M.
Rann, M. D.	Rau, J. R.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M. G.	Weatherill, J. N. (teller)
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

NOES (19)

Brindal, M. K.	Brown, D. C.
Buckby, M. R.	Chapman, V. A. (teller)
Evans, I. F.	Goldsworthy, R. M.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Matthew, W. A.
McFetridge, D.	Meier, E. J.
Penfold, E. M.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

Majority of 7 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendments Nos 2 to 8:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 2 to 8 be agreed to.

Ms CHAPMAN: Those amendments are agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 9:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 9 be disagreed to.

Subsection (4) was included as a precautionary measure to enable unforeseen and unintended consequences to be addressed. It would, for example, have enabled a board member who is specifically appointed from a particular group to represent the interests of that group from having to continually disclose a conflict in that regard following ministerial notice in the *Gazette*. Whilst the bill contains a provision enabling the Governor to exempt by regulation, it is considered appropriate to retain the clause in question because some advisory bodies are not established by statute and, hence, are not recognised at law in that fashion. For this reason it would be irregular to introduce regulations concerning them. Also, advisory bodies established administratively—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Government Enterprises will come to order. The minister cannot be heard, and it is an important issue.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Also, advisory bodies established administratively may, on occasion, need to be established quickly and for a finite period. Exemption by regulation does not necessarily fit comfortably with this scenario. Essentially, I think what is suggested by those upstairs is that the regulation provision is adequate to provide this level of exemption. We are saying that there are some informal, ad hoc committees that are not established by statute where you may need to simply deal with it by way of notice in the *Gazette*. So, it is an administrative measure to allow easier dealing with those more informal bodies.

Ms CHAPMAN: This is the second amendment moved by the Liberal Party to clause 21 of the bill. It specifically inserts a new division, division 4, headed 'Duties of advisory body members' (proposed sections 6K, 6L, 6M and 6N) which imposes duty on advisory body members, that is, duties to act honestly and to declare and avoid conflicts of interest. 'Advisory body' is defined as: 'unincorporated body comprised of members appointed by the Governor or a minister (whether or not under an act) with the function of providing advice to a public sector agency'. I refer to clause 18, page 15, line 3.

Proposed section 6L provides that the advisory body members have a duty with respect to conflicts of interest. However, subsection (4) of section 6L provides:

> The relevant minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, exempt an advisory board member (conditionally or unconditionally) from the application of a provision of this section, and may, by further notice published in the *Gazette*, vary or revoke such exemption.

The Liberal Party in the other place has successfully moved for the removal of this power of exemption. It seems extraordinary that the government would want to cast this net, far too wide, as has been clearly indicated in the course of debate on this matter, and then attempt to come in and administratively deal with this matter, based on the fact that it has captured so many. This is all the more reason, we suggest, that this is exactly the reason why it should be dealt with by regulation and not in the gazetted proposal.

This appears to be a very significant power of exemption from the duty of advisory board members with respect to conflict of interest. These are obligations that carry a heavy fine for non-compliance. The simple device of publishing a notice in the *Gazette* that a particular member is not obliged to comply with these requirements is, we suggest, totally inadequate. Such a notice is not an instrument that has to be laid before houses of parliament and can be disallowed. It is inappropriate to have this way of exempting people from obligations. This government has set the obligations. This government has to deal with the fact that it should follow the proper process to allow for that exemption.

It is interesting to contrast this exemption provision in section 6L(4) with the general exemption that is in section 6ZF. In the latter case that exemption is by regulation. It is very clear to be in regulation. It is a formal process that is subject to parliamentary scrutiny, and any regulation can be disallowed by resolution of either house. All regulations are considered by the Legislative Review Committee. We identify that contrast. This is an exemption here by ministerial decree, and it is entirely inappropriate, as I have indicated, that such a blanket power be made available in relation to advisory body members. We seek this house's support for the amendment of the other place.

Mr BRINDAL: I would like to ask the minister why a government that is committed to open and accountable government would seek not to support the amendment moved by my colleagues in another place. The member for Bragg puts a compulsive argument. If in fact this government wishes to be open and accountable, why should any minister have the power to exempt someone because of a conflict of interest? I think this is a very important issue raised by the member for Bragg, and I think this house deserves an answer from the minister. If he will not support it, why will he not?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The member for Unley makes a silly point-scoring point on what really is just an administrative matter. If the honourable member had listened earlier to the points being made, he would have heard there are some bodies of an advisory nature—I am sure he set up many of them—relatively ad hoc committees, that may be set up for a finite period of time. They may not be appointed by statute but simply be advisory bodies but, because of the provisions of the act, they will be captured by the obligations to account either in terms of honesty or in terms of conflict of interest. Because these will be specialist bodies, because they will be formed of and from people who come from the relevant interest in question, there will be a conflict of interest every moment they sit.

Rather than have that absurd situation, rather than wait for a long time while we actually promulgate and take through a cabinet process, a parliamentary process, a regulation, this provides a simple administrative means of ensuring that the minister can exempt them—in a proper case—from these provisions. There is no running away from accountability or honesty: this whole bill is directed at these matters. It is a churlish point.

Mr BRINDAL: First, I would ask you, sir, to instruct the minister that he has no right in debate to assign to me motive: churlish is a motive, and cheap point-scoring is secondly a motive. Notwithstanding that, I still do not believe that he has made a compelling point. I will remind the minister, along with everyone else, that I do enjoy a vote in this house. The Premier made the point in question time today that he wants bipartisan support. If the government wants bipartisan support from the opposition, there is not a person here who does not remain to be convinced. I tell the minister that the minister has not yet convinced me. If this conflict of interest—I'll wait till you finish having your conversation so you can hear the question so you can give me an answer.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It's not a question: it's a dummy spit.

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

Mr BRINDAL: If the minister is worried because a professional conflict of interest will be held to be a conflict of interest (and this is a problem we face, too), then perhaps what needs changing is not the minister's power to exempt people but the definition of 'conflict of interest'. It has been held by members on this side of the house, and I think by some members opposite, that the definition of 'conflict of interest' can be taken to be so wide at present as to catch the wrong people, and no person can sit on any committee for any reason. The way to sort that out is not to give the minister some sort of godlike powers of exemption but to fix the definition of 'conflict of interest'.

The committee divided on the motion:

AYES (26)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Caica, P.
Ciccarello, V.	Conlon, P. F.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hanna, K.	Hill, J. D.
Key, S. W.	Koutsantonis, T.
Lewis, I. P.	Lomax-Smith, J. D.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
O'Brien, M. F.	Rankine, J. M.
Rann, M. D.	Rau, J. R.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M. G.	Weatherill, J. N. (teller)
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

NOES (20)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A. (teller)	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Matthew, W. A.	McFetridge, D.
Meier, E. J.	Penfold, E. M.
Redmond, I. M.	Scalzi, G.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.

Majority of 6 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Legislative Council's amendments Nos 10 to 13 agreed to.

TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

I regretfully move that the amendment be agreed to. This bill was passed by this house in November last year, after a prolonged debate about the treatment of Australian workplace agreements in the bill. The bill was subsequently amended by the Legislative Council to enable Australian workplace agreements to be used for the employment of apprentices and trainees under contracts of training, and has now returned to this house. I do not need to restate in detail the government's concern over AWAs: that has been expressed at length in this house and in the other place during the debate on the bill. Suffice to say that there is a growing concern that some employers appear to be using AWAs to reduce employment costs and/or conditions of apprentices and trainees and/or to access commonwealth employment subsidies, without any real intent or commitment to the training of their trainees. AWAs also have the potential to undermine the state's ability to effectively protect the interests of trainees, who are often young people undertaking employment for the first time. In particular, there is evidence of some employers who see AWAs as a way of circumventing the disputes resolution mechanism provided in the state's apprenticeship legislation.

The government's concerns over the use of AWAs for the employment of apprentices and trainees remains undiminished. In that regard, I wish to record the government's dismay over the position taken by the opposition on this matter, particularly since the bill as it relates to AWAs was identical to the bill put forward by the current opposition when in government. However, I see little prospect of reaching a compromise on the amendment, and I refrain from withdrawing the bill altogether because, as I mentioned in my second reading speech, it contains a number of other measures that will enhance the planning and quality of vocational education and training and adult community education in the state, including the apprenticeship system.

These measures—these completely new protections—are that a person under a contract of training must be employed in accordance with a bona fide award or industrial agreement; employers must seek approval for contracts of training; the commission can decline to approve a contract of training on certain grounds; and there is protection for existing employees. In addition, penalties for employers who fail to comply with the employer's obligations specified in the contract can be brought to order, and the disputes committee can take account of non-wage remuneration when determining payments to apprentices and trainees arising from disputes. In addition, the disputes committee can refer matters to other competent bodies.

There are, in addition, strengthened safeguards for those involved in this system. In particular, the employers must be approved, and the approval of employers can take a broader range of factors into account than under the current act. Also, that approval can be withdrawn, and contracts of training are subject to a range of conditions. The disputes mechanism is improved by taking into account non-wage remunerations and the ability to refer those matters to other bodies, particularly the Industrial Relations Commission; and, in addition, there is an early sign-off feature, which is more flexible and consistent with competence based training. Other protections and safeguards that were in the VEET act remain unchanged. I therefore move that the amendment be agreed to.

As a partial offset to the effect of this amendment, I wish to advise the house that I am considering ways of ensuring that employers, apprentices and trainees are aware of their rights and obligations under contracts of training and that they comply with the terms of their contracts. The purpose is to increase the successful completion rates for participants in the training system and to reduce the number of cases that result in disputation.

In closing, I think it needs to be made absolutely clear that it is the Liberal Opposition that has gone back on its word and forced the use of AWAs into the training system in South Australia. Today we are passing a bill that will substantially improve the training system in South Australia, and that is why I am prepared to move, with regret, that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr BRINDAL: The longer one stays in this place, the more interesting it becomes. The minister is quite right: the bill, as it comes back here, is not the bill that I presented to the house in the last government, and it differs only in respect of AWAs. The minister full well knows that the only reason why the AWAs provision was left out of the original bill was to have a compromise with which Trades Hall could agree. My advice from my officers at the time was that the law of Australia still applied and, therefore, it would not make a lot of difference. I am not sure on that advice, but I am sure that, in the spirit of compromise, we introduced the bill, and that then, finding ourselves in opposition, we no longer were forced to compromise and we could argue on matters of principle.

The minister knows that an AWA is a principle in the Australian parliament set out by my party. The minister also knows that, in this place, we argued vigorously and long for AWAs. The minister, who could control the numbers in this place, refused to accept that fact. The minister refused to see that, in the other place, our point of view might prevail, and it did. So, now we have the unfortunate situation of coming back here—and at least the minister is big enough to admit that the bill is too important to lose, and is prepared to accept the position laid down by the Liberal Party in this house, and laid down again by the Liberal Party in another place and supported in that place by a majority of the members. Perhaps in the future, when such a bill comes before this place, we can save a lot of the time of this place if the minister will listen to what the opposition is saying—and count.

The government whip laughs, but the government whip knows as well as we that the only thing that counts in this place is votes—and votes in two places; and, if you cannot get it through two places, you compromise. In this case, a compromise is right. The minister is prepared to make it. I acknowledge that because I, like her, quite frankly, would be doing the same thing. This is a good bill, because it was prepared by a Liberal government, in the main. It was actually prepared by the officers. It is an excellent bill. It is a way forward for training, and no government should want to lose this bill.

Having said that, I will not detain the house for long, but I want to keep in the forefront of our minds the points made by the minister. The minister elucidated a number of points that give the very protection that she seeks. Whether or not members on this side of the house and members of the

government agree on the principle of AWAs is a matter of political difference and a matter for debate, but I think both the government and the opposition do not want to see young people disadvantaged in their training opportunities, whether through AWAs or traditional apprenticeships.

I am surprised that this legislation has come back in this form, because in the interregnum I received strong representation from Janet Giles and a delegation from Trades Hall on this matter, and a number of practices were explained to me, some of which did not make me happy. If the minister wishes in a bipartisan way to approach the federal minister and say that there are things in respect of AWAs that should be changed, I am quite prepared to talk to her and to assist, because, as the minister would know, nobody is supposed to be disadvantaged by an AWA. Janet Giles and others have presented at least prima facie evidence to me that perhaps there are employers in this state who are deliberately using AWAs to disadvantage young people. I think I can say categorically that that was not the intention of the Liberal government in Canberra, because if it was I would not be very proud to be a member of the Liberal Party. I do not think those people are so lacking in integrity that they would deliberately disadvantage people.

The thing that also appears to be a very moot point—not for us but for the commonwealth, and therefore I think the commonwealth may do well to consider this—is that, as the minister knows, there are special protections in law for people who take on apprenticeships. Apprentices have minimum conditions laid down by the law. I believe it is a technicality that under AWAs traineeships are not seen as apprenticeships. An apprenticeship is very narrowly defined in the law as an old traditional means of training. Plumbers, butchers and all the old traditional jobs are referred to, and those who take on the new forms of apprenticeships (traineeships in IT and 100 emerging industries) are referred to as trainees. Simply because they are not called apprentices, technically they are not covered as apprentices and therefore they fall outside the net. I do not believe this is a problem for this house: it is a problem for the federal government, one which I hope the minister will take up with her federal counterpart. I will help, and I hope my whole party will help.

I return to the argument on principle: is AWAs a legitimate interest? We say, yes; the government clearly says no; and the minister is now prepared to concede that we hold the numbers and she does not want to lose the bill. We do not think that AWAs should be used to discriminate or be wrongly used against young people in their training or apprenticeship. As it has been demonstrated to me that that might happen, I will support the minister and this government in any undertaking with the federal government, because I cannot see that any changes to the law that they make would be other than minuscule. All you have to do is say that, henceforth, traineeships equal apprenticeships, and the minimum protections apply.

I conclude by saying to the minister that I wish her luck with this legislation. The test will be in the final result, because I remind the minister, without going into too much detail, of a person whom she has asked on a number of occasions (for good reason) to represent her in Whyalla or go with her. I will tell the minister the name of this person afterwards unless she wants me to put it on the record now, but I do not think that is advisable. For instance, this person went to the small business meeting in Whyalla when the minister was speaking at Port Lincoln.

Because there was a dispute at one stage, this person was disallowed as a trainer. Despite the fact that she had been training in Whyalla for about 30 years, she was put through an elaborate process and, at the end of the day, she was reinstated as an appropriate trainer. She is also the Vice-President of the Spencer Institute of TAFE. So, the minister had someone willing to train, an approved trainer who was basically put through the wringer for 12 or 18 months and then finally reinstated.

I wish the minister and her new committees good fortune, because I think that was quite a scandal. You do not take a trainer and put them through the ringer for 12 months and then reinstate them, because that suggests to me that either there was no case in the beginning or it was a flimsy case and this person was wrongly and badly dealt with. This state cannot afford to treat employers like that and then say 18 months later, 'Sorry, we were wrong; you start again and be a good person and keep doing the training that you were doing before.'

I conclude my remarks by saying that this is an excellent bill, because it removes certain inherent conflicts. The proposition was put that, in a sense, the judge and the jury were the same body. This amendment splits those roles. The new board can set up the equivalent of a disputes resolution committee at arm's length. This will result in a better process than the one we had before. I hasten to say that—it might have been your legislation, Mr Deputy Speaker—there was nothing wrong with the old act. In essence, it was a good act, but this is better—a new act for a new millennium which improves on the old act. In so far as there were some things in the old act that we could do better, I think this act is a giant step forward. I congratulate the minister not for admitting that she was wrong—I did not hear her say quite that—but she did admit that she could not count and that, in deference to a bill that is a good bill, she is not prepared to do it. So she should be congratulated for that. Therefore, we support the minister's position.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I thank the member for Unley. I am pleased that he stepped back from the brink and did not name RTOs or trainers who might have been before ARC or DRC or been involved in some dispute. I am also relieved that he stepped back and refrained from naming members of staff, as he has done in the past, because he has felt aggrieved about their decision-making ability.

Mr Brindal: I would have if I'd felt like it.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I think it is proper that you don't. Having said that, I cannot say how delighted I am to hear the member for Unley recognise that there are apprentices and trainees being badly treated. In previous discussions he has shown some faith in the 'no disadvantage' test and has not remembered (as do I) the constant series of cases going across my desk where people have been truly disadvantaged in their training schemes. I have been shocked to see the number of young people who have no understanding of the contract that they have entered into. Their parents have not been aware that they have been in a training scheme; they have not been aware that by entering into one traineeship they were precluded from further traineeships down the line. They have not understood that they had the right to be paid for the first 13 weeks of their traineeship. They had not appreciated that the hourly rate they were paid was discounted by somehow averaging out the number of hours that a notional full-time employee might be engaged in, adding on the overtime hours, and then dividing it by the number of

hours undertaken to suggest that the low levels of pay were fair and equitable in some of the fast food outlets.

There were also very plausible (as he says) accounts of large numbers of employees in some businesses making a mockery of the idea that there could be anyone left in their business even to train the number of trainees who were allegedly part of a training scheme. Those tales, which I think are salutory ones, tell us quite clearly that the no disadvantage test is not truly in place and that there are many young people and people of a mature age who are disadvantaged, unable to claim their rights, disempowered, and adversely treated by the implementation of AWAs across the community.

I will not go into all the cases, because we have already discussed that at great length. However, it is my intent to enhance our training and apprenticeship management role by increasing the ability to have advocacy and to have specific measures that will support trainers, trainees and employers and ensure that disputes are listened to early on and action is taken, so that, if any pattern of abuse emerges, prompt action is taken to effect those opportunities for unscrupulous employers.

I am particularly grateful to the member for Unley for his magnanimous and generous offer to go with me to the commonwealth government to discuss those ways in which we might better run the 'no disadvantage' test for the good of our young trainees, and I will certainly take up his offer. I will share the stories and the information I have, and I will share the information that we get out of our new enhanced advocacy role within the department. I will certainly go with him to Canberra to try to make the situation better for South Australian trainees and apprentices.

Mr BRINDAL: On coming to office the minister herself would have said, 'This is the way I want things done.' I can absolutely assure the minister, subject to one of her officers correcting me (but I do not think that they will), that my ministry was conducted in such a way that rarely did I ever see the detail. I certainly remember no case of any individual student being disadvantaged. If they were there, they were not handled at my level, and I was never aware of them. So, if I supported unreasonably the 'no disadvantage' test, it was because I was not aware of specific instances.

One spectacular instance on which we acted very strongly related to an agricultural group which was purporting to offer training to agricultural people. They would go to the farmer and say to his wife, 'You can be a trainee', and the wife would be paid and the farmer would be made the trainer. The whole thing was a rort. Probably after being far too generous with them—because rural training is very difficult to obtain, and it was one of the few firms trying to offer it (or saying it was)—we basically stomped on them from a great height. However, that was not a personal instance; it was a generic case. Generally speaking (and I am not saying that the minister should not or that I would not have been interested in those cases), those cases did not appear across my desk, and I was not aware of personal instances.

In conclusion (and the minister will learn this), normally I never mention officers in this place. However, I know that I did, because I believed at the time (perhaps wrongly), and still do, that, where an officer takes a decision to do something that is not a decision made by the minister and enters the political arena and acts in a way that might be construed to be political by the minister herself, the minister has a redress. The minister simply telephones the officer or the officer's head of department. An opposition member who has been the minister has no such redress. When you do see, during the change of one government to another government, something which you think might be a bit political, I believe that is the one instance when there is some right to say, 'This is what I think, and this is who I think is involved.'

If I have wronged that person, I am sorry, and I will apologise to that person. I do not know that I have; I do not think that I have. I therefore name them not from the point of view of picking on that person, but there is a process. The process is that I was the minister and you, minister, are the minister. In the change between government, it is very important for everyone to remember that public servants serve the government of the day. They do no service to the previous government or the new government if there is a time when the minister is perhaps new and not quite across things when they whip in one or two little decisions that perhaps the minister might not have made in six months' time and the minister in the previous three years would not have made.

I do not want to say any more about this. I am not seeking to elaborately defend myself, but I am saying to the minister and to this house that I do not normally mention public servants. I will continue not to mention public servants unless I feel that it is warranted, and I believe that is what the freedom of parliament is about.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I am very happy to take back the member for Unley's apology to the officer who was named and whose credentials were impugned. I am very happy to apologise to that person on his behalf. Can I suggest that, if the former minister was not aware of the injustices done to apprentices and trainees, it just shows the advantage of having an open and collaborative relationship with the union movement. I am sure that if the member had known Janet Giles as well as he obviously does now, and trusted her opinion and advice about these issues, it would have been good had he known and discussed these matters sooner.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

WIND POWER

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Wind energy is the world's fastest growing energy fuel and an abundant and inexhaustible resource. Since 1995, generating capacity has grown 487 per cent world wide, yet South Australia has not embraced this valuable energy resource with the enthusiasm I believe it should have.

Technological advances make the large-scale production of electricity from wind turbines one of the most attractive forms of producing energy from renewable resources. Using fossil fuels to generate electricity is becoming a thing of the past in other Australian states. We should ensure that South Australia is not left behind the other states, particularly through its insistence on taking up the regulated SNI interconnector providing dirty coal power from New South Wales. Instead of investing in jobs in New South Wales, we should be investing in the new wind industry in South Australia and encouraging companies to build wind farms and their components here. The same funding as is proposed for the building of the SNI interconnector put into a regulated line on Eyre Peninsula would encourage 1 000 megawatts of

wind power and $1 billion in private enterprise venture capital expenditure.

A report by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu completed in December 2002, and still not officially released by the state Labor government, provides an insight into what South Australia could be doing. The economic impact analysis on wind generation developments on the Eyre Peninsula undertaken by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu found that wind farms in that region could have a total economic impact of billions of dollars for this state. This is a far cry from the perceived benefits of the Labor government's so-called key initiative, the SNI interconnector. The study found that Eyre Peninsula had a consistent wind pattern and abundant land that were both ideal conditions for efficient wind supply. However, severe limitations were found with the transmission infrastructure servicing the area.

The region currently contributes more than $1 billion into the state's economy. Economic output will continue to increase, and I estimate that it could double to more than $2 billion within 10 years, with the further upgrading of the electricity infrastructure and the provision of desalinated water. The investment in infrastructure would create a substantial demand for goods and services throughout South Australia and significant induced activity.

The report analysed a number of scenarios for the configuration of wind energy on Eyre Peninsula, with the minimum installation of 175 megawatts, rising to a maximum installed capacity of 1 000 megawatts on Eyre Peninsula and 500 megawatts in the rest of the state. It outlines in scenario five a total economic impact of local manufacturing activity during the construction phase of $4.72 billion to this state. I understand that the potential to build a minimum of 100 turbines could entice an overseas turbine manufacturing company to build a factory in Australia. Let us make that South Australia. Already we are hearing that South Australia is being left behind, with Tasmania and Victoria gaining foreign investment to build these manufacturing plants in their states. Applications for 50 jobs at the new Tasmanian Wynyard Vestas factory for nacelle assembly and fibreglass components have now closed. It may be too late already for South Australia.

The potential of such developments would add to the region's economic prospect. Hundreds of new jobs would be created in the region during construction and operation, with local manufacturing industry being boosted. The $65 million Starfish Hill wind farm has been estimated to generate 160 new jobs and contracts awarded to South Australian based companies of $25 million. Other industries will benefit. For example, expansion of the fishing and aquaculture industry and an increase in the availability of electricity could have an estimated economic impact of $67.5 million per annum and provide over 800 new jobs.

Wind power would remove the constraint on many potential developments in this state, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, in industries such as mining, fishing, aquaculture and agriculture. Recently, I asked AusMalt executives why they were not considering Port Lincoln as a site for expansion of their malting activity, as the region produces much of the state's malting barley. Their immediate response was lack of power. The environmental benefits from wind farms have been well documented and demonstrated throughout the world. The wind farms planned on Eyre Peninsula could significantly contribute towards achieving the federal government's mandatory renewable energy target, unlike the SNI interconnector, which has a capacity to produce about 2.1 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions. The Premier was quoted on 30 April as saying that the Starfish Hill wind farm will prevent 2.5 million tonnes of CO_2 being released into the atmosphere. I know which energy I would prefer to have powering my home. The Minister for Energy himself acknowledged in parliament that SNI provides no benefit to South Australian consumers when he stated that if Heywood and MurrayLink were fully despatched 'you would not be despatching any down SNI'.

Another Labor MP recently said that she resents getting petitions on energy price hikes but feels she has no options. Again, I think the Premier has already given her the option in his recent speech on the Starfish Hill wind farm. Action is now needed to assist the six other wind farms already approved by government or councils and promoting those that are on their way. The Deloitte Touche Tomatsu report also states that development of this magnitude would have the potential to create a downward pressure on electricity prices in South Australia, reduce the reliance on interstate coal powered generators and lead to additional export of wind energy, technology and components. Overall, the study concluded that the investment in wind farms and the upgrade of the transmission network has a substantial economic benefit for Eyre Peninsula, South Australia and the country of potentially more than $4 million combined, without taking into account the other industries that may be stimulated.

The current government of South Australia needs to grasp this opportunity to lead the rest of the country in renewable energy. They need to hear that the electors in South Australia do not want dirty power from another state that will keep costs up. They need to recognise that this fantastic opportunity is about to pass them by. The proposed regulated $110 million SNI interconnector, which has been independently estimated to actually cost about $200 million, utilises an outmoded method of power generation. The government must ensure support for the powerlines required on Eyre Peninsula and the rest of this state to bring South Australia to lead in wind power energy generation in Australia and, indeed, in the world.

Motion carried.

At 5.15 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 13 May at 2 p.m.