

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 7 March 2007

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (EXTENSION OF TERMS OF OFFICE) AMENDMENT BILL

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

MINING BOOM

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I have a major announcement to make to the house. I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The international focus on South Australia's mining boom is gaining momentum. The most eminent authority in the world to survey mining company activity—the Canadian-based Fraser Institute—has just released its latest survey for 2006-07, which shows that South Australia's mineral sector is now a world pacesetter. Just three years ago it ranked South Australia as 18th on a list of 65 jurisdictions throughout the world in terms of our mining prospectivity. So, it was 18th in the world, and last year we moved up to sixth position.

Today I can announce to the house that South Australia has moved up again, and we now hold fourth position in the world for mining prospectivity—fourth in the world out of 65 mining jurisdictions. The survey contains other good news.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What?

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You want to compare it to when you were in power—I think it was 30 something. This is very important, because it also ranks South Australia fourth in terms of attractiveness of mining policies (the top-ranked Australian state) and equal first in other categories, including:

- political stability;
- labour relations;
- geological database; and
- security.

It also ranked South Australia:

- the best Australian state in terms of certainty in the administration, interpretation and enforcement of existing regulations;
- the best Australian state for environmental regulations; and
- the best Australian state for 'best practice' mineral potential (with only a 2 to 3 per cent room-for-improvement factor).

This is further evidence that the world is becoming increasingly aware of our state's enormous mining potential. Importantly, the survey also reinforces the success of the minerals and resources sector initiatives introduced by this state government. It is led by the hugely successful Plan for Accelerating Exploration (PACE) initiative, which has attracted many large exploration companies to come to South Australia to look at what mineral riches we have here in this

state. Our PACE initiative has sent a very loud message to the world's mining companies that South Australia is pro-mining and pro-business.

More than 300 international exploration, development and mining consultancy companies participated in the 2006-07 Fraser Institute survey, representing about 14.5 per cent of the \$US7.13 billion spent globally on exploration in 2006. The survey covers 65 jurisdictions on all continents except Antarctica, and includes sub-national jurisdictions in Australia, Canada and the United States. The state government's PACE program has produced very encouraging results since its inception in 2004. The success of PACE can also be measured by the fact that other states are now starting to duplicate the initiative. Significant discoveries have been made with PACE contributions—

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order: normally, when ministers have leave to give a ministerial statement, they provide the house with copies of the statement.

The SPEAKER: It is a courtesy thing.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very pleased that members opposite want to read the fact that we are now fourth in the world in terms of mining prospectivity, as opposed to somewhere in the distant thirties under the Liberals.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We just heard them say they can't believe it. The Fraser Institute, the world authority in Canada—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—gives South Australia the big tick, says we are fourth in the world, and they do not believe it because they do not want to believe it, because they are not on South Australia's side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on questions, I bring to members' attention the presence in the gallery today of students from Annesley College (guests of the member for Unley) and students from Westminster School (guests of the member for Elder).

QUESTION TIME

HOLDEN

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. During discussions with Holden regarding the \$3.4 million worth of government assistance provided to support the production of the Pontiac G8 model, was the government advised that production could be moved to North America if the model proved to be a success? Yesterday the Treasurer advised the house that claw-back provisions had not been included as part of the \$3.4 million deal with Holden because the funding was not for employment, maintenance or production support. Instead, the Treasurer advised the house that the money had been provided to assist Holden to build on its unique capability in large-wheel drive vehicles such as the Pontiac.

Today it has been reported that Bob Lutz, Production Development Chairman of Holden, has confirmed that this unique capability will be lost by December next year when a platform for the production of the Pontiac will be opened in Canada.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): What a lazy opposition! What a lazy Leader of the Opposition! The depth of research by the opposition for question time is picking up the Adelaide *Advertiser*—

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of order, sir. There is no basis on which to reflect on the opposition's question. Question time is for answers from the government.

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not need a lecture from the deputy leader. The Deputy Premier does not help things by making reflections on the virtue of the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise, Mr Speaker. It is just that when I read *The Advertiser* in the morning before question time I know what the questions will be. The Leader of the Opposition is wrong to say that yesterday I did not allude to the fact that there are certain milestones and trigger points that General Motors has to meet for the provision of this money. As I said yesterday, there are a number of milestones and trigger points in this agreement, which requires GMH to meet certain obligations. These obligations pertain to research and development expenditure and the introduction of technology into its vehicle fleet. Clawbacks may occur if these milestones are not met.

Is the Leader of the Opposition honestly suggesting that his Liberal colleague Ian Macfarlane would put in \$6.7 million, the Victorian government would put in \$3.4 million and we would put in \$3.4 million so that Holden could produce the car in North America? Is he honestly suggesting that Ian Macfarlane is that dopey? Does he honestly expect me to believe that his federal colleague is that dopey? I am happy to defend this government in this parliament, and from time to time I am prepared to defend the integrity of a Liberal. In this case I am prepared to defend the integrity and the common sense of the industry minister in Canberra, who would not have provided \$6.7 million—nor would we have provided \$3.4 million—if, as the leader is suggesting, it was somehow going to fund the production of a car in North America. What a silly question!

INTERNATIONAL TOURISTS

Mr PICCOLO (Light): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What is the state government doing to encourage international visitors to South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): As the honourable member knows, international tourists are particularly important in South Australia and in the past year South Australia has definitely been punching above its weight. The numbers have just come out for the year ending December 2006, and I have to say that the figures have been outstanding. This has not happened by accident. We have put a \$1.5 million investment into cooperative marketing programs because one of the ways of getting tourists to South Australia is to recognise we need extra flights. We have such a low percentage of international inbound flights. We have worked very hard to go from 13 inbound flights a week to 24 inbound flights a week, with increased flights from Malaysian Airlines, Singapore Airlines and Air New Zealand to Auckland. These are important ways of using our \$240 million new airport.

Above all, we have to put in marketing dollars in order to get the seats filled. These cooperative marketing campaigns have been in the key markets that bring tourists to South Australia; that is, New Zealand, the UK, United States, Hong Kong, Singapore, Germany, France, Italy, China, Taiwan and Japan. Our marketing efforts in New Zealand have been

particularly successful in 2006-07 and we have used them to leverage those brilliant flights by Qantas and Air New Zealand, the latter being linked to the United States with about 16 or 17 hours flight time from Adelaide to the West Coast of the United States. It is a very attractive flight for inbound operators.

SATC has been spending approximately \$500 000 a year on brand marketing for our new brand that was introduced last year. We particularly work with wholesale travel partners and the airlines that bring in flights, going through television, radio, press and online means. In addition, we have signed an MOU with Singapore Airlines to help market jointly in Europe and South-East Asia. We are particularly pleased with the extra flights from Singapore Airlines. They have been announced as daily flights now which provide more opportunities and options for visitors.

I particularly want to mention the latest international visitor numbers. I said that we had outperformed the rest of the states. Whereas across Australia there has been a 1 per cent increase in 2006 over 2005, we have achieved a 9 per cent increase in the number of visitors coming from international origins. This is an extraordinary performance, well ahead of the rest of the country where the average is 1 per cent. In particular, we hit 7 million bed nights during the last year—a very important figure—and South Australia has actually delivered more international tourists to our state in the last year than ever before on record. This is a great achievement.

It is worth mentioning that 2007 will also be a good year. Last year built on the back of the Australian tourism exchange in June, which was not just a short-term opportunity but a long-term opportunity to market internationally, and this year is shaping up to be a stellar year. We have had not only the Tour Down Under but a whole range of cricket events; we are also about to have the Fringe and WOMADelaide.

We have had a stellar Clipsal season and, within the next two weeks, the biggest ever event in South Australia will occur: the World Police and Fire Games. This is an extraordinary biennial event and we expect 8 000 competitors from around the world and a massive influx of international tourists. In addition, these competitors come with colleagues and travel companions. This event will certainly change the streets of Adelaide. Every hotel will be booked out and we expect a massive income through our hotels, pubs and restaurants.

There will be some stellar competitors. As we know, these events are open to retired former firemen and policemen as well. This event will lead into our first International Rugby 7's event this year, which will provide an extraordinary opportunity for people to see world-class rugby. Of course, throughout the year, we will have the Australian Cattle Drive and our first new arts event for this year, the International Guitar Festival. This event is not just a first for Australia; it will be partnered with a stellar event from New York and attract international tourists to an event which is truly world-class. This year will again be an exciting one, but we should congratulate the whole industry for an amazing 2006: it has been a brilliant blend.

HOLDEN

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer think that the then industry minister Holloway's statement to parliament that 2 000 jobs at Mitsubishi provided employ-

ment for some 6 000 was correct, or was it based on no facts, no modelling and no logic? Yesterday when asked about the extra job losses that may flow from Holden's reduction of 600 jobs, the Treasurer said that my figures were based on no facts, no modelling and no logic. Component manufacturers have announced cuts of 70 jobs today. In June 2005, then industry minister Holloway stated in regard to Mitsubishi jobs:

It still employs in excess of 2 000 South Australians. But more importantly than that, through its demand for components, it provides employment for... about three people for every one who is employed at Mitsubishi. Even in its downsized state, you are still talking about 6 000 jobs.

The question yesterday was based on the government's own figures.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The absurd nature of that question leads me to believe that the opposition is gloating about and delighting in job losses and somehow wants it to be dramatic in the way in which it—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, the way in which you make up things. The deputy leader could not have said it any better. The simple facts are these. The job losses that are occurring at Holden's are regrettable. With the export plan that Holden's is putting in place to export the G8 to the United States, it is confident that production will sustain itself at levels of around about 135 000 to 145 000 units. That still equates to a substantial amount of economic activity in this state.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: What are you doing for the second and third tier suppliers?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What does the leader suggest? What are we doing for the second and third tier suppliers? Let us put that question to Ian Macfarlane, the federal industry minister. What does the leader expect the government to do?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: What we are asking for is an extension of the tariff.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly. The leader could support us in that, for a start. Do the Liberals support us in extending the freeze on the tariff reduction? Do they support the government's position on tariffs? No, they do not. That is one practical measure we are putting forward to support the automotive industry, and the Liberals in South Australia do not support us. Unemployment in this state has rarely been lower than it is today. The demand for skilled labour is extraordinary. Only this morning, prior to coming into parliament, I was briefed by major mining company Oxiana on its outstanding Prominent Hill production. It has 1 000 construction jobs and 400-plus direct jobs once the mine is operational. The reality is we are seeing a structural shift in the nature of our industrial base in this state.

Ms Chapman: You should apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have to learn not to respond to her. She is really quite annoying.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: She is so witty!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That is why she left the courts.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes. The reality is that we will do all we can as a government, together with the national government, to assist an industry in transition, but we cannot,

as the leader would suggest, somehow further subsidise or somehow start buying cars. What practical solutions would the leader put forward, if he has some practical solutions, instead of making short-term political mayhem? He should come forward with practical solutions and I will sit down and listen to him.

ADELAIDE FILM FESTIVAL

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Can the Premier advise the house about the outcomes from the Adelaide Film Festival?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister for the Arts): Don't tell me: they don't like the mining boom and now they don't like the Film Festival. It is amazing. What do they like? They do not like their own company. They do not like each other. So, what do they like? The Adelaide Film Festival 2007, after only its third event, has made stunning progress. It has more than fulfilled the promise as an event of both national and international standing, and it has achieved critical acclaim both nationally and internationally. The critics have been attentive, realising that, as a festival that not only shows films but also invests in them, the Adelaide Film Festival has a uniqueness worth celebrating.

If you do not want to listen to the opposition, let us hear what people interstate are saying. The Melbourne *Age* headlined one of its reports with the words 'Festival fast attaining classic status'. Garry Maddox of *The Sydney Morning Herald* described our film festival as one that 'has clearly overtaken the Sydney Film Festival in just its third biennial outing'. In *The Australian* today, Noah Cowan, co-director of the Toronto International Film Festival (one of the biggest in the world, along with Cannes), was attributed as saying that the AFF has attracted the notice of international festival curators, not least for its investment in film production. He was also quoted as saying:

It [the AFF] has a robust way of intersecting with other cultural art forms and exploring the intellectual possibilities of cinema.

What is more, and most importantly, audience response to the festival has been fantastic. The festival has realised the potential of the vision of nurturing the production of creative and challenging films rather than just screening them. There are 1 500 international film festivals around the world, and only a tiny number invest in films. Our first baby was *Look Both Ways*, and was virtually a clean sweep of the AFI awards in 2005. Our second was Rolf de Heer's *10 Canoes*, with another virtual clean sweep of the AFI awards last December, including best film and best director. Of course, both those films were featured at the Cannes Film Festival, with *10 Canoes* receiving a special jury award.

The investment through the Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund has once again generated terrific rewards. This third festival included no fewer than 12 films made with the support of our own investment fund, many of which have also benefited from the assistance of the South Australian Film Corporation. The gritty family drama *Boxing Day*, the compelling story of Norma Khouri in the documentary *Forbidden Lies*, the short film *What the Future Sounded Like*, Rolf de Heer's latest film, a black and white silent comedy, *Dr Plonk* (with perhaps the greatest Australian cast since *Breaker Morant*), *Lucky Miles*, the very sad *Home Song Stories*, produced in conjunction with Film Victoria, *Kalau-papa—Heaven, Words from the City*, *Crocodile Dreaming*, *Spike Up*, *Sweet and Sour* (which was the local company, the

People's Republic of Animation, in conjunction with the Shanghai Animation Film Studios), and *Swing* were all a tremendous success and were helped to fruition by our fund.

Our success in this area has clearly spurred Victoria, with Melbourne's equivalent, the Melbourne International Film Festival, recently announcing the creation of a similar fund. Apart from Australian success stories, the festival also included the latest and best movies from around the world. The festival presented 17 world premieres, 54 Australian premieres, 65 feature films, 24 documentaries, 32 compilations and 29 short films from over 44 countries—films from China and Germany, from Chad and Paraguay—covering all manner of subjects and genres. The huge success and positive critical response is reflected in terrific patronage. Of course, we do not yet have the final figures for the festival, but I am delighted to announce to the house today that initial figures indicate that attendances were around 25 per cent up on the previous festival. In a crowded cultural calendar, the festival's bold yet accessible programming, along with its choice of venues, ensured that one-third of all sessions had attendances of 80 per cent or more, with over 20 per cent being completely sold out. In total, the festival achieved attendances of over 46 000 over the 11-day period, I am advised.

There were so many stirring and very different elements of this festival. For example, there was the hugely successful Australian International Documentary Conference, with people from all around the world making pictures—people from South America and France, and even New Zealand—and the Fringe component of that conference. There was the Crossover event, which brought together the film and new media sectors to brainstorm new projects, there was the South Australian Short Screen Awards and there was the implicit promotion of the creative and technical ability of the South Australian film industry. There were 12 major forums, 17 free events, five free gallery exhibitions, 34 international and 130 Australian film industry guests who participated in illuminating discussions after the films as part of think tanks, laboratories and forums across the program, and the thoughtful judging of the inaugural Natuzzi International Award for Best Feature Film.

For the overall excellence of the festival I would like to thank Cheryl Bart, Chair of the AFF board, all members of the Film Festival Board and Katrina Sedgwick, whom I have reappointed to be the director of the next festival for 2009. I am sure—I hope—that all members opposite would join me in congratulating the festival. Our festival has become a destination for those who think about movies as well as love them, and I am sure every member is looking forward to the next festival.

VICTORIA PARK REDEVELOPMENT

Mr PISONI (Unley): Will the Treasurer explain what he meant when he said to opponents of the Victoria Park grandstand, at the Rundle Mall information day, 'I'll fix you'? Today I received two statutory declarations, one from Mr Michael Hudson—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: —and one from Mr Philip Groves, who were both attendees at the state government's public consultation in Rundle Mall in relation to the Victoria Park development. Excerpts from Mr Hudson's declaration state:

While Mr Kevin Foley was being interviewed by the electronic media in his role as a Government Minister he was interrupted on several occasions by protesters, including members of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association, and the general public. At one stage he turned away from the cameras and shouted, 'I'll get you; I'll fix you.' These remarks were addressed to nearby protesters, of which I was one.

Mr Groves states:

The heckling was quite run-of-the-mill type heckling, and in my opinion, Mr Foley reacted violently, at one stage threatening members of the public around him stating 'I'll fix you. You're the rudest group I have ever encountered!' Spittle was actually flying from his mouth and he appeared out of control.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Unley has gone beyond what is necessary for the explanation.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The grub from Unley. The Leader of the Opposition has not got the guts to ask me that question. The Leader of the Opposition will not stoop that low to ask that question; he gets the grub from Unley. I am glad there are a couple of stat decs because, once I have time to speak to my legal advisers, those stat decs may well come in handy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If the members opposite want to support the behaviour that occurred on that Sunday, I am happy, because I will tell you what happened. For a start—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If, as the grub from Unley says—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Point of order. In the last week of sitting, you—

The SPEAKER: I know what the point of order is.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: All right. I would like it withdrawn, please.

The SPEAKER: I know what the point of order is; it is disorderly to refer to the member for Unley as a grub. I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw that comment.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I withdraw that, sir. Was the suggestion that, while the cameras were rolling, I turned around and said to somebody, 'I'll get you. I'll fix you'? With four cameras rolling I reckon that would have been the story that night, if that is what actually occurred. As I said, I will be seeking some legal advice on the article that has appeared in the Messenger Press. Members opposite support this behaviour because, as I was giving the press conference, my press secretary was standing behind and to one side of me.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry, 'hiding' did you say? I would have thought physical violence towards a woman was something you would not condone. My press secretary was shoved. I initially thought she had been punched, but she had been shoved by one of the parklands protesters—physical violence to a woman in public. If members opposite condone that, they are disgraceful. I also say to the deputy leader that one woman from that protest group walked all of 15 metres towards my partner (who was well away from the press conference over by the Myer shopping centre) and abused her and her family. If the deputy leader thinks that is behaviour that should be condoned, then she is a disgrace.

They are the two things that happened on the day. I do not recall saying what these people allege I have said. If I had said it in front of a camera, that would have been the story that night. I reject that. I deny that. I have no recollection of

that at all, and I will take it up with my legal advisers. If the grubs opposite want to come into this place and—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir. You have already ruled on this matter. I seek an apology and withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Yes. It is disorderly to refer to members collectively or individually as grubs.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will withdraw. I will just conclude on this point: that if any protester commits an act of physical violence against one of my staff, and if any protester abuses my partner, I will be upset and disappointed and will express that. But I did not threaten anybody on that day.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SUSTAINABLE ENERGY

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. What is the state government doing to encourage research and development of sustainable energy projects for South Australia?

The SPEAKER: The cameraman in the gallery is reminded that he is only to film members on their feet.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Science and Information Economy): I thank the member for Giles for her question on this very important issue that is vital to our state's environmental and economic future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members wish to have a discussion, take it outside the chamber. Do not continue a discussion while a minister is attempting to answer a question from a member.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you, sir, and I again thank the member for Giles for her question. I know that the honourable member takes an active interest in sustainable energy projects in her vast electorate and beyond. The South Australian government is committed to actively encouraging research and development of sustainable energy projects, with the Sustainable Energy Research Advisory Committee (SENAC) program providing valuable support to innovative initiatives. SENAC provides research and development grants for competitive sustainable energy projects through the Premier's Science and Research Council, specifically projects that have strong commercialisation prospects, environmental benefits or the potential to reduce costs for South Australian energy consumers.

SENAC's priorities are to facilitate the further development of sustainable and renewable energy technologies, including demand side management technologies which enable more efficient use of energy. This is particularly important at times of peak energy demand and assists in reducing energy-related greenhouse gas emissions. SENAC also aims to encourage the development of competitive South Australian industries and to foster collaboration between our state's academic institutions and industry. This year the South Australian government has awarded grants totalling over \$194 000 to the following projects: \$43 650 to Rinnai Australia and project partner CSIRO Technology for their project 'Solar thermal micro power and hot water'.

Mr Venning: Where?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Rinnai have a manufacturing plant in Adelaide—to answer your question, Ivan; you only have to wait—that produces gas and electric-boosted solar hot water systems. This project aims to convert solar energy into electricity in order to power appliances such as aircondi-

tioners and heaters, which can be especially valuable during periods of peak electricity demand; again as Ivan would know. The School of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Adelaide will receive \$75 000 for its project 'Optimised engine fuel injection strategies for bio diesel combustion'.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: You may. This project aims to develop injection technologies for alternative fuels that have low emissions, fuel economy and high performance. The University of South Australia Sustainable Energy Centre will receive \$34 130 to continue its project on the development of innovative commercial cooling systems for stationary and transport applications, incorporating phase change materials. This work aims to produce an innovative technique for refrigeration in trucks by using phase change materials to maintain cargo at desired temperature levels throughout a trip. Finally, \$41 558 is for the development of a residential solar thermal system for Adelaide conditions which combines hot water generation, heating, cooling and dehumidification.

These grants will support sustainable energy research projects, with a total estimated value of \$946 000. The South Australian government remains a leader in its pursuit of innovative ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and the more efficient use of energy supplies.

TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I have really missed the Minister for Transport, but I have a question for him. Will the minister now withdraw his accusations and apologise for falsely accusing me of misleading and telling lies to the public of South Australia? Yesterday, the minister claimed in a Dorothy Dixers arranged from his own side that I misled the South Australian public regarding the government's limited additional funding for public transport services. However, at the very moment the minister was speaking, my office fax upstairs was burning. A fax received from the officer concerned contradicted the minister and included the following statements:

Having read the transcript it is obvious that I was at cross purposes with you during the interview.

I now realise that you were referring to the additional funding provided for public transport services. My comments immediately after yours were directed to TransAdelaide's annual capital program and maintenance spend as is clear from the text quoted. . . It was not my intention and it never has been to engage in political debates with members of parliament or candidates for public office. If my answer to the journalist's question caused you offence, please accept my apologies.

You can't even get your Dorothy Dixers right.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): As the member for Waite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has not even begun to answer the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I know, sir, and he doesn't want to hear it. Let me make the point again, since the member for Waite did not understand it yesterday. He took offence because he had finally told the truth about the \$10 million. That was the point I made. He finally admitted it was new money after saying in September last year that it would not match inflation, and again, later in September last year, saying it would not match inflation despite the fact that he had been told—and it was made very clear—that there had been an additional \$6.6 million in that very year for extra

costs. So, I repeat: he misled the public of South Australia on two occasions, and he took umbrage because he finally told the truth. He finally told the truth because somebody argued with him, and he took umbrage. Let me just repeat for the member for Waite: he lied to the people of South Australia about the \$10 million on two occasions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Speaker, that is not appropriate. The word 'lied', as you know, is simply not on from a minister of the Crown.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will have to withdraw the accusation of lying.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Let me withdraw and say this then: when he told the people of South Australia that the \$10 million would not match inflation, he was not telling them the truth. He was not telling them the truth on, I think, 13 September and he was not telling them the truth in his budget address. The second time he must have known what the truth was and still he did not tell it. The reason he took umbrage the other day is because he finally did tell the truth and now he wants some credit for it. He said, 'How can he say this? I'm finally telling the truth; I've finally got it right.' So, Mr Speaker, I do not retract a single thing I said. If you like, I will come back here on a daily basis and reveal a whole load of other misinformation that the member has provided the people of South Australia.

I was present during a speech the member for Waite made to SARTA. Do you know what he told them? That their government started building the airport. I mean, excuse me! The man suffers from delusions. He served in the Middle East and perhaps the sun got to him. He suffers from delusions. He misled the people of South Australia on two occasions and he wants some credit for finally telling the truth—I don't think so.

MINDA INCORPORATED

Ms FOX (Bright): My question is to the Minister for Disability. How is Minda spending some of the \$15 million once-off money granted to it in 2005?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability): I thank the honourable member for her question. I was very pleased that she was able to see for herself some of the wonderful work that Minda does in our community. Minda provides services and support for more than 1 100 people with an intellectual disability, accommodating 340 adults on campus and 204 adults in the community. The state government provided a \$15 million one-off payment to Minda to support its Project 105—a process in which 105 people are being moved into supported accommodation in the community. This \$15 million for Minda comprises three parts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport and the members for MacKillop and Waite will have their turn. While the minister is answering a question from another member, I ask the three of them to show some courtesy.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The \$15 million comprises three parts: the first component is \$3.9 million for capital works, and the second component is to purchase 48 commonwealth aged care licences so that Minda can more appropriately care for its elderly clients. The other advantage of this process is that it frees up 48 beds and allows us to take people off the urgent waiting list and into those beds. The third and remaining component is the purchase of 14 group

homes to provide enough space for five people to live. I had the pleasure of opening one of those group homes last Friday. As I said, the member for Bright was there, as were other representatives of the community.

There is nothing like seeing the face of someone with a disability who is finally able to have a home of their own. In fact, when I walked into the new group home, one of the residents greeted me and said about 20 times, 'This is my home now.' So, he had got the message, and it was just wonderful to see the pride on his face. What we know from experience is that their health and wellbeing dramatically improve. Ironically, it is one of the pressures on our system, but having people with disabilities living longer and happier lives in our new group homes is a wonderful pressure. Of course, it is a sense of relief for their families to know finally that they have a settled place to live.

Through Project 105, Minda is providing homes to nine people who have been urgently waiting for supported accommodation, and the state government is committed to doing more to support the families on that waiting list. In the most recent budget, the Treasurer announced that there would be 40 more places in group homes and 375 extra packages of supported accommodation in our community. The state government has created a single waiting list for people needing supported accommodation, and it has also made a \$21 million investment in the Julia Farr Housing Association, a disability organisation that is now providing housing services. Since coming into office, there has been 36 per cent extra recurrent funding and over \$40 million in one-off funding for the disability sector. There is a long way to go, but we have made an important first step.

TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Why is the Minister for Transport not providing morning radio talkback interviews and instead requiring senior government officers to respond on his behalf to concerns regarding the government's management and plans in the transport portfolio? During 2007, the minister has not provided regular interviews for morning radio talkback. Instead, senior officers, including Rod Hook, Heather Webster and Bill Watson, have been required to address concerns regarding the government's management and mismanagement plans in the transport portfolio.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I was on FIVEaa just a couple of weeks ago pleading with the member for Waite to ring in and have that debate with Leon Byner. I do not know whether you know Leon Byner. Have you heard of him? Anyway, I was in the studio taking calls for half an hour; one of the calls, of course, was you. You said, 'I'd really love to debate the minister, but the phone might drop out.' So I am not quite sure what the honourable member is talking about. If he is talking about those other radio people to whom someone (not I) has referred as 'gibberers', then it is my understanding that I will be in their studio, live, next week, and I invite the member for Waite to ring in this time; I would very much enjoy having a discussion with him.

Regarding the accusations of mismanagement in the portfolio (and the honourable member has been around talking a lot about cost estimates that go wrong), I have to confess to something: I have discovered another road project

where the estimate of costs was grievously wrong. In fact, it is worse than any estimate we have seen so far. I refer, of course, to the estimate made by the opposition when, prior to the election, it committed to duplicating the Victor Harbor Road and said it would cost \$130 million. We took the opposition to task on that, but members opposite defended the figure and said that the RAA supported their costing. In fact—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They hate having to listen to things like this. The member for Waite was out there again in December last year calling on this government to commit the \$130 million needed to duplicate the Victor Harbor Road. The problem is that in February, just two months after Marty costed it at \$130 million, the RAA (which supported the opposition's costing estimate, remember) was out calling for the duplication of the Victor Harbor Road. Chris Thompson of the RAA, when asked what it would cost, replied, 'It would obviously cost a lot of money, but the full duplication of the road, it's really hard to say because of the terrain, but we are looking at \$300 million plus.'

So the member for Waite has been in here talking about mismanagement, saying that the government should not get estimates wrong, but when is he going to apologise? The member for Waite is a stickler for getting it right on the public record, so when is he going to apologise for costing a \$300 million plus road at \$130 million just two months ago? Does the member for Waite still believe that it costs \$130 million? He is the one who wants a debate: does he still believe it costs \$130 million? The member for Waite is stonily silent about something on which he was out in the public arena about two months ago. The fact is, when it comes to estimates he has got it more wrong than anyone ever has: \$300 million plus in February and \$130 million in December, and the poor old RAA has been verballed for the original costing. Whenever the member for Waite (and I cannot refer to him as I would like to because it would be unparliamentary) gets up to talk about mismanagement, I thank God that he is not in charge.

SECURITY INDUSTRY

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General inform the house of the impact of amendments to the security industry legislation that came into force just over one year ago?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I can, and I am pleased to tell the house that the changes made to the law on crowd controllers have worked out as the government had hoped. I can recollect that when the legislation was introduced there were Cassandras who said that there would not be enough doormen, who predicted huge increases in the cost of employing crowd controllers; some said that the new laws would not make much difference. However, I am pleased to say that the impact of the crowd controller legislation has been as this government expected. Our aim was to rid crowd controlling of violent men, men with links to motorcycle gangs and men who use mind-altering drugs or drink alcohol on the job. I think I speak for both sides of the house when I say it was our intention to improve the safety of all who frequent licensed premises that use crowd controllers. The new laws were designed to do that. They provided for fingerprinting, random drug and alcohol testing and a ban on bouncers charged with offences including drugs and firearms.

Since their introduction in December 2005, the amendments have had a big impact. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has advised me that nearly 3 200 of the state's 7 900 crowd controllers have surrendered or failed to renew their licences. In addition, OCBA has cancelled the licences of another 18 bouncers who tested positive to drugs, including amphetamines and cannabis. Another 12 have had their licences revoked for refusing to take a drugs test. Two were banned for drinking alcohol at work and another 60 were banned for refusing a fingerprint test.

I hope we do not hear any more scoffing about this legislation. I well remember my feeling of disbelief in May 2002, only three months after Labor won government, to be informed by police that over 60 per cent of crowd controller firms operating in the CBD were linked to outlaw motorcycle gangs. Some who opposed the measure, such as the Democrats and their sidekick Dr Arthur Veno, told us that Steve Williams of the Gypsy Jokers had much to contribute to the criminal justice debate and that outlaw motorcycle gangs were being unfairly maligned by the Rann Labor government. I am wondering what the Democrats have to say about that today and, since the Democrats believe that those traumatised by the Eyre Peninsula bushfires should be prescribed ecstasy, I do not suppose their lone representative in parliament has any objection to such a therapeutic substance being sold under crowd controller supervision in our nightclubs.

We can see now that, after a short 14 months, a problem that has been evident with doormen forever is well on its way to being rectified. The critical statistic is that over 40 per cent of the state's crowd controllers have voluntarily left the industry or been banned from it. To my mind, this amounts to a comprehensive and highly effective crack down on rogue elements in crowd controlling and has made our state a safer place for every South Australian, young or old.

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is again to the Minister for Transport. Is the government working secretly to develop a new plan to extend the Northern Expressway west of Port Wakefield Road to connect to the Port River Expressway as an alternative to the now abandoned upgrade and widening of a 10-kilometre stretch of Port Wakefield Road and, if so, when will details regarding the planning be released?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Once again, the stickler for the facts has got it wrong straightaway. The widening of Port Wakefield Road has not been abandoned. He is simply not telling the truth about that. Do we have secret plans? I do not know what you mean by secret, but do we look at a wide range of options into the future? Yes, we do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: So what if we were? We will be looking at a whole load of options into the future and many of them will not be done—that is the nature of planning and the nature of looking at options. The one thing I will say is that at least we are building infrastructure. Again, the stickler for facts was down there, and he started talking about the Liberal Party's efforts. He said one of their achievements is the South-Eastern Freeway which, of course, was entirely funded by Laurie Brereton from a great Labor government. The other one he mentioned was the one-way freeway, and he said that, as soon as they got enough money, they were going to build it both ways. At least we are building infra-

structure; at least we are planning for the future. Once we do tell people we are going to do something, we generally do it—not like you mob. You told people for 12 years that you would extend the tramline down North Terrace, and then you ran and hid as soon as someone made some noise. Yes, we do look at a lot of options, and we are proud to do it.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question is again to the Minister for Transport. Why has the work being done by the government to develop a new plan to connect the Northern Expressway to the Port River Expressway taken place behind closed doors and not been publicly announced? The opposition has been advised by a number of sources that planning to connect the Northern Expressway north of Port Wakefield Road to the Port Adelaide Expressway has been undertaken confidentially and without public knowledge.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, so what? We have looked at a range of options, and that might be one of them. I will tell you how secret we keep them: we talk to the commonwealth about them—and the last time I looked, the commonwealth had a Liberal government, which I am told occasionally does still talk to you people, but very, very occasionally. So what if we look at a lot of options!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: So what? If we want to talk about estimates, \$130 million to \$300 million in two months.

Mr Koutsantonis: Over \$300 million.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Over \$300 million in two months. Do we look at options? Yes, we do. Is that one of the options? What I will do for you is check whether we have done some work on that option; I suspect we have. At present, we are also looking at extending the railway line down to Aldinga. We have looked at a whole load of things. Some may happen, some may not. So what!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question is again to the Minister for Transport. What then is the estimated cost of the new plan to connect the Northern Expressway to the Port River Expressway, and why were those costings for this additional component of the Northern Expressway project not included in the \$550 million blow-out the minister admitted to the house some time ago? The opposition has been advised that this new planning—this new secret planning that was done confidentially—includes costs that should have been part of the original project but were not—and deliberately not—included in the figures that have so far been publicly released.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The guy simply cannot present the facts. He simply is a stranger to the truth. There is not a plan; one looks at options. The widening of the Port Wakefield Road has not been abandoned. The member for Waite is simply not telling the truth about that.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I see; we are only widening it in bits, he reckons. It has been abandoned except for the bits we are widening. You are a joke. We have abandoned the widening except for the bits we are doing!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The works that are proposed on Port Wakefield Road as part of the Northern Expressway do have a significant cost. We are talking to the commonwealth about it, and it is all going to happen. My advice is

that those works will make that road fit for the purpose that we intended to at least 2016. We are looking at other options into the future, and we continue to look—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: God! You are pathetic; you really are. But, Mr Speaker, understand what is happening here today. The member for Waite was goaded into asking questions, because he was exposed for only ever wanting to go somewhere I am not. He was goaded into asking questions; he has to find something to ask questions about. The fact that the Department of Transport looks at options into the future is completely unremarkable.

COMPETITION REFORM PAYMENTS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Consumer Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

Mr HANNA: How many millions of dollars in competition reform payments has South Australia forgone as a result of failing to comply with national competition policy in respect of liquor retailing?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): As members would be aware, there were a number of requirements put down for national competition policy repayments that included a whole raft of reform, much of which this parliament has done, some of which this parliament has not done to the extent that the National Competition Council would have liked us to. Deregulation of taxis is one that we have not complied with. The deregulation of barley marketing is one that we have not complied with; although we are now putting legislation to the house. But, it is all a bit—

Mr Hanna: You actually voted against it in the last parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will endeavour to get an answer for the member as to what may have been forgone, but, of course, going forward, it does not matter any more because those payments are no longer being made to the state. I will see if we can put an approximate number on what it may have been as it relates to liquor. Are members opposite now telling me that they do support the total deregulation of liquor marketing in this state? That would be an interesting position from the opposition. I am not quite sure what the point of the question is.

DE CRESPIGNY, Mr R.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HANNA: Is it possible that, as a member of Executive Cabinet, Robert de Crespigny gained knowledge which might have been of use to him for Australia Nuclear Energy's proposal to set up a nuclear power plant in Victoria or South Australia?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Can I just say that I think that is outrageous. We have a number of business leaders on the Economic Development Board, and they are required, under laws established by this parliament, to act prudentially, properly, and without conflict of interest, which they have to declare. The same applies not only to cabinet ministers but also to members of ExComm. In fact, at every meeting, matters of conflict of interest are always addressed.

You would be well aware that the company, which apparently has been set up with Ron Walker and Hugh Morgan, was set up (as I understand it from reports) in June; indeed, after Mr de Crespigny left the country.

I am not quite sure what information Robert de Crespigny, who is a major figure in mining, could have picked up on ExComm in terms of preparation of the State Strategic Plan about the future of the nuclear power plant industry in South Australia, given that we have banned it. I would not have thought that that was really helpful to him, being that it was a public position. I guess if Mr de Crespigny's company wants to build nuclear power plants elsewhere, then that is up to him. But he could not have gained any information that could help them establish a power plant in South Australia except that we are against it and have ruled it out. I just find this somewhat curious. It may be, of course, that the Liberal Opposition cannot ask this question for the simple reason that there is a split on the front bench. That became painfully apparent to all of us on the 8 a.m. news and in an interview at 8.42 a.m.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Will the real leader of the opposition please stand up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: The Premier is reflecting on the member for Mitchell who asked the question. It did not come from the opposition.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You wrote it for him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

VICTORIA PARK REDEVELOPMENT

Mr PISONI (Unley): Today I received two statutory declarations, which prompted me to ask the Treasurer a question during question time to clarify comments he made to protesters at the government information booth set up in Rundle Mall on 18 February this year. I will read those statutory declarations. The first one is from Mr Philip Vivien Groves, who declares:

I was present at the state government's public consultation of the proposed development at Victoria Park. This event was held in Rundle Mall on Sunday 18 February. I was present as an official representative of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association. The Deputy Premier, Kevin Foley, attended this event. During the course of Mr Foley's media interview he was heckled and interrupted by members of the public. The heckling was quite run of the mill-type heckling and in my opinion Mr Foley reacted violently, at one stage threatening members of the public around him, stating, 'I'll fix you—you're the rudest group I have ever encountered. Spittle was actually flying from his mouth and he appeared out of control. I also witnessed a member of Mr Foley's staff manhandle a member of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association.

A statutory declaration from Michael Francis Hudson states:

I declare that I attended a public display in Rundle Mall on February 18 at which plans and a model of the proposed grandstand for Victoria Park were available for comment.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: It continues:

While Mr Kevin Foley was being interviewed by the electronic media in his role as a government minister, he was interrupted on several occasions by protesters, including members of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association and the general public.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: It continues:

At one stage he turned away from the cameras and shouted, 'I'll get you; I'll fix you.' These remarks were addressed to the nearby protesters, of which I was one. At the same time a man who was known to be a member of Mr Foley's staff placed his arms around one of the APPA's members and dragged her away from her position behind Mr Foley.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What nonsense. You are a gutless grub.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. That is the third occasion now that the Deputy Premier has used that language and I ask him to withdraw it and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Referring to the member for Unley as a grub—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I withdraw the word 'grub', Mr Speaker, but the word gutless remains.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask that the Deputy Premier apologise and withdraw.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order—he has withdrawn. I have directed him to withdraw and he has withdrawn. That is all that he is required to do.

Ms CHAPMAN: With respect, sir, he refused to withdraw the word 'gutless'.

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will calm down as well.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. The house will come to order when I am on my feet. Members will calm down. I have explained to the deputy leader that I instructed the Deputy Premier to withdraw, which he has done. That is all I can direct him to do, and it is all that I am empowered to direct him to do, and that is what he has done.

Mr VENNING: On a point of order, sir, the Deputy Premier did withdraw that, but he left the other word still on the record and refused to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: It is silly to nit pick over this. The Deputy Premier has withdrawn. The word 'grub' was disorderly. I directed the Deputy Premier to withdraw that and he has done so. Let us move on.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, sir—

The SPEAKER: I will not engage in debate on this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not engage in debate on this. If the deputy leader disagrees with me and thinks I should force the Deputy Premier to apologise or thinks I am empowered to do it, she can dissent from my ruling. My ruling is that the only power I have is to direct him to withdraw the word 'grub', which he has done.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a second point of order, sir. I am not in any way digressing from your ruling on 'grub'. My second point of order is that it is disorderly for the Deputy Premier to refer to the opposition as gutless and I seek that he be directed to withdraw it, which he has indicated that he will refuse to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! No; the word 'gutless' is not and never has been considered disorderly. The member for Mount Gambier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Finnis has a point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: Mr Speaker, I believe that, when the last series of discussions finished, the Deputy Premier made a most unparliamentary remark directed at the deputy leader. He referred to her as a 'bitch'. Now, if that is not unparliamentary, I do not know what is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Certainly, I did not hear that remark. In any case, if the remark was made, it is up to the deputy leader to draw it to my attention. No? The member for Mount Gambier.

WATER, MOUNT GAMBIER

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You're threatening people now. 'He'll keep'; what does that mean?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will vacate the chair if this does not finish. This must finish now. The member for Mount Gambier has the call. I will vacate the chair if any of this rubbish continues.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: The week before last, three intelligent, articulate and concerned young ladies brought to me a petition. I indicated to them that the petition was not in a form that I could request to be tabled in the house; and, so, through a grievance speech, I choose to bring the substance of their petition to the attention of the house. The petition was signed by more than 500 residents of Mount Gambier, and I understand that a further 500 signatures exist on further documents that have not yet been delivered to me.

They petitions call for the City of Mount Gambier to request the state government to hold a referendum on fluoridating Blue Lake water. At the outset of my discussions with the three young ladies, I indicated that, globally, there was a long-held view that fluoridation of water posed far more benefits than it did risks. Also, I pointed out that all Australia's capital cities (and, I believe, all other large rural cities the size of Mount Gambier and bigger) have been fluoridating their water for between 30 and 40 years, and that the City of Mount Gambier remains the only large city of that nature in Australia where the water is not fluoridated.

I accept that there is not universal support for fluoridating water, and equally I accept a number of the points the young ladies made to me. They were caring of their families and they took responsibility for their own families; and, to that extent, they said that the public administration of a medication was not supported by them. They felt that, on behalf of themselves and their families, everyone had a responsibility to ensure that their health was managed in an appropriate way; and, further, they believed they had the right to choose. Of course, the evidence points to the fact that not fluoridating water in Mount Gambier has led to a position where tooth decay amongst young people in Mount Gambier is 70 per cent higher than the national average.

Of course, the consequences of that spill way beyond the people of Mount Gambier, because the immediate and long-term costs associated with poor oral hygiene are picked up by the health system at large. I pointed out to the young ladies that I would not support the state holding a referendum of the people of Mount Gambier, because the action that I supported in fluoridating the water had implications well beyond Mount Gambier in terms of the costs of not fluoridating the water. I did admit that I could not see why the City of Mount Gambier could not hold such a referendum, but it would not in any way cause me to change my view that, as a matter of urgency, we ought proceed down the path of adding small quantities of fluoride to the water.

Along with the petition a flyer was circulated, with the heading '12 reasons to reject fluoridation'. I will not waste the time of the house in referring to them all, but to show how sometimes alarmist statements can make it difficult for a community to have an objective debate, I bring to your attention one of the claims. Claim No. 2 says:

The chemicals used in fluoridating Australia (85 per cent fluoridated) are untreated toxic waste from inside fertiliser factory smoke stacks.

Some members lean forward in mirth, but could anyone credibly believe that a government, on behalf of a community, would inject into their water supply untreated toxic waste from inside fertiliser factory smoke stacks? The point we need to make is that in very small controlled doses there is enormous benefit in adding fluoride to our water. In much larger doses fluorine can be toxic. Panadol in large doses can be toxic. I believe that if you consume too much water you can actually die. The point here is that, managed in the appropriate way, the benefits far outweigh the risks.

Time expired.

TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I want to raise a series of issues concerning the transport portfolio and the Minister for Transport, and perhaps he would like to respond with a grievance of his own. The public is well informed on the series of crises and catastrophes within the transport portfolio measuring hundreds of millions of dollars, the details of which I will not repeat to the house. I will say that, as shadow Minister for Transport, I think the minister needs to lift his game. There are a number of issues that I want to raise, and one of them is sending bureaucrats out to do the minister's bidding on talkback radio and with the media. I know how the game works. Having been a minister myself—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Five minutes!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I got there long before you did, mate. I know the advice I received, and it was: 'If it's a difficult issue, minister, send out one of the public officers, because the opposition won't feel free to attack them.' Everyone knows the game. The member for Mawson was the minister's chief of staff: no doubt he provided the same advice. I will just say this: if the minister keeps sending Rod Hook, Bill Watson and Heather Webster out to do the government's political spin, he compromises those officers considerably. Each of the three of them is very professional and it puts them in a very difficult position when they have to be out there defending the minister when he should be up in the morning doing talkback radio himself and should be sufficiently across his brief to take calls, whether from the ABC or FIVEaa.

I have to say to the minister that this opposition will not refrain from taking up matters of fact and issue with public servants if the minister continues to run away from the media. That leads to my next point, which is, the minister's behaviour at the SARTA conference. If the minister does not agree with me, he can make his own remarks separately, but I sat there during that conference while the minister spoke to a group of 200 people. I politely listened. When it was my turn to speak, I had to endure interjections from the floor—loud and abusive interjections from the minister—in front of 200 stakeholders in a public forum. I am told that the same thing occurred last year when the current Leader of the Opposition was the shadow for transport and went to the same event.

When I sat down at the head table on completing my remarks, I then had to endure foul language and abuse from him within audible range of a number of people present. I will simply say that if the minister wants to conduct himself with a little bit of dignity in public forums, he will get the respect deserved of a minister of the Crown. However, if he interjects publicly and makes rude and offensive remarks that are clearly audible to others, then remarks will be made by the public—as they were to me at morning tea—about his behaviour. It diminishes ministers of the Crown to act in such a way—and that leads to my next point.

The brave minister wants to have public debates. He has been invited to a tram forum organised by the Property Council to be held some weeks from now. I am speaking, so is the Greens member, the Hon. Mark Parnell. I note that the minister for one reason or another is unavailable and that 'a senior government representative will be attending'. Well, here is another opportunity to have a public debate. Will we get another public servant sent along to do the government's bidding? I am happy to debate the minister any time, any place, any public forum, on radio, on TV, in front of a crowd, in here or anywhere he likes. But I say to the minister: just turn up! When he does turn up, he should have the dignity and the presence to behave like a minister of the Crown and not a Dimboola councillor—and I mean no offence to the people of Dimboola.

I now move to the matter concerning a senior public servant and correspondence. The minister chose to come in here and beat up and make a big issue of private correspondence between me and a senior member of his staff. He chose to make political capital out of it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Private to a department?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: As a matter of fact, the senior officer rang me on receipt of the correspondence and we sorted it out. He admitted he had made a mistake and he has since put that in writing. It was a misunderstanding. I think it was a genuine and honest mistake. We have sorted it out. But, although we had sorted it out, the minister made a big issue of it. He has embarrassed his senior officer, he has embarrassed himself and he has embarrassed his office. I just say to the minister: if he wants to be taken seriously and if he wants to be treated with the respect due to a minister of Crown, he should conduct himself accordingly. Now, he thinks he can be a bully. Well, you have hit a brick wall, buddy. You will get nowhere with me and you will get nowhere with this opposition. We know the minister's form, we know his game and we know the way he is behaving. Increasingly, the public is aware of it. He himself demonstrates it by his own erratic and foolish behaviour. It must stop.

MEMBER'S REMARKS, TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It was said by the member for Waite that after the SARTA speech—and I accept I did interject because he was not telling the truth—I used foul language. At the end of the SARTA speech, I said privately to him that he was not telling the truth and he lacked ticker. That is all I said to him. It was not swearing and it was not foul language. I told him that he was not telling the truth—which I stand by—and I told him that he lacked ticker—which I stand by.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the minister and the member for Waite take things outside.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

DIABETES

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): I rise to praise the efforts of some people who were involved in a very important fundraising activity in South Australia in January. It was actually the Saturday of the penultimate stage of this year's Tour Down Under. It was held in the Barossa Valley. Unfortunately, I could not make it because I was in McLaren Vale, which is in the electorate of Mawson.

Mr Rau: The centre of the universe.

Mr BIGNELL: As the member for Enfield quite rightly says, the centre of the universe. Another bike ride was happening, apart from the Tour Down Under which was at McLaren Vale and Willunga that day. A bike ride involving 200 amateurs occurred in the Barossa Valley. This ride raised \$780 000 to help find a cure for diabetes. The first tour was held four years ago and raised \$170 000. It has risen now to \$780 000. Organisers are hoping that next year they will pass for the first time the \$1 million mark.

Top executives from companies such as Macquarie Bank and Westpac come to Adelaide and have a great time in the Barossa Valley. The ride starts at the Jacob's Creek Visitors Centre, and there are three different courses—a 35 kilometre course, an 80 kilometre course and a 160 kilometre course. I know Phil Chronican, Group Executive of Westpac Institutional Bank, and a couple of his colleagues, including Rob Allen, came. There is a great competition between the various companies, in particular the banks. I know that Macquarie and Westpac try to outdo each other each year in raising money. This year Westpac won the prize by raising \$240 000 of the overall figure of \$780 000.

Type 1 diabetes is the most serious form of diabetes, and occurs when the immune system mistakenly turns on itself, destroying the cells in the pancreas that produce insulin. Without insulin, the body cannot process food into energy. During the bike ride, champion cyclist Stephen Hodge and Adelaide Crows footballer Nathan Bassett (who himself has type 1 diabetes) took part in the ride. Mike Wilson, the CEO of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, has stated:

Unlike type 2 diabetes, type 1 diabetes cannot be prevented and its causes have nothing to do with diet and lifestyle. We're working to find a cure so children and adults with type 1 diabetes no longer have to endure multiple daily injections, blood glucose tests, life-threatening 'hypos', and the fear of developing serious complications.

The Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation is the world's largest not-for-profit supporter of diabetes research, investing \$130 million each year in the search to find a cure for type 1 diabetes. The Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation was founded in 1970 by parents of children with type 1 diabetes.

I am also pleased to inform the house today that the South Australian Parliament is about to follow in the footsteps of the federal parliament in starting a Parliamentary Diabetes Support Group, and I am sure this will receive bipartisan support. My colleague the member for Morialta was in the Barossa Valley for the Jacob's Creek Ride to Cure Diabetes. The member in another place, Russell Wortley, along with myself and the member for Morialta, are foundation members of the Parliamentary Diabetes Support Group. We are hoping to tap into our electorates and work with people who have diabetes and to get a real understanding of what they are going through in their day-to-day life, to play any role we can in trying to raise the profile of diabetes and, most importantly, to raise some very much needed money to help in the research to find a cure for type 1 diabetes.

About 140 000 Australians live with type 1 diabetes, and the incidence in this country has almost doubled over the past five years. Every day, five more people are diagnosed, usually children and young adults.

Time expired.

LIGHT REGIONAL COUNCIL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): The first comment I want to make this afternoon is that I heard on the radio coming down this morning the member for Light waxing lyrical—I do not know that it was lyrical, but he was waxing on. He appears to have a vendetta against the Light Regional Council. Can I suggest to the member for Light, if he really has the interests of the people of that council at heart, that he lets the new council and the new mayor get on with the business of running the council and putting in place the necessary programs and procedures which will help the people living in that district. It is not the role of a member from outside the area to continue an unreasonable attack upon the council and to take up a great deal of that council's time by sending emails to people on the most minor issue when he can simply pick up the telephone. There must be some motive.

The first time he comes here, of course, he wants to see the Light Regional Council dismembered and parts of it incorporated into Gawler. Or does he have some other motive? I suggest to the member for Light that he let those people who have been elected get on and do their job and carry out the difficult tasks they have ahead of them without an ongoing public barrage of unnecessary criticism being levelled at hardworking people who have the best interests of all the citizens of that council at heart.

The second thing I want to mention is that, yesterday, the member for Ashford and I attended the unveiling by Her Excellency the Governor of a portrait of the Mayor of Port Augusta, Mrs Joy Baluch. It was a very important occasion, because the Mayor of Port Augusta has given outstanding service to her community, and it was great to be associated with that service being recognised by her council and her

community. The Governor was able to fit it into her busy schedule and play a very important role. I want to place on the public record my support for the Mayor and the work she does. I also want to put on the record that I strongly support her views in relation to imposing a curfew to ensure that young people are not roaming the streets and getting into trouble at all hours of the night. During the next session of this parliament, I will again give every member of this house the opportunity to vote, because I will bring legislation to the parliament to allow—

Ms Breuer: Where are you going to put them when you take them off the streets?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I look forward to the honourable member's voting for it if she is really interested in the welfare of those people. The last matter I want to raise relates to a letter I received from the Mayor of the District Council of Peterborough (a copy of which was sent to the Minister of Police) dated 20 February 2007. The letter states:

It is with tremendous disappointment/disenchantment with the State Government that this Council has again resolved, at the meeting held 19 February 2007, to raise its voice in protest over the vital issue of the very minimal staffing of our Police Station! Attached is a copy of my previous correspondence... dated 27 January 2004, along with a reply from the Acting Minister... I draw your attention to the second paragraph...

'... Peterborough Police Station has an allocated establishment of five officers'.

That status existed for a very short time only and once again, Council asks when is the wellbeing of the rural communities, and the health of those few police officers serving in those communities, going to receive due attention from the bureaucracies, so far removed from the 'real' world? Also enclosed is a photocopy... of a clipping from the Mid North Broadcaster...

The letter continues:

The issues remain exactly the same as my letter of 27/01/04... the situation of minimal staffing strains those stationed here severely—obviously leave of any sort is extremely difficult to arrange, hence more stress, leading to more leave required, and so on and so on—all of which jeopardises the safety of the general public—and rural areas do have general public!! Minister, this situation cannot continue and we, as the representatives of our community, expect your earliest intervention in this matter in order to resolve the issue of adequate staffing of our Police Station here in Peterborough.

Time expired.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley): Today I would like to pay tribute to the invaluable work undertaken by a number of community groups in my area in caring for those affected by domestic violence.

Mr Venning: And Joe Scalzi.

Ms PORTOLESI: And Joe Scalzi—he is one of my constituents, of course. This is a timely reminder, as we celebrate International Women's Day. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Campbelltown Uniting Church, the Campbelltown Rotary Club and the Central Domestic Violence Service (which, of course, is a government agency). Reverend Gillies Ambler and his church, the Campbelltown Uniting Church, have a strong record of practising what they preach for those in need, including women affected by domestic violence.

In addition to providing basic food and services, the church community also provides counselling for women at the local shelter, including the provision of an art therapy program. A recent grant of \$25 000 from the Campbelltown City Council (and I congratulate it on its support) and an in-

principle grant of \$65 000 or so from the state government will allow the Campbelltown Uniting Church to continue and expand the great work that it does. The proposal will allow the church to upgrade its on-site facilities and offer improved services to local women, including the provision of financial management courses and learning how to deal with family conflicts. How appropriate today! I offer my sincere congratulations to the church.

The other night I had the pleasure of celebrating the 41st birthday of the Campbelltown Rotary Club, an organisation that does so much in our community quietly and discreetly. Today I would like to sing its praises and, in particular, the support it gives to women and children at the local shelter in the form of comfort boxes—something which I had never heard of. In particular, I would like to mention a lovely woman by the name of Mrs Annita Somariva, who takes charge of this initiative. The boxes contain simple necessities such as toothpaste, brushes and sanitary items which we are lost without but which often get left behind when you are fleeing domestic violence.

Many of these items are donated by the local community which is a wonderful gesture. They also provide comfort boxes to children, who I see as the silent victims of domestic violence. The children's boxes contain items such as lunch boxes, drink bottles and basic stationery, enabling them to attend the local school, and provide one less headache for mother and child to worry about. All these little touches do help a child blend into their new and strange class, or group of students.

While on this subject of children, I would like to mention the very generous donations made recently by the Hon. Wayne Goss. He has donated the fees received thus far in his capacity as chair of the Government Reform Commission. He has given, I think, more than \$25 000 or about that amount to Catherine House, which is a shelter in the city for homeless women. I might also add that Madge McGuire and her board do a fantastic job. That amount of money will upgrade their facilities, including the makeover of a garden, I think. He has also given an amount of about \$10 000 to the Central Domestic Violence Service, which is especially earmarked to upgrade play equipment, buy books, prams and other necessities for children. It is a fantastic act of generosity. Members might want to think about that the next time they attack him.

An important part of ensuring that victims of domestic abuse do not return to the source of the violence is by ensuring that they do not feel abandoned or alone. While this role can perhaps be best provided by family or friends, it is not always an option. As a community we would be lost without the outstanding contribution made by organisations like the Campbelltown Uniting Church and the Campbelltown Rotary Club in collaboration with the Central Domestic Violence Service and, of course, Wayne Goss. I look forward to the day when their services will no longer be needed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: STURT HIGHWAY UPGRADE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 260th report of the committee, entitled Sturt Highway Upgrade—Gawler to Greenock Duplication, be noted.

Today I would like to speak about the Sturt Highway upgrade from Gawler to Greenock. The Sturt Highway is the major interstate road connection between Adelaide and Sydney and also provides for a portion of the movements from the eastern states to Perth and Darwin. The highway also serves as the interstate connection to the Riverland and Barossa Valley regions of South Australia, and beyond to the Sunraysia areas of northern Victoria and south-western New South Wales. Locally, it is preferred for intra-regional movements as it provides shorter travel distances and travel times for commuters and other traffic movements between towns and regional centres. The highway connects the Riverland and Barossa Valley regions to the export facilities at Port Adelaide, which operate on a 'just in time' basis and which rely on an efficient road system.

Despite the road's importance, in 2002 a Sturt Highway corridor study identified the Gawler Bypass to Seppeltsfield Road section as not meeting the strategic safety and vehicle capacity performance indicators for a national highway. Consequently, the Australian government allocated funding of \$26 million in 2005 for the duplication of the Sturt Highway from the Gawler Bypass to Argent Road, Gawler belt, as part of the Sturt Highway five-year upgrade program in the AusLink investment program. In June 2006, the Australian government also allocated \$100 million for an accelerated Sturt Highway upgrade package which comprises duplication of the Sturt Highway from Argent Road to Greenock (approximately 17 kilometres) and road and junction improvements between Greenock and Nuriootpa.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: I am glad that the member for Kavel has interjected because, in fact, it has been noted that local government has been pressuring the federal government for many years because South Australia does not get its just desserts with regard to road funding. Several conferences have been held with regard to this, and we are still behind the eight-ball when it comes to an appropriate level of road funding in this state. On Monday I did prevail on the member for Stuart, as I was having a debate with him, that perhaps he should lobby on behalf of South Australia to get more road funding for the state.

A memorandum of understanding was signed on 27 June 2006 with the Australian government. It requires this package of works to be completed by 31 December 2009, although there is a process whereby an extension of time can be negotiated if delays in the land acquisition process prevent the project being completed by the end of 2009. The duplication treatment will include a divided carriageway with a wide median, which has been determined as the most appropriate treatment to deliver the desired road performance and safety outcomes. All property owners affected by the duplication works were contacted and discussions assisted in determining their transport and work practice needs. In particular, the consultation identified the movement of machinery across the highway and the impact on their businesses.

Most landowners own land on both sides of the Sturt Highway, and the alignment has been based upon their preference as to which side is less significant for their business. The landowner feedback was considered, along with other social, environmental, community, agricultural and commercial land uses and technical design demands to determine a preferred alignment which minimises the overall impact on all users. The result is that the preferred alignment for the new carriageway will vary from north to south of the existing road in response to the local impact.

Traffic volumes are increasing along the Sturt Highway at a rate of 3 to 4 per cent per year. The road provides for the competing demands of commuter, freight, over-dimensional and tourist traffic. While there is sufficient lane capacity to cope with existing traffic volumes, it is operating at a low service level, characterised by the bunched traffic, delays and inconsistent travel times, particularly during peak hours. Duplication of the road will result in it operating at the highest service level.

Variation in travel times is a particular issue for the 'just in time' deliveries of export goods from the Barossa Valley and Riverland. Freight movements comprise 15 to 25 per cent of the traffic volume, with their volumes expected to increase. Furthermore, the strategic importance of wine-related industries and infrastructure in the Barossa Valley results in bulk haulage along the highway from other wine regions for processing and storage and, subsequently, out of the region for export and sale.

The key aims of the project are to improve road safety for all users and improve efficiency for interstate and local export industries along the Sturt Highway. These aims are consistent with the Australian government's commitments under the AusLink Investment Program and the state government's strategic and infrastructure plans. In the past six years there have been over 80 crashes on the highway between Gawler and Nuriootpa: 35 have resulted in serious injury requiring medical attention or hospitalisation, and seven involved fatalities.

Specific issues associated with this highway section are a high proportion of head-on road crashes, resulting in serious injuries or fatalities; a disproportionate number of crashes occurring mid-block (that is, between junctions) compared to road junctions; and, a significantly higher fatal crash rate than the remainder of the highway. The benefits of duplicating the Gawler to Greenock section have been evaluated based on directly quantifiable road benefits. These include the improved efficiency for freight travelling along the highway (interstate, intrastate and local) as a result of the higher level of service provided by the new facility, and improved safety by reducing crashes (particularly eliminating the severe head-on type crashes).

A detailed economic analysis, using a 6 per cent discount rate, reveals a net present value of \$15 million and a benefit cost ratio of one to one. Other benefits not easily quantifiable in economic terms include the increased competitiveness of exports, increased employment, less impact on the rural communities because of the reduced crash rate, and improved connectivity for rural communities which will deliver a flow-on of social and community benefits. Alternative treatments, including additional overtaking lanes and duplication with a narrow median and the use of a physical separation barrier between opposing travel directions, were considered. These did not address the issues of head-on crashes and local accessibility as effectively as a divided carriageway with a wide median.

Funding for the duplication is provided entirely from the AusLink Investment Program 2004-05 to 2008-09. Based on concept planning work undertaken to date, the estimated project cost is \$130.2 million (in out-turn dollars). However, this is subject to review as more detailed survey and design work is undertaken and as the issues of land acquisition, service location and local accessibility are finalised.

The recurrent costs arising from the normal routine and periodic maintenance are estimated to be in the order of \$11 000 per kilometre per annum for the operating life of the

road. This includes routine maintenance, road lighting and operating costs, and future reinstatement costs. Total additional annual operating costs are therefore \$220 000 per annum. Funding of these additional operating costs is proposed to be included in future AusLink negotiations. However, the committee is told that the AusLink funding is a set amount indexed annually to provide for maintenance of the total network. The federal government has not been prepared to increase that as the extent of the network increases within South Australia. The backlog in terms of what is available is in the order of \$18 million a year and this project will add to that.

Based upon the evidence received, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I certainly rise with some pleasure to support the motion put forward to the house, that is, that the 260th report of the Public Works Committee entitled 'Sturt Highway Upgrade—Gawler to Greenock Duplication' be noted. I am very pleased to support the motion because, as a previous member of the committee, I certainly welcome projects such as this. We have not seen enough of these projects in the last five years, and it is very pleasing that this one has come up. I thank the Public Works Committee for allowing me to be present and have input during the presentation.

This is a major Australian road. It is the main road linking my electorate—that is, the Barossa Valley—to Adelaide. It has an atrocious road safety record. Under the recent Australian Automobile Association's rating of our main roads, the Sturt Highway only achieved a two-star rating out of five, which is an absolute disgrace. I am very upset about that, but this will go a long way—at least on the busy end of it—to lifting that, hopefully, up to a four or even five-star rating.

I have observed the plans and I must say that I am pretty impressed. I note the cooperation of the department in giving access across the road—as the member for Norwood has just said—where a lot of people own land on both sides. With a double carriageway, it is very difficult to get machinery across the road. I certainly appreciate the cooperation of the department. Compulsory acquisition is inevitable. I raised this matter at a private meeting with the department in the Shea-Oak Hall. I raised the fact that some arrangements relating to the compulsory acquisition for the last upgrade—which was 10 or 12 years ago—have not yet been finalised after all this time. For the last five years—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: People will not accept the valuations.

Mr VENNING: I will name the family: the Wendt family. Their land was acquired so the highway could be put through the hill, not far from Nuriootpa. At that time the Liberals were in government, of course—I am not running away from that—I inquired for them, and we practically had it sorted. Then we had a change of government and we started again. The compulsory acquisition arrangements have still not been finalised and what that family has gone through over 10 years is totally unsatisfactory. First they had to come to a figure (which they did eventually), but there was always a reason that they could not agree. The frustrating part was that we eventually got an officer to agree and then all of a sudden the officer was changed and we had to start again. Minister Laidlaw understood that this had to be dealt with, she herself

intervened and it was going to be fixed, but three weeks later we were no longer in government and we had to go back again. It is a sad state of affairs when such a family has to go through that, but they have been pretty patient.

Over the years, I have been through this process, particularly when the railway line went through my farm, so I know what is involved with compulsory acquisition. It is a pretty technical area, and it is not easy, especially when you are talking about compensation for the loss of quality of life and everything that goes with that. However, I hope that in this instance it will be a straightforward process. I support the project, but I am the first to acknowledge that people who live alongside it will suffer inconvenience, and it is up to us all—via the taxpayer and the Treasury—to assist them to live with the inconvenience that we foist upon them.

I welcome the announcement, and I hope that the project will proceed. I note the comments made by the Minister for Transport in the house today that the project for the north-east corridor is still going ahead, and I fully support that. I am curious as to why they chose that particular route. I am not being critical, but I think that there could have been a more direct route than the one chosen. When you consider the traffic at peak times, it is a disgrace that only two lanes of traffic lead north out of Adelaide. As the member for Taylor knows, the highway through Salisbury and Elizabeth comprises two lanes, then three lanes and then two lanes again. It is totally unacceptable for all that traffic—the Barossa, Mid North, Riverland and interstate traffic—to use just two lanes. It is 2007, and you wonder why our state is being strangled in such a way. I welcome moves to get around that by putting in a new highway across the open country and linking Gawler directly with the Port Wakefield Road. It is common sense, and I support it.

Once we get to Gawler, we come onto the Sturt Highway, but my concern is that the upgrade should go further. I am pleased that it goes to Greenock—and that is certainly 30 to 40 per cent of the local problem—but, initially, it should go further and on to Wolf Blass. Once you get there, you are past the Barossa Valley Way intersection, and I am pleased that it gets to that point. The next stage should go further, to the river and to Blanchetown and, because it is open country, that should not be too big a deal. Of course, the highway should then go on to the Riverland and the border. Let us hope that is a project for the government in the next decade. Not a month goes past when we do not hear of some terrible fatality on this road—not just in the Barossa but also in the Riverland—because it is a busy road and we have just not spent enough on it.

I am very concerned that over the last five years we have not seen enough projects like this come before the parliament via the Public Works Committee. As the member for Norwood knows, I served on that committee. I enjoyed my time there, and I miss it because it was a committee that was doing something. It is just a pity that we did not have more projects like this. I have forgotten the dollar figure involved, but I know that it is a lot of money, and we certainly appreciate it. The current government has not had enough projects like this. The last major project I can recall in which a Labor government was involved was the Port Wakefield dual carriageway. How long ago was that? It was a damn good project, and I appreciate that road very much, and the member for Giles would often use it. Labor put it there—but it was the last one it did. I cannot recall any other major project.

Members have nightmares about Gomersal Road, a matter that I have mentioned to the house ad nauseam. It is now

open and, as the minister and the Chair of the Public Works Committee would know, the figures on the use of that road are many times greater than those predicted. It is a very busy road. I complain about its 90 km/h speed limit. I have not been picked up, but I will be one day when I am running late, as it is the last bit of road I travel on before I get to my destination. I have to say that I do creep up a little. Gomersal Road was a Liberal initiative and it is very popular. I would also like to note that the quality of the job is very good and the design of the road is excellent. It will add to the ambience of the region (which is, of course, the best region in the state), and I commend the motion to the house. I only hope that the committee has a lot more projects like this one.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MARION OAKLANDS TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 261st report of the committee, entitled Marion Oaklands Transport Interchange, be noted.

The Marion Oaklands Railway Station was constructed in the 1960s and is in poor condition. It contains asbestos materials, passenger facilities are rudimentary, the area is vandalised on a regular basis, lighting and security is substandard, and passenger safety is a key public concern. In addition, the facilities do not comply with most of the requirements of the Commonwealth Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport.

The Marion Oaklands Transport Interchange will provide high-quality public transport infrastructure with an emphasis on comfort, access, safety and security for all users. It will include:

- a new train station with associated bus interchange areas on Morphett Road;
- a park and ride facility for an additional 110 vehicles;
- a kiss and ride zone for car passengers;
- new facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, including a new pedestrian crossing on the southern side of the railway line for pedestrians to safely cross Morphett Road;
- enhanced safety and security for passengers, including security cameras, duress alarms and increased lighting; and
- other general passenger facilities, including real-time passenger information and a ticket sales kiosk.

The scope of the infrastructure works will consist of: relocating the train station, with associated bus interchange areas; track realignment and signalling upgrade; 110 additional park and ride spaces; kiss and ride drop zones; accessible parking areas for Access Cabs and people with disabilities; landscaping, lighting and security coverage; and demolition and site remediation of the existing Oaklands station. Other work to be undertaken includes the installation of electronically controlled, gated pedestrian track crossings; the upgrade of the track through the length of the railway corridor; and a pedestrian-activated crossing at Morphett Road. All facilities will be compliant with the requirements of the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport.

The new platforms will provide continuous shelters to protect passengers from inclement weather, and a ticket sales kiosk will be provided for passenger convenience. Locality and advisory signage will also be included within the interchange. Other features will include real-time passenger information facilities, information screens, clocks and public address systems. Toilets will be provided for use by public

transport operators and the public, including people with mobility impairments and carers requiring changing facilities for babies.

Significant community consultation processes have been undertaken. On the basis of community support for the relocation and significant benefits associated with it, this was selected as the preferred option to proceed for construction. The community consistently raised concerns about the implementation of a traffic management scheme for the Morphett Road/Diagonal Road level crossing. The committee was told that the nearby roads are nearing their maximum capacity and that some type of road/rail separation will be necessary within five to 10 years. It has been suggested that the proposed interchange will have to be scratched when the traffic management infrastructure is constructed; however, TransAdelaide has assured the committee that the location does not preclude grade separation. The consulting engineers took this issue into account and TransAdelaide has actively worked with the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure to ensure that future traffic management options are not limited. A preliminary envelope has been established for a potential future grade separation and sufficient land has been withheld from sale.

The community is also concerned about the removal of trees for the development; 81 need to be removed to enable the project to proceed. However, TransAdelaide engaged an arborist to examine all trees in the area and have the review undertaken without reference to the proposed plans. In this way, the arborist's view was not influenced by the project's parameters. Management of the on-site vegetation up to the 1970s created a safety problem and many trees are rotting and becoming unstable; these will need to be removed, but TransAdelaide has designed the car parks around the trees which have been identified as suitable for retention. TransAdelaide is also working with PIRSA to ensure the habitat of local fauna is maintained, and it will maintain native vegetation through the Adopt a Station program. Remaining trees are protected by a title encumbrance. The committee is satisfied that the minimum number of trees necessary for public safety have been removed and that appropriate steps have been proposed to ensure that the habitat and local amenity is maintained. The expected outcomes of this project are:

- to provide a fully accessible facility for the mobility impaired and families with prams;
- to improve the visibility and passive surveillance at the facility;
- to improve connectivity with key local facilities and precincts and between transport nodes;
- facilitator material;
- to increase patronage;
- to improve the amenity of the local area; and
- to provide a water sensitive facility which stores all stormwater on-site to water vegetation at the sub-surface level.

An economic assessment shows that the \$6.79 million project cost is attenuated by capital and operational expenditure offsets. The primary offset of \$950 000 is the estimated total capital cost to bring the station into line with the requirements of the disability standards for accessible public transport in two stages as part of TransAdelaide's program to meet the federally mandated deadlines for compliance.

The capital offset cost is \$200 000 associated with the removal of asbestos from the existing station shelters and structures within the next five years which would necessitate

the construction of replacement facilities. The assessment has quoted the net present value of benefits as \$3.13 million (in 2006 dollars) and a benefit cost ratio of \$1.5 million. Based on this evidence, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to make some comments on the Public Works Committee report into the upgrade of the railway station. It is on the boundary of my electorate and the boundary of the member for Mitchell's electorate. It is a crucial crossing point for thousands of cars at the Oaklands crossing every day. I used to use that crossing four or five times a day when I was going to my vet clinic from Glenelg; I know the area very well. I have been to a number of public meetings regarding the upgrade of this crossing. It has a very long history of being in the public mind for discussion because I think it was nearly 25 years ago when the original \$1 million plan, as it was then, to have grade separation there was first brought up, and that was certainly talked about at the first public meeting that the member for Mitchell and I went to at the Marion Cultural Centre.

A number of weeks ago the Minister for Transport said that I said at one of these public meetings that the Liberal Party would not be supporting the funding of grade separation at that location. I was supposed to have said this at one of the public meetings. I cannot recall saying that. I would not have said that because it would have been making policy on the run. Also, I have been right through the transcripts that were provided of the meetings from Transport SA and the notes taken by one of my staffers who attended, and neither the transcripts nor my memory nor the memory of my staffer record my having said anything like that.

I certainly support the upgrade of this location. The redevelopment is well overdue. We—the member for Mitchell, many of the residents and I—are disappointed that the government has not bitten the bullet on this and that it has not gone for grade separation. We realise that it would be an expensive and difficult option to engineer, but we see the many other projects that are being planned and how the government talks about wanting to build infrastructure and upgrade certain roads around the place. The government is doing the Bakewell Bridge and these underpasses—admittedly, at much greater cost than initially was scoped.

I am pleased to see that the need to always have the option of having grade separation at Oaklands is included, although I am disappointed that it is not being done now. As I have said, the preferred option has always been grade separation—and that not only is my opinion but also is shared by many hundreds of people. It was interesting to see the hundreds of people attending the public meetings that were held at the Marion Cultural Centre. I give Bill Watson of Transport SA his due for fronting up to answer questions. His answers were not always pleasing to the people attending the meetings, but he came to the meetings and did what he is charged to do in his role with Transport SA.

One good thing we are seeing down there is increased car parking. Certainly, many of the trees were planted a long time before people realised the damage that can be done by falling limbs. I have to agree that many of the trees need to be trimmed or removed and, while that is something about which there is a degree of discussion, it is being done in a sensitive way. I had one meeting with Transport SA, the arborists and

some of the engineers, where we looked at the situation, and I thank them for the opportunity to be involved in that process. While in some people's opinion the outcome is not ideal, it is a compromise—and it always will be a compromise—when people plant trees with the best intentions and they turn out to be great monsters that drop limbs and are a danger to people, but that is just a small part of it. The overall development, with increased car parking and park and ride facilities, whether it is trams, trains or buses, is something I support, because it gets cars off the road. It is not the grand plan people might have wanted, but it is there.

I do have some issues with the way in which buses will be pulling in and out of Diagonal Road and the increased traffic signals. There will be a pedestrian crossing north of the railway crossing near Dunrobin Road, by the Warradale Hotel; a set of traffic lights at the Morphett Road/Diagonal Road intersection; wig-wag signals at the train crossing; and I understand there will be a new pedestrian crossing just south of that again. So, it will cause some headaches for people if these signals are not synchronised properly. Talking about synchronising signals properly, I will digress slightly to mention that there is a new set of traffic lights at the Morphett Road tram crossing, as well as the wig-wags, and that is causing absolute traffic headaches. So, I hope that the traffic engineers will look at the situation at Diagonal Road and Morphett Road, at the Oaklands crossing, to make sure that things are coordinated properly. We do not want any further congestion there, particularly with the state swimming centre being developed there and the very busy Westfield Marion site, which is becoming increasingly popular with shoppers.

Although we are paying millions of dollars just to move a railway station 200 metres, there are some add-ons. In the opinion of many people, it is far from ideal. I would love to see the grade separation there, but the thing—

Mr Hanna: Well, put it up for the next election.

Dr McFETRIDGE: If we are elected in 2010, hopefully, with the money this government has, we should be able to look at including the grade separation in our 20-year transport plan, because we will have a plan. We know this government came to office in 2002 without a transport plan. It has a bit of a wish list now, but there is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morphett, you are speaking very fast, as you know. Will you slow down for Hansard, and will other members please keep quiet, because Hansard already has a challenge. The member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Hansard are very kind to me. They are able to make my speeches readable, if not audible. The need to upgrade this intersection has been around for a long time, and I wait to see whether the treatment that has been opted for on this occasion will be carried out as rapidly and efficiently as possible and with minimum interference.

I conclude by saying that the poor old Dunrobin Road/Diagonal Road intersection is an issue that been around for many years, and I do not see the upgrade of this railway crossing and intersection being a solution to the problem. It will be a dangerous intersection and, unless there is a complete rethink and a complete revamp of that whole area, it will continue to be so.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am speaking today about the Public Works Committee report on the proposal to upgrade the Oaklands Railway Station. I refer to it as an upgrade of

the railway station quite specifically, because the original plan was for a bus/rail interchange. What we have at the end of the planning process is something far less than an interchange, although there will be two additional bus stops. The community in my electorate around the Oaklands Railway Station in Oaklands Park and Warradale will be pleased to have a new train station. The community will be pleased to have plenty of car parks. However, there has been a lot of disappointment along the way, and I feel that I must place a couple of these issues on the record.

The most important issue is the strong desire on the part of the local community for road/rail separation at the Oaklands crossing. This is, of course, the intersection of Morphett Road, Diagonal Road and the Noarlunga railway line. There have been fatalities in the area in my time as a member of parliament. I know of at least two pedestrians who have died either while crossing the tracks or near the tracks, and that is a very powerful reason to consider a road/rail separation. The other issue connected to that, which locals experience every day, is the severe congestion at that intersection. I am pleased that the Public Works Committee report acknowledges that congestion and the fact that the intersection is rapidly becoming overloaded.

However, it is disappointing that the Public Works Committee did not go the extra step to at least look at some preliminary plans for a road/rail separation. They do exist; they have been prepared within the Department of Transport. One of the critical issues with the proposal that has been put forward by TransAdelaide is directly connected to this proposal for a road/rail separation. I mean that, by moving the Oaklands station closer to the intersection itself, common sense would suggest that it will need to be completely replaced if a road/rail separation proceeds. This is by virtue of the fact that, no matter whether it is road or rail going over or under, or some new combination of road and rail, it is unlikely that one could do that without some degree of gradient preparation. In other words, the preparation would have to commence at some distance from the intersection itself to allow that sort of separation.

As I said, it defies commonsense that placing a station very close to the intersection itself will be good value, because, if the road/rail separation proceeds, we will have to move that station again. It just does not make sense. However, as the member for Norwood indicated on behalf of the Public Works Committee, TransAdelaide has assured us that the new station will not impede progress with a road/rail separation. I gave evidence to the Public Works Committee in relation to this proposal—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr HANNA: I hear the member for Waite interjecting. I put two strong recommendations to the committee. One was that committee members should look at the way that TransAdelaide approached the whole project. I criticised TransAdelaide for what I called a silo approach; in other words, there was an utter lack of cooperation between TransAdelaide, the Department of Transport, local council and the community. Each of those entities was doing its own thing. Although I have a lot of respect for Mr Bill Watson, General Manager of TransAdelaide, there were times when I thought that, on behalf of TransAdelaide, he was concerned only about getting his project within TransAdelaide done on time, on budget for TransAdelaide.

That neglected the broader issues, which are intricately related to what TransAdelaide was proposing. I refer to the prospect of a road rail separation; to the traffic in the

Warradale shopping precinct immediately to the north of the station; and also to the increasing traffic flow that is likely from development to the south of the station at the Marion Domain site, where a swimming pool and health centre are proposed. It was extremely frustrating to think that one government agency would be working on how to spend \$7 million and comply with cabinet approval in relation to their project, while leaving other agencies entirely to their own devices when it came to these other issues.

The other recommendation I made to the Public Works Committee was to ensure that this station would not impede the development of a road rail separation. I have already canvassed those issues, but it was very disappointing to hear the report being described in the House of Assembly today without reference to how a road rail separation might be built around the proposed new station, although it is so close to the intersection of Diagonal and Morphett Roads. This issue has generated a lot of interest and passion in my community and, although the local community will be happy with a new station, there is still a lingering disappointment, widespread in the community, that the government has not seen fit to investigate a road rail separation in conjunction with this project.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I will make a brief contribution. One of the issues, which is slightly tangential to the main thrust of the report but which has concerned me for some time is the practice of TransAdelaide (and the Oaklands station area is a classic case) constructing or allowing to be constructed on its land huge billboards which ironically are targeted at motorists and not at rail passengers. I have written to the Premier and the Minister for Transport about this matter, bearing in mind that one of the great achievements of Don Dunstan was to prohibit billboards like that on our highways so that we did not look like downtown San Diego or somewhere else in the United States or parts of Queensland. That has been followed through and we do not have on our highways this multitude of billboards that we see in some parts of the world. However, we have a government agency that does that very thing, and the loophole is that it uses TransAdelaide land to allow these huge billboards. When I have raised this issue the answer that comes back is that these are road safety messages. Some are, but many are not. The one at Tonsley Railway Station—

Ms CICCARELLO: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, I wonder about the relevance of what the member is saying. Signage has nothing to do with the Oaklands interchange. It seems to be very broad.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I am sure the member for Fisher is getting to the point, but I will listen carefully.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The point is that this area is undergoing redevelopment and there is an opportunity to get rid of the hideous eyesores there and elsewhere. The answer often provided is that these are road safety messages. Occasionally they are, but sometimes they have included invitations for elderly citizens to have a Brazilian wax job. I know that many members here have led sheltered lives, but I have certainly noticed those sorts of signs as I have driven along. I can vouch for that because I have noticed those sorts of signs as I drive along.

One important issue relating to this development is that, again, it highlights the fact that Adelaide has a disjointed approach to public transport. It is too late to correct it easily now because it will cost a fortune and upset a lot of people.

If the planning had been done correctly in this case we should have had the rail system integrating with the Marion Shopping Centre. It will not happen now, so an opportunity has been missed. Box Hill in Victoria has an integrated transport system, and that is what we should be doing. We do not have an integrated transport system in relation to the CBD of Adelaide, either; so, I make that point.

The other point which I think is very important and which I trust will be followed through in this development is the provision of electronic pedestrian boom gates. Perth has them on its railway system. That state does not simply rely on the boom gates to alert pedestrians or discourage them from crossing those rail tracks. As I said, Perth has specific pedestrian boom gates which stop people from crossing a railway line when a train is approaching. As the member for Mitchell pointed out, several fatalities have occurred at this particular point as a result of people stepping in front of trains.

I trust that, in relation to this development, TransAdelaide and the Department of Transport might look at providing some of these electronic pedestrian boom gate systems to avoid the possibility of people walking in front of a train and losing their life. This project, as we know, has been scaled down from what it was meant to be. Again, I think the tragedy is that we will not have an integrated shopping/community/public transport system in that part of the metropolitan area; and, sadly, that is the general situation in Adelaide.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support the motion, and the opposition will support the motion because we want the work to proceed. However, I do raise a number of serious concerns about it, which my friend the member for Finnis and I raised in the Public Works Committee when the matter came before it. I note the contribution of the local member, my friend the member for Mitchell, who gave a very erudite presentation to the committee on behalf of his constituents. In his presentation, the member for Mitchell made the point that, really, there does not seem to have been a long-term vision in the government's approach to this Marion Oaklands interchange.

If it was smart, the government would be thinking about grade separation for the site in the fullness of time. It would be going the full hog and solving what is a significant problem now and not leaving it until later. The government wanted to build a genuine bus/rail interchange. The opposition has made the point already that what we are getting is not a bus/rail interchange. We are getting a new train station (relocated) and an upgraded bus stop with new pullovers. However, people will still have to get off the bus and cross over the road to get to the train station, and vice versa.

No agreement seems to have been set out—certainly from what we have seen—to connect this bus and rail station not only to the Marion Shopping Centre but also to the swimming complex which is to be built there and which, I would have thought, would be one of the major service points of the entire endeavour, yet that does not seem to have been thought through. Evidence before the committee was that, to get it right, it would cost about \$11 million to \$12 million, and the government had only \$7 million to spend because that is what it said it would cost. Again, it got its costings wrong.

On this occasion it had to rescope the work to fit it into the \$7 million budget, and what we have got is something significantly less than what it could have been. I understand that senior officers of government at public meetings said that

it is a 'watered down' version of what was originally conceived, and that is regrettable. I know that the cost of grade separation at the site could have been anything up to \$55 million or \$60 million. Fair enough, but where does it sit in the overall infrastructure priorities? For example, is that more important than \$31 million worth of trams down King William Street and North Terrace?

If you ask the people who live in this area, they would probably say yes. Although we love trams, the number of people who will get to use them and who live along the route is minute compared to the number of Adelaideans who use the bus and train system, which is the vast majority of people, probably the other 95 per cent. It is investments like this that could have been so good had they been done properly. We could have had something like Mawson Lakes, where people genuinely can flow from one mode to the other. The committee heard that buses will not even be allowed to enter the interchange site but will have to stay on this busy Morphett Road, and the parking is watered down. It is a step forward, it is at least something, and I give the government some credit for that.

At least we are getting something and it will be of use, and it will be better than what is there. There is no question of that. However, it is a shadow of what it could have been. Of course, it was very clear from the outset what the government's strategy was when it came out straight after the election, having promised that we would get a bus/rail interchange, and said, 'We will put this back out to community consultation. We've decided that we need another round of community consultation.' The minute I heard that, I knew exactly what the government's game was: 'We haven't got enough money. Go out and have another round of community consultation so that we can provide some evidence to support our argument that we can't go ahead with the full bus/rail interchange and then you can blame it on the consultation.'

That is exactly what unfolded. We were told that the community had decided that it wanted this watered-down version. If you gave people something visionary, like grade separation and a proper bus/rail interchange, the community would have embraced this like there was no tomorrow. We have been over the issue of the removal of trees, and I note the government's explanation in that respect. As I said at the time, the evidence we heard at the Public Works Committee just confirms what we already know, which is that the Minister for Transport's chaos reigns supreme and this government would struggle to organise a barbecue, based on what we have seen in the case of this bus/rail interchange.

We will not get in the way of it: we will agree to the report. We look forward to work commencing, but here is another one: it is over schedule, over budget, it is watered down, it is not what we were promised, at a time when the government is awash with money from property taxes. The government is raking in something like \$2.7 billion extra a year. It has money to burn, but it says that it is short of cash. What a load of nonsense! This is why we struggled after the State Bank to reduce state debt—why we went through the hard times, why we made the tough decisions—so that the money would be there for these sorts of developments. And what do we have: virtually nothing, and this is an example.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I also support the motion but would like to point out, in supporting the member for Waite, that this is the el cheapo solution. It is not the best answer. It could have been a lot better, and I believe that the people of

that area deserve better than they are getting. It seems to have been carved up to save money. It is a bit of a mishmash of an area with roads, traffic lights and heaven knows what else. As has been pointed out, there are quite a number of areas that could do with a considerable amount more of expenditure to make it something that everyone could be proud of, instead of how I think it will end up, which is something that will be there but which, in seven or eight years' time, the government of the day—which, hopefully will be us—will say has to be done properly and we will go back to the drawing board and do it again.

However, it is a step forward from what is there currently. This area is a most important area of the city, particularly the area around the enormous shopping centre down there and the good folk who live there. With those few words, I am happy to support the motion.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: McDONALD PARK SCHOOLS REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 262nd report of the committee, entitled McDonald Park Schools redevelopment, be noted.

In 2005 a master plan was prepared for the McDonald Park schools. The outcome of the master plan is a redevelopment of the school site to accommodate a maximum of 700 students through an extension to the administration building, seven new classrooms, a new resource centre and activity hall, upgrading of building No. 1 to provide improved learning areas and amenities, demolition of high maintenance transportable buildings, and site works and landscaping. The cost of the proposed new facilities and the inclusion of new site infrastructure is estimated to be \$5.975 million (excluding GST) on completion. It has considered the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act and will be fully certified in accordance with the legislative requirements. The project requires a staged delivery to enable the ongoing operation of the school to be maintained throughout the redevelopment.

The design provides a new activity hall and resource centre facilities, as well as an upgrade of administration facilities and a refurbishment of the existing main classroom building. The internal school environment will meet all regulatory standards and encourage best practice educational approaches. The passive design principles will reduce reliance on energy. It also applies contemporary interior space planning principles through the selection of materials to provide the best whole-of-life solutions in terms of cost, health and maintenance. Ageing high maintenance timber and asbestos transportable accommodation will be removed. Currently, mobility impaired students are unable to access the buildings due to a slope up to some of the buildings.

The redevelopment will provide a lift for access to the first floor of the existing main classroom building, and ramping and handled rails will be provided throughout the site to ensure access to all areas. Flexible learning will be maximised in the main classroom building by providing large sliding panels linking pairs of classrooms. During construction, temporary fencing will be erected to limit access by students and staff. However, at times a crossover of contractor staff and students will occur. Appropriate management procedures will be put in place to suit those requirements. General teaching facilities services will be affected, but a significant impact on the school's teaching delivery is not anticipated during the redevelopment. Temporary classes will

be provided within the existing buildings while new facilities are constructed.

The principal, school staff and the district director endorse the redevelopment and scope of works. Throughout each stage the governing council and staff have been closely involved with direct representation on the project's development. During the concept planning stage, care has been taken to consult widely to meet the needs of all stakeholders. The project is intended to provide modern educational accommodation, reduce the level of asbestos-related risk, meet legislative compliance requirements and deliver DECS benchmark accommodation for the primary school students. When completed, the redevelopment will provide an increase in teaching possibilities for students, enhanced professional learning for all staff, improve the amenity of the site for the wider community and aesthetically improve the presentation of the site.

Building a new school for 700 students is the most costly alternative and was discounted as the main building is deemed suitable for redevelopment, and two other buildings on the site are also suitable teaching areas in acceptable condition. Delaying the redevelopment of the school's infrastructure severely increases the future overall capital costs associated with the redevelopment of core services. Postponement of redevelopment will result in significant additional cost due to anticipated price escalation and associated fee and cost increases.

The redevelopment option will minimise the potential capital escalation cost if the project was to be deferred. All the issues being faced by the McDonald Park schools will be resolved and the facility will meet the current and future needs of the community. Based upon the evidence received and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): The opposition supports the motion.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: LINDEN PARK SCHOOLS REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 263rd report of the committee, entitled Linden Park Schools Redevelopment, be noted.

In 2005 a master plan was developed for the Linden Park schools. Existing accommodation will be upgraded, ageing timber accommodation will be demolished and new accommodation will be provided at an estimated cost of \$5.952 million. The redevelopment of the Linden Park schools will meet the needs of 700 reception to year 7 students. It will include:

- consolidating the joint school administrations and staffrooms into one building;
- demolishing all timber transportable classroom accommodation;
- providing new resource centre and classrooms;
- refurbishing and extending existing solid construction accommodation; and
- site, civil and landscaping works.

The proposal has also considered the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act and will be fully certified in accordance with legislative requirements.

The project requires a staged delivery to enable the ongoing operation of the school to be maintained throughout the redevelopment. Temporary fencing will be erected to limit access by students and staff during the construction work. However, when a crossover of contractors, staff and students must occur, appropriate management procedures will be put in place to suit those requirements. General teaching facilities will be affected but there will not be a significant impact on the schools' teaching delivery during the redevelopment. Temporary classes will be provided within the existing buildings while new facilities are constructed. The principal, school staff and district director endorse the redevelopment of the schools and scope of works in this project. The governing council and staff of the schools have had direct representation during the project's development, and care has been taken to consult widely to ensure the needs of all stakeholders.

The design solution for the Linden Park schools will consolidate the junior primary and primary administration and resource centre functions into central locations. It will also provide an internal school environment that meets all current regulatory standards and encourages best practice educational approaches. Environmentally sustainable design principles have been incorporated into the design. It includes passive design principles to reduce reliance on energy, the use of energy efficient mechanical plant, and rainwater collection for re-use in irrigation. The redevelopment will improve traffic management for access to the facility and improve vehicular access and car parking for students with disabilities, staff and visitors.

The project will provide modern educational accommodation, remediate contaminated and hazardous materials, meet legislative compliance requirements and deliver DECS benchmark accommodation for the primary school students. Achieving these goals will allow students to experience accommodation specifically designed to support early, primary and middle schooling and international baccalaureate methodologies. It will also provide opportunities for enhanced professional learning for all staff in shared administration and staffroom accommodation. Further, it will improve the amenity of the site for the wider community and aesthetically improve the presentation of the site.

Building a new school for 700 students is the most costly alternative and was discounted because the main building was deemed suitable for redevelopment and the two other buildings were also considered to provide suitable teaching areas in acceptable condition. Choosing to redevelop the school at this time will minimise the potential capital escalation costs, resolve the issues being faced by the Linden Park schools and meet the current and future needs of the community.

Debate adjourned.

MOTOR VEHICLES (NATIONAL TRANSPORT COMMISSION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.J. McEwen for the **Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport)**, obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, and to make a related amendment to the National Environment Protection Council (South Australia) Act 1995. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill amends the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* to change the mechanism for the adoption of nationally agreed heavy vehicle registration charges.

Based on recommendations by the National Transport Commission, heavy vehicle registration charges are determined nationally by the Australian Transport Council, formerly the Ministerial Council for Road Transport.

The amount of the heavy vehicle registration charges are set out in the Commonwealth *Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act 1993*, which is amended each time the charges are increased. In South Australia, these charges are imposed under the Motor Vehicles Act by reference to the Commonwealth legislation, thereby avoiding the need to amend the Act with each increase.

With the establishment of the National Transport Commission (replacing the National Road Transport Commission) under the *National Transport Commission Act 2003*, there has been a change of policy in the way national transport reforms are made available for implementation by jurisdictions. Instead of passing template legislation, the text of existing and future reforms is set out in schedules to regulations made under that Act.

In keeping with this policy, the Commonwealth will no longer amend the *Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act 1993* and in due course it will be repealed. Increases in heavy vehicle registration charges agreed to by the Australian Transport Council will be made publicly available by the promulgation of regulations under the National Transport Commission Act and jurisdictions will amend their own legislation to reflect the increases.

In order to make future Australian Transport Council approved increases in national heavy vehicle registration charges effective in South Australia, the Bill amends the Motor Vehicles Act to remove references to the *Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act*.

Following the passage of these amendments, the *Motor Vehicles Regulations 1996* will be varied to incorporate the nationally determined and agreed heavy vehicle registration charges. Definitions in the Act that refer to the *Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act* will be moved to the Regulations.

The opportunity has been taken to update references in the *National Environment Protection Council (South Australia) Act 1995*. The Bill amends that Act so that it refers to the National Transport Commission and National Transport Commission Act.

The Bill is purely administrative in nature. It is intended to change the method of referencing national heavy vehicle registration charges so that nationally agreed increases can be recovered in South Australia. The Bill itself does not change the charges, it merely allows South Australia to recover nationally agreed increases in line with other jurisdictions.

I commend this Bill to Parliament to allow South Australia to recover future nationally agreed increases in heavy vehicle registration charges.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

4—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause redefines the terms *configuration* and *prescribed registration fee*. This is necessary to remove references to the *Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act 1993* which is to be repealed.

5—Amendment of section 43A—Temporary configuration certificate for heavy vehicle

This clause amends the definition of *current configuration* to remove the reference to that Act.

6—Amendment of section 145—Regulations

This clause simplifies the regulation-making provisions. In doing so it updates references to Commonwealth legislation and the bodies responsible for national transport reforms.

7—Repeal of section 146

This clause repeals section 146. This is also consequential on the repeal of the *Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act*.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *National Environment Protection Council (South Australia) Act 1995*

2—Amendment of section 14—Council may make national environment protection measures

Section 14 refers to the National Road Transport Commission and the legislation that established that body. This clause updates those references.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY EXPORTING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 1839.)

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): The opposition supports the thrust of this bill and agrees to the repeal of the Barley Marketing Act 1993. We will propose a number of amendments to the bill, but I will speak about them later in my speech. The issue of barley deregulation has a long history. There is no doubt that the ABB has served the barley growers of South Australia and Victoria very well over many years, and will continue to do so. As a dedicated barley marketing organisation, it gave great stability to growers and a level of certainty, and built a reputation internationally for what was called Southern Australian barley. However, the last decade has seen many changes in grain marketing, international markets and the structure of the Australian market and, indeed, the ABB. The mid to late 1990s saw the initial moves for deregulation primarily driven by the national competition policy. At a time when the vast majority of South Australian growers wanted to retain the single desk with the ABB, the Victorian government wanted to deregulate with haste and the NCC was pushing for South Australia also to deregulate. It was felt by many at the time that this would leave the ABB very exposed. It had been operating as a single desk and, given its policy of maximising returns to growers, it did not hold significant enough reserves to be thrown to the wolves by being deregulated with so little warning.

As minister at the time, I was very concerned about the demands on the South Australian government, but I also saw threats to the ABB if Victoria were to fast-track deregulation. To this day, I appreciate the work done by the Hon. Patrick McNamara, who was the minister for agriculture in Victoria and also deputy premier to Jeff Kennett. We were faced with a review, as was required under the national competition policy, which was recommending rapid deregulation. However, Pat McNamara understood the risks (as did I) that this posed to a grower-owned ABB. We jointly challenged the reviewers on their conclusions and worked to ensure that ABB was given time before deregulation in Victoria. Unlike me, who had good cabinet support, Pat faced a cabinet intent on following Treasury advice, which is often a dangerous track to follow. Patrick succeeded in having deregulation in Victoria delayed for 12 months, and this was important to the ABB's being in a better financial position with stronger reserves at the time of deregulation in Victoria.

I met a couple of times with Graeme Samuel of the NCC, and we were able to argue the case for the retention of the single desk at that stage. At the time, I worked very closely

with the SAFF Grains Council. There was no doubt that it wanted a single desk, as did the majority of industry. Since that time, much has happened. ABB has merged with the former AusBulk to become far more of a broad-based and sizeable company.

The once very strong support for ABB and the single desk has waned somewhat, more so in some regions than others. Last year, we saw the establishment of the Barley Marketing Working Group, chaired by the Hon. Neil Andrew, a former speaker of the House of Representatives. The bill before us largely reflects the recommendations made by that committee. The SAFF Grains Council has unanimously supported the recommendations. That is an obvious and significant change from its position of the late 1990s. Growers are not as unanimous on the issue, and I am certainly aware of the range of views that are held by growers. Some hold very strong views on the issue and, certainly, a vocal debate took place over quite some time.

This bill effectively removes ABB's monopoly on barley exporting from South Australia. The single desk is removed by schedule 2 of this bill, which repeals the Barley Marketing Act 1993. The bill particularly reflects the following recommendation by the barley working group, which was that the bulk barley export market in South Australia be deregulated following a three-year transition period of export licensing for companies participating in the South Australian export industry.

The bill also establishes a licensing scheme for exporters of barley to come into operation from 1 July 2007. The scheme will be administered by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA). This bill, as I said, repeals the Barley Marketing Act 1993, therefore allowing growers to deliver barley to those other traders licensed by ESCOSA. Under clause 21 of the bill, the minister may establish an advisory committee to advise the minister on the operation of and any matters arising under this bill. ESCOSA must, when exercising its functions under the bill, take into account any advice given by the advisory committee. We agree that ESCOSA is an appropriate body to be the licensing authority.

Part 2, division 2, deals with the licensing of barley exporters. We support clauses 6 to 17, with the exception of clause 11(4)(c), (d) and (e). I disagree that these conditions should apply to the licence fee that is set. It should be based strictly on the total costs and a share commensurate with that licensee's portion of the licensing activity. To set a higher fee based on one licensee having greater assets is irrelevant, and I feel that subclauses (a), (b) and (f) give the minister sufficient flexibility. There is no doubt that the total costs for ESCOSA will be significantly higher in year 1. I have raised with the minister the possibility that, given the working group's recommendation to approach the federal government for assistance for the transition, a one-off grant would allow licence fees to be held to a reasonable level in year 1 and would certainly support any such request of the federal government.

Part 3 relates to the reviews and appeals, and we agree with those provisions. Part 4 is the miscellaneous provisions. Clause 21 relates to the advisory committee. The bill provides that the minister 'may' establish a committee but, to reflect the rest of the bill in reality, I will move an amendment to say he 'must' appoint the committee as a vital part of the bill, if it is to accurately reflect the recommendations of the working group. I think that reflects, in any case, the minister's intent. We will also move an amendment spelling out the compo-

sition of the advisory committee, consistent with the recommendations of the Barley Marketing Working Group report on page 82.

Clause 23 relates to the expiry or repeal of the act. If the licensing system is working well, there may be support for continuing a licensing system, and a review would be the better way of keeping that option alive. I have drafted an amendment which creates the necessity of a review before the act expires or is repealed. I have spoken to the minister about this and such a review relates purely to whether or not there has been a benefit from licensing and whether it should continue. Such a review could also test the matter of compliance with competition policy. I intend not moving that amendment today. I have had a discussion with the minister and he has no objection to the review, but there is an issue with the wording of the amendment. The minister and I have agreed to deal with this matter before the bill is dealt with in the upper house, when we will move a reworded amendment.

Schedule 1 relates to assessors for appeals to the District Court, and the opposition also agrees with those provisions. There has been debate in recent days about the wording in schedule 3 of the amendment to the Essential Services Act. There have been concerns expressed by some that the insertion of 'grain handling services' goes beyond what is required and creates a fear that the commission may be given powers beyond what was intended. I have been given considerable comfort that this is not the problem feared, and I ask that the minister, replying to the second reading, include an explanation as to why no-one need fear this wording.

This bill has come to the house after several years of vigorous public debate. This matter was for some time a very divisive issue amongst our rural communities and really did need to be resolved, as it was starting to generate considerable animosity between and within regions. I offer my thanks to Neil Andrew for his commitment in leading the group charged with putting forward a model to move ahead and see that our farmers get on with growing and marketing barley instead of engaging in ongoing and divisive debate. To Stuart Murdock, Gary Hansen and Michael Schaefer, I offer my congratulations on taking on a most difficult task. They stepped into a situation where they were willing to serve their industry, knowing that they risked enormous pressure and, indeed, the possible wrath of their fellow barley growers. No doubt, whatever the findings of the committee, there would be many who strongly disagree—one is behind me, I think. I also have no doubt that they probably wondered on occasions what they had accepted. However, I think they also knew that the industry was battling for consensus and we needed a way ahead.

There will be many who disagree with repealing the Barley Marketing Act. Indeed, one of the great privileges of being a member of the Liberal Party is that we respect the right of our members of parliament to reserve their right to vote as they choose. Several members have put forward the case for retention to the party room, and they have made sure all our members are aware of the issues for and against retention of the single desk.

My decision to support the repeal of the single desk has in itself been a long journey. As minister for primary industries for six years, and having about 30 years ago worked for the Barley Board, I have seen it grow and prosper. My father also had a close association with the Barley Board and for many years was the agent for Ausbulk, now part of ABB. This grain system was very much part of our lives—

Mr Venning: He was a good guy.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: He still is, too. In the late nineties my support of the single desk was made easy by the overwhelming support that it had. In the ensuing years much has happened. I am not, and never have been, a rampant deregulationist. However the industry has changed dramatically in the last decade. I now support this bill with some comfort. I feel the time has come for this to happen, and I will contribute further to the discussions in the committee stage.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): While the last 12 months as a new member of parliament has been an enormous learning curve for me, the Barley Exporting Bill has proven to be one of the more difficult issues for me to consider and express an opinion on, and I confirm that I reserve my right not to support the bill. Before commenting I wish to place on the public record that my wife's family are barley growers and my uncle on my mother's side is a barley grower, and I presume that all these people are shareholders of ABB.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Not quite. I myself, however, have no direct financial interest in these farms or their operations. That said, I have always taken a keen interest in what the yield has been and how harvest has gone. Although I have had the great pleasure of living on Yorke Peninsula for 33 of my 44 years—no doubt, all within this house are aware that Yorke Peninsula is known as the barley capital of the world—the growing, harvesting and selling of barley is certainly out of my intimate knowledge area. It is, however, a matter on which the people of Yorke Peninsula, the Adelaide Plains and the people of Goyder whom I represent have very definite opinions. As is the case in many regions of South Australia, however, these opinions vary.

My understanding is that ABB Grain (previously known as the Australian Barley Board) owes its very existence to the efforts of Yorke Peninsula farmers, who in the 1920s created Yorke Peninsula Barley Producers Limited. This cooperative arrangement was created so as to ensure that the financial return to barley growers was maximised and the previous practice of grain buyers turning up at the farm gate and often purchasing grain for ridiculously low prices was prevented. This highly successful system was adopted by various other marketing groups for exporting wheat and barley, and during World War II the federal government formed the Australian Wheat and Barley Boards to accumulate grain and effect payment to growers through grain pools.

Many of the farming families of Goyder have been involved over several generations in the management of ABB Grain. Family names that spring to mind include Honner and Saint. Indeed, my own father-in-law was a one-term director of ABB Grain in the mid-1990s. He took that role very seriously and enjoyed the opportunity to be involved in his industry at a high level. In the period during my campaigning for election to parliament, probably the issue that I was challenged to express a firm opinion on the most was how I stood on the single desk. My answer was always that I wanted to do whatever provided the greatest guarantee of return for effort to growers. I have not changed my position over the last 18 months.

Discussion about the single desk and its future has been going on for many years. One of the very first functions I attended after the 2006 election was the annual general meeting of the South Australian Farmers Federation Grains Council. At that meeting the results of a SAFF poll conducted in late 2005 on the single desk were made public. Questions in the poll included: do you support a single desk for barley,

and do you support a more independent single desk for barley? My recollection is that approximately 5 000 poll forms were posted out to growers, with about 2 300 responses received. As I understand it, several hundred were excluded for some reason, and I am not sure why. In relation to the support for a single desk question, an overwhelming result of 80 per cent was achieved. To me, this is a clear indication of what the industry wanted and still wants.

In relation to those respondents from Goyder, I have been advised that the support rate for single desk was 92 per cent. The question I ask myself is: how can I, as a new member of parliament, question this level of support? Since the announcement by the minister of the establishment of the South Australian Barley Marketing Working Group and its eventual report in early December 2006, I expected to be inundated by the opinions of growers on what should happen. Frankly, the opposite has been the case. It is only when I have initiated a discussion with a grower about the future of the single desk that people have talked to me about it.

I have asked people why this is the case, and the answer constantly given to me is that they feel that, after all these years of a clear majority of growers expressing support for the retention of the single desk but with efforts continuing to be made to undermine and remove it, they have basically given up. I am deeply saddened by this as it is not in the nature of Australian farmers to give up. By nature they are eternally optimistic. The amount farmers invest every year, without a guarantee of a return, makes them probably our biggest group of gamblers.

In trying to look beyond purely the results of the SAFF poll and my discussions with individual farmers to determine what my position should be, I reflected upon the sentiment that existed at a recent commonwealth government convened Ralph committee meeting on wheat marketing at the Balaklava Bowling Club. This meeting was attended by probably 250 growers from across the Mid North, Yorke Peninsula and beyond. Every seat was filled and all possible standing positions were taken up. Overwhelmingly, the positions expressed that day—and again I admit that they were about wheat—were that the single desk had to be retained.

An indicative poll via a show of hands was not taken that day, but the growers I have spoken to since then say that at least 80 per cent of the people present supported the single desk. Based on my own observations, I support this estimate. My natural assumption was that the growers who supported the wheat single desk would also support the barley single desk. Making an assumption, however, is the easiest way of making a mistake. So, in asking a grower who spoke at the wheat meeting whether barley was considered in the same way, a very definite yes was given.

The South Australian barley industry is unique in Australia. Generally, we have poorer soils and rainfall, but 80 per cent of the barley produced is exported overseas. In fact, I am advised by the member for Hammond that South Australia produces 29 per cent of the world's export barley. Many farmers I have spoken to have told me that the comparison of prices between South Australia and Victoria is not an 'apple for apples' case, as Victoria has a large domestic feedlot and a dairy industry which consumes the absolute majority of the barley produced, with only a small surplus being exported.

South Australia has a freight disadvantage to overseas markets, with deep sea ports being a considerable distance apart and grain delivery to these ports being expensive.

Comments made to me include, 'This whole debate has been sidetracked by a small percentage of growers who want high cash prices at harvest.' While I can understand that, given the drought conditions over the past five years and often poor prices, maximising income each year is of paramount importance, so potentially the long-term future of the industry is at stake here. High cash prices are impossible when 80 per cent of the crop has to be supplied to the export market in an orderly manner over an 18-month period. What grain trader can pay a high cash price at harvest and take the risk associated with holding millions of dollars worth of barley in this uncertain world when price is determined by the level of supply, seasonal conditions and the world market?

Information provided to me by growers indicates that, in the case of the Round Review (conducted in 2003, I believe) and the recent Andrew Committee Review, the panels had to distort the evidence to support the terms of reference that they were established under so as to appease national competition policy requirements. Again, information provided to me indicates that the majority of growers are getting weary of this debate and continue to strongly support the single desk.

The GLA model of Western Australia is often referred to. I am advised that it is flawed and costly. Licences were issued to traders who were not required to purchase barley if they could not see an opportunity to make a profit. Competition to supply the same market in Saudi Arabia using a different buyer or trader does not necessarily improve grower returns. The buyer always pays the cheapest exporter or negotiates the price down. I am advised that traders in Western Australia have used the risk management tools of the major exporter, knowing they can cheaply buy a licence to export, but they are not obliged to export if they can see no profit opportunity.

Sometimes a monopoly is the only economic solution. We now have a system where the domestic market is totally deregulated and the majority of growers accept the advantage that growers in the eastern area of South Australia, closer to the eastern states, can benefit from having a strong domestic market in seasons like this.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: And Ceduna. The year before, however, many of these same growers had a much better yield season, when the domestic price was competed down by the same growers to an uneconomic price in a deregulated domestic market saturated by growers competing against each other. I recognise that within my own electorate there are growers who have not sold their barley to the ABB in the last few years. I am not and never would be critical of that judgment, as I understand that they have made decisions important to their operations.

It seems to me that the important decisions on this debate were made several years ago, when the ABB went from being a grower-controlled organisation to one in which shares could be traded. All of a sudden, we had two levels of involvement: the shareholders, who demanded better returns on their share investment, and the stakeholders, who were the people who actually grew the product. It seems as though this bill was inevitable when the structure of the company changed.

Many people I have spoken to mentioned that the single desk works best when it is in its purest form, as it was for many years but is not now. Interestingly, figures provided to me on the share ownership of the ABB paint an interesting picture. Some three years ago, between 85 and 90 per cent of shares were owned by growers; now only about 52 per cent are owned by growers, with predictions of this figure being

as low as 40 per cent by the end of the year. The reasons detailed for the reduction were quite interesting. It was suggested that they included:

- paying out the off-farm siblings;
- purchasing additional land or new machinery;
- needing to diversify investment areas;
- the fact that the shares are well valued and disposal allowed risk to be managed;
- the fact that immediate cash flow needs required the injection of funds from the sale of the shares; and
- allowing for the retirement needs of older members of family farming operations.

Whatever the need, the make-up of the ownership of the ABB has changed significantly in a very short time. The fact is also that South Australian farmers need the ABB to be strong. While not personally supporting the bill, I know the reality of the numbers in the house and that change will probably occur.

Across much of regional South Australia the debate about the future of the single desk has been very emotive. Growers have attended meetings, completed polls, spoken to the policymakers and continued to express, in the majority, that they do not support the loss of the single desk for export barley. Earlier this week, the Premier talked in the house about a referendum being held on nuclear energy generation in South Australia. This proposal allows the community to express its opinion and the policymakers to understand what the community at large actually want. In 2005, South Australian farmers voted overwhelmingly to retain the single desk. I ask: why are the minister and the government not listening?

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Like the member for Goyder, I rise to oppose the bill, and like the member for Goyder I am a realist and know that later on (probably today) the house will pass the bill. Before I give the reasons for my opposition, I inform the house that I have a couple of shares in the ABB. I did not purchase them; they came to me as a result of my delivering some canola to the local AusBulk handling facility some years ago. I do not know how many shares I ended up with, but they are probably worth a couple of hundred dollars. I do not think that I can be accused of attempting to line my pockets by supporting the bill; however, I put on the record that I own a couple of shares in my business name.

Let me talk a little about the rural industry in general and why and how I think that this measure will impact on it. At the moment, we are going through probably the most significant drought in many years, and grain growers across South Australia are having as tough a time as they have had in a long time. When we talk about the barley industry, we must be aware that it is made up of various distinct segments. When you deliver barley, and it is tested by the receival people, if it comes within certain agreed parameters, it will be sold or bought as malting barley. If it is outside those parameters it will be downgraded to feed barley. The price differential changes, but malting barley is generally worth a fair bit more than feed barley—perhaps anywhere from 20 per cent to 40 or 50 per cent more but, again, that varies. The greatest determinant of the differential price between them is probably the size of the crop and the greatest determinant of the overall price for both categories of barley is also probably the size of the crop, so it is seasonal-dependent.

By way of example, I grow a little barley on my farm but use most of it for feed, so we do not sell much; however, we grow a bit more canola. In the season 12 months ago my farm delivered canola to a local crushing plant in Millicent and received the princely sum of \$270 per tonne. Again, this was adjusted by certain parameters (dependent on oil content, etc.), but that was the base price. In this latest season we delivered canola to the same plant, the same purchaser, and dependent upon the same variations in the contract, and received \$530 per tonne. Members opposite, in particular, because they do not represent rural electorates, are not familiar with these industries and would not be aware that there are huge variations in price, depending upon the season and on the amount of grain produced, and they would not be aware of how demand and supply match up. At the moment supply is very tight and barley prices are very good.

It is a few years since we have had a glut of barley. Probably three or four years ago the prices were pretty ordinary. In fact, I would argue that a number of barley growers in South Australia reasonably regularly sell barley at below what it costs them to grow it. This has been part of the problem. The cost of growing barley (as with other crops) is continuing to rise dramatically. There are huge inputs into growing grain in South Australia. Fertiliser costs have grown incredibly over the last 30 to 40 years, and obviously machinery costs and the costs of running machinery—diesel costs—and labour inputs have also grown enormously in recent years. In fact, grain growers would suggest that the average prices they are receiving for coarse grains today are probably not dissimilar to what they were receiving in the early 1980s—yet their costs would have doubled, if not trebled, in the same time.

This may have created an environment where people who think they can get a better price, or who think they can make some money for themselves out of trading in barley, have been able to get out into the barley-growing areas of the state and suggest to growers that they are being ripped off by the single desk and that they can do better. Members have to understand that barley growers are under severe pressure—of course, all farmers are under these cost pressures but barley growers are under severe pressure. There is a group of people out there who will be the big winners out of this, because suddenly they will be out there trading barley and they will be putting their margin on it. They have been trying to get rid of this single desk for many years and have taken advantage of the current circumstances where barley growers are under a lot of pressure. They have convinced some of the growers that they can do better, and they have done this by using examples of differential prices between the various states.

In fact, there are stories about barley growers in South Australia who are delivering their barley over the Victorian border at Murrayville and getting considerably more per tonne. I think the house has to ask itself why a grain trader would pay someone, say, \$160 per tonne for feed barley at Murrayville yet at Pinnaroo, 10 minutes this side of Murrayville, they would pay \$30 a tonne less. Why would a grain trader do that? I argue that it is in the grain trader's interest to have that differential to demonstrate to South Australian barley growers that they would be better off without the single desk.

You have to understand that the grain traders involved are not little Mickey Mouse companies: they are large international companies with huge vested interests in getting rid of not only the South Australian barley single desk but also the AWB and the Australian wheat single desk. This is not

just a coincidence that we are talking about a single desk in regard to barley here in South Australia and that other people are talking about the single desk and the viability of that and its future in regard to wheat. These international grain traders want to get rid of the Australian wheat single desk, and one of the things they have to overcome on the way to that end is to get rid of the South Australian barley single desk, because that has been a sticking point for them for a long time. So, it is not beyond my imagination that these major international companies are more than willing to spend maybe several millions of dollars in ensuring that the price at Murrayville and all over Victoria is at least \$10 or \$20 above the price that the same people would pay here in South Australia.

If they buy barley at Murrayville, they are not restricted by the single desk in Victoria, whether they export it or sell it domestically, and if they buy South Australian barley there is nothing restricting a South Australian barley grower from selling his barley to the domestic market. The barley that is bought, say, at Murrayville does not have a little sign on it to say that it was grown in South Australia and that it must be sold on the domestic market. In fact, these same businesses can quite easily take that barley, blend it, or put it through a cleaning machine to change the nature of the barley. They can quite easily buy feed barley grown in South Australia and, by putting it through a process of cleaning and separating out the various qualities, turn a substantial portion of it into malting barley and then export it out of Victoria to compete with the other South Australian malting barley growers.

I have no doubt that that has been happening and I have no doubt that that is one of the reasons why they have been able to afford to pay a few dollars more in Victoria than they are willing to pay here in South Australia for the same product. I have no doubt about that, because they have a vested interest in getting rid of the single desk. It disappoints me greatly that the barley growers of South Australia will be the ultimate losers and that the government of South Australia, and particularly the minister, has fallen into this trap as well. We are about to change a system that has been in operation to the benefit of barley growers here in South Australia for many years—

Mr Venning: Sixty years.

Mr WILLIAMS: This is all the minister said in his second reading speech to support this bill:

The pressure to change this arrangement has been building for several years.

There has been a very vocal minority, but I would argue a small minority, of people out there who have been arguing for change. They have been vocal because they have a huge interest, and the poor old barley grower is just sitting there—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Hung out to dry.

Mr WILLIAMS: He is being hung out to dry. His expertise is in actually farming the ground and growing a crop. His expertise is not in marketing the crop or hedging against the foreign exchange rate. He has been relying for over 60 years, as the member for Schubert said, on other experts to perform that function for him and now, under this bill, he will be put in a position of having to manage those things himself and he will be thrown to the mercy of these international grain traders. The minister would have us believe that this is necessary because the pressure to change has been building for several years. I do not think there has been any pressure at all—or very minimal pressure—from the barley growers. The pressure comes from those who make money out of trading and getting a margin of \$2, \$10 or \$20

for every tonne that every grower in South Australia produces. I do not believe that is a reason—and it is certainly not enough of a reason for the house to support this bill.

The only other reason the minister has given for bringing this matter to the house is the national competition policy. I think he said that it has already cost South Australia \$9 million. I can tell members that the national competition policy will not cost South Australia one red cent now or in the future, because there is no longer such a thing as national competition payments being made to the states. That money has been subsumed into the national water initiative. If that is a reason, I ask the minister and the government: what are they doing about the liquor trade in South Australia, because I understand—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS:—and I think the member for Mitchell has an interest in it—that has come to the attention of the National Competition Council. What is happening with regard to chicken meat? The last time I read documents from the National Competition Council, it was also concerned about the South Australian handling of that industry.

More importantly, what is the government doing about the taxi industry in South Australia? I understand that the National Competition Council believes the taxi industry in South Australia is quite uncompetitive. We know what the government did to the barley growers of South Australia. When the government had the opportunity to make a case on behalf of South Australian barley growers, because it was beneficial to South Australian barley growers and the South Australian economy that we retain the single desk, the government was not prepared to put in a few dollars to have a decent investigation and come up with a decent report to the National Competition Council. That is what happened. I think the member for Schubert will elaborate on that matter, because I know he has been talking about the Round report, which is the botched-up job that was used to try to justify the single desk a few years ago. The problem is that money was not put in to finance the research and to provide a decent report to the National Competition Council on the benefits of the single desk to South Australia. I will not go into that now, but I draw a parallel between the barley growers of South Australia and the Riverland wine grape growers.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: They're having a bit of trouble.

Mr WILLIAMS: They are probably not in huge trouble at the moment, because they have no damn water and are probably not producing too much. The supply has dropped dramatically and, of course, those who do have grapes are probably selling them, although I understand there are some contractual arrangements with one winery that are causing a bit of anxiety to some poor grape growers who, for want of a better word, are being screwed.

Last year, when we had a glut of grapes not only in the Riverland but right across Australia—right across the industry—thousands of tonnes of grapes did not find a market. Even in the Coonawarra in my electorate, high quality grapes were left to rot on the vines because they could not be sold. I guarantee that every one of those grape growers who had grapes rotting on the vine could not get a market for their grapes, and I guarantee that every one of those citrus growers who is turning out hundreds (if not thousands) of tonnes of citrus on farmland in the Riverland only to have sheep and cattle eat them would love to have the benefit of a single desk.

The Barley Board, amongst other things, is the buyer of last resort. Along with the single desk, it has an obligation to

barley growers that, if barley growers come to the delivery point to deliver barley, the Barley Board has to buy it. They have to find a market for it, and that is what they do.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: And if they can't?

Mr WILLIAMS: And if they can't—well, what have they been doing for the past 60 years? There has not been too much barley over the past 60 years laying in the paddocks because it could not be sold. It has not happened; not like the grapes that were left on the grape vines all across South Australia 12 months ago. I have never seen a paddock of barley not reaped because the farmer could not sell it. I have never seen that. But I will guarantee that people with a few more years on them than me—our fathers and grandfathers—saw that regularly when grain could not be sold.

We are making this decision at a time when the market is pretty good because there is not a lot of grain available. The member for Goyder said that about 29 per cent of the world's exported barley traded on the world markets comes from South Australia, and about 80 per cent of our production is traded or exported. We are a significant player. It is easy for anybody to market, and it is easy for anyone to give a pretty good price to a barley grower when there have been poor seasons, when there is not much grain in the supply chains and there is none coming out of the paddocks.

However, mark my words: they will be revisited in a few years when we have had two or three bumper seasons, when the supply chain is chock-a-block, or when the silos all over South Australia are chock-a-block full, and we cannot get enough ships in the ports to export the barley, when there are not enough buyers on the international market to take the barley that has been grown in South Australia. I would love this minister to go to Maitland, or anywhere on Yorke Peninsula, and explain what a wonderful job he has done for the barley growers in South Australia. I guarantee that he will not do it. I also guarantee that it will come to pass that there will be barley growers in South Australia who will not be able to sell their produce under a deregulated market. It is the last thing I want to see. The farming community in South Australia has been treated badly enough by governments over the years but more particularly by changing world trade and by the seasons and soils that they have to endure. I think this is a most regressive step.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I could not let this debate pass without adding a few words, for what it is worth. As members know, I have had an interest in this issue for virtually the whole time that I have been in this parliament, and I can honestly say that I have no personal interest in anything to do with the growing, marketing, or any other facet of the supply chain of barley—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Except for drinking beer.

Mr RAU: Except, as the honourable member for Stuart says, occasionally I will have a beer on a hot day, but, otherwise, I have no interest in it. Most of my electors live in the metropolitan area; in fact, all of them, as far as I know, so they do not have much of a view about this either. My interest in this issue comes from some sense, I think, of history, some sense of what I would call common sense, and having listened to people who know a little bit more about this than I do and who have weighed up all of the arguments. The bill that we are considering today would not be before this parliament if some years ago foolish people, who were legislators at the time, had not taken the step of corporatising or privatising growers' cooperatives.

If those cooperatives had remained as they were in the hands of the growers, and if the corporate spivs had not got hold of them and decided to 'ring value' (as they would put it in their terminology) out of the cooperative arrangements that existed for the benefit of growers, we would not be in this position. We would not even be considering this piece of legislation. As has been said by me and others in this place many times, Australia needs to take notice of the fact that in the world trade arrangements we are a minnow, an insignificant player overall but, remarkably enough, in the traded barley sector we are not—we are actually a significant player. If all of our produce is pooled and marketed as a collective offering to the marketplace, we are a substantial player in the international barley market, just as the AWB, before it was foolishly corporatised and allowed to be ruined by spivs, controlled a substantial proportion of the traded wheat in the world market.

The fact of the matter is that we are in a position where Australian producers of primary products are not like the Europeans, who are able to go down to Brussels and say to a bunch of people who have more money than sense, 'Look, I've got a backyard. I want to have two goats and a cabbage patch; will you please pay for me to live here?' They then say, 'Fine, no worries; you and your two goats and a cabbage patch can have an income and you can stay there.' Every now and again, when somebody does something they do not like—you see it all the time in Paris; somebody turns up in France with an extra goat—all the roads are blocked. All these chaps with their two goats and a cabbage patch come out of their backyard and block the roads.

In Japan the LDP is completely dependent on the fact that they have rice growers who are living on lots that are completely uneconomic, but they cannot do anything about it because the political cost of doing something about it is that the LDP will lose government. The member for MacKillop has said in previous debates on this matter that the EU policies to do with agriculture are social policies and not agricultural policies. I agree; he is dead right. They are social policies designed to keep people on the land, and they are subsidised by the European taxpayer to an extraordinary extent. The Japanese are in the same position with their rice growers and the United States—the great white hope of free trade—subsidises and protects its market to an extent that is not even imaginable in this country. Perhaps Canada might be in the same position as us; I am not sure, but we are one of the few countries in the world where our primary producers are paddling their own canoes, are not subsidised by governments, do not get all these tax breaks and do not have the taxpayer constantly funding them to sit on their backsides and do nothing. They do not have quota systems to protect their own markets from infinitely cheaper and perhaps equally good or better foreign product. We do not have any of that and we have even less of it now, because the federal government has been entering into these so-called free trade deals.

A year or two ago we entered into one of these deals with the United States. How absurd: a free trade deal between a goldfish and a whale! How ridiculous! Anybody who sits back and says, 'It's great here: we are the goldfish, we're going to do better out of this than the whale' would have to be a lunatic. When Mr Vaile came back, like Neville Chamberlain from Munich, he was waving a useless piece of paper at the airport: peace in our time! Mr Chamberlain thought he would be stoned. As it was he was lauded by a bunch of lunatics, and that is exactly what happened to Mr

Vaile. He came back with the concept of peace in our time. He sold our sugar producers down the toilet—they are gone—and one of the things he was waving around on this useless piece of paper was the concept that we can keep our single desk for barley and for wheat and it will be terrific. We have ruined umpteen other industries, and we will not get any benefit out of that even on the express words of this free trade deal because for the Americans it cuts in over 15 or 20 years—for us it happens tomorrow. So, he is waving this Munich agreement around.

At the same time Mr Costello is fining the South Australian government because it has not ruined the single desk for barley. At the same time the idiots in charge of the Wheat Board—which should have still been in public hands and it would not have happened, or if it had happened someone's head would have been on the chopper for it—buggered that up as well. What do we have left? It is absolutely disgusting. Anyone who thinks that Australian primary producers—who are not allowed to organise—will compete with foreign producers who are subsidised has got rocks in their head. What we will get are cherry pickers. There is always the cherry picker. There is always the person who reckons they can do better than everyone else. There is always the first one out of the pack. That is good for them. It is like the bloke who stands up at the football: everyone else is sitting down and he gets a better view—terrific. Then everyone else stands up. What happens?

It seems to me that we were set on this path many years ago. It is a lamentable, disgusting, stupid and ignorant path that we have been set on, and we were set on it by ignorant and stupid governments. The fact is that, once we have corporatised these cooperatives and rendered what was a corporate cooperative activity into A and B class shares which are traded on the market, the game is over. The only question is: how long will it be till the whistle blows? Well, I say to members of the house here that the whistle has blown. This legislation represents the blow of the whistle, but it did not represent the end of the game.

The minister is administering the last rites. I feel sorry for him being put in that position; he may not. However, it was inevitable that this would happen sooner or later once those steps were taken. As all members in this house know, I have very firm and consistent views about this for all the reasons I have just explained. I cannot see for the life of me why national competition policy should be concerned to give the consumer more leverage against the producer when the consumers live in Saudi Arabia, China and Japan.

Quite frankly (and I do not know about other members), I do not give a toss whether or not they get ripped off. If we are able to get a decent price for our product over there, who cares? Why has national competition policy had to stick its beak into this issue? Why? What does it matter to Australian taxpayers—and Mr Costello in particular—that the Japanese brewers get a better deal? What does it matter to Mr Costello that the Chinese brewers or the Saudi feedlotters get a better deal? What does it matter? I am damned if I can work it out, and I cannot see anyone over there who does either.

I want to pay a couple of tributes, and I hope I do not leave anyone out. Three wise men are sitting opposite. The members for MacKillop, Stuart and Schubert have been consistent—and perhaps the member for Goyder, although I have not heard him on this, but he has been nodding in a very sensible way. So, maybe there are four wise men—it is better than Christmas!

Members interjecting:

Mr RAU: Perhaps one of them is the Messiah. Anyway, the point I want to make is that I mention those members opposite because they, too, have been consistent on this point. They, too, have said in this place what had to be said. They have told the truth, and I respect the fact that for them it is probably more uncomfortable to have done that than it is for me, because they have been telling the truth, which is confronting their colleagues in Canberra and, historically, some of their colleagues in this place who have been guilty of the crimes that have led to today's last rites.

I commend you most sincerely for having had the courage to get on and do that: good on you! Someone one day, in 10 or 20 years or whenever it is when the wheel inevitably turns, as it will, may decide that on some sort of sentimental journey they will wend their way through the *Hansard*, because they will have nothing else to do. Their barley crop is no good. As they are sitting in their caravan wondering whether they are going to be tossed out, they might pick up the *Hansard* and say, 'At least those members of the opposition were consistent with us. They stood with us all the way through, these blokes,' as they are being shuffled off their farms, as they are being moved out and the big combines come in. So, who is going to be the winner out of this deal? Let us talk about the winners.

The winners will be the cherry pickers: one season in 10, when they happen to be the first one out of the pack. It will be the international grain traders, the people who play the markets, the speculators and spivs who work on the futures market: the people who say, 'We'll buy your crop today for \$10 but you have to deliver it to us next year for whatever the price is.' It will be the people who will force farmers to go from being good producers of grain to being speculators, hedge fund operators, grain storers and grain traders. They are going to have to acquire all these skills overnight. I hope they are equipped for it. I hope they are ready for it. And there might be a couple of them out there who are really good, who have MBAs and who can sit there all night on the screen, playing around and seeing what is happening in Chicago every evening. Good luck to them.

But that is not most of them. As to the final point, obviously this, in my opinion, is an inevitable event that was set in train years ago. It is a lamentable, very sad event but, quite frankly, we do not have any choice, because there is absolutely nothing else that can be done. The thing that most disappoints me is that at this point we do not have enough people, even sitting on the opposition benches, who can join the four wise men and, at least in harmony with them, stand up and speak the truth about this issue. And I think that is lamentable. As far as the question of how I am going to vote on this is concerned, I think John Wesley said, 'God helps those who help themselves,' and, with the exception of you four wise men, if you mob cannot help yourselves, I am not going to try.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I oppose the bill. When I got off the ferry this morning as I came into the harbour at Wallaroo, what did I see? I saw those big silos built by the farmers of South Australia thanks to the foresight of people like Tommy Stott, who stuck up for the farmers, who was one of the great architects of our wheat marketing program, because his constituents, people like my father and others, paved the path for grain traders. My father never lived to see us grow up, but I always remember his comments about two groups of individuals that he detested. One was grain traders and the other was trustee companies, and I have never

forgotten that he regarded them as leeches. And I have not changed my views.

We saw there this morning those great silos that were built, not for profit but to store and handle our grain. We have a proud record in South Australia of not only having some of the best plant breeders in the world but of having some of the most efficient farmers. That has been to the benefit of every South Australian citizen. I am proud to say that I am a fourth generation farmer in this state. My family started growing barley in 1948 and I had the pleasure, for the first couple of years that I was on the farm, of lumping a few bags of barley. We lumped it. It was good for us. By the end of harvest we were fit. In those days they used to shut the pub at Poochera between five and six. We all gravitated to the pub, had a few schooners, came back and cleared the yard, went home and loaded up ready for the next day. Of course, that is absolutely taboo today. Nevertheless, it was a challenging lifestyle and we were fit.

Let us look at what the results of this bill will be. This bill will go down in the history of this state as the time when we pulled the rug from under the farmers and barley growers. Minister, I will vote for this legislation if you do one simple thing: you conduct a fair plebiscite of all barley growers in South Australia. I am prepared to accept the result of that ballot. Are you and the government prepared to accept that? I know what the result will be. We live in a democracy. This legislation will affect those people. The Premier wants a ballot about whether we have nuclear power stations; well, let us have a ballot here. We have the best barley in the world. Why would you want to let someone else in on the act? Why would you want to create a situation where our people will be paid less? You will discount to the Saudis—and I think they have a quid or two. Why would you want a discount for them?

Taiwan is a big market, as are other parts of the world. Why would you want to do it? For the life of me I cannot understand, when you have a system that has worked for nearly 70 years, why you would want to change it. What is the reason? You do not change for the sake of change. You do not change because a group of eggheads or academics in Canberra—people who have never had a bit of barley dust or grease on them in their life—come up with an economic theory that says, 'You can't have this; we have to have competition amongst ourselves. We have to make it easier for our competitors overseas.' I say, 'Do what you want to do in Canberra but leave the rest of us alone.' Let us get on and do something for the people of South Australia.

Let me issue a warning: if this bill passes, look out for the taxi industry. That will be next; then the liquor industry. They will want Woolworths to sell all the booze. The little corner pub will be gone—that will be next. The AHA ought to take notice of this. The taxi council wants to take note because it is next.

Mr Kenyon: Pharmacies?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not agree that Woolworths should have a pharmacy. That is a nonsense. These people should be very aware that this is a test case today. It is a test case which will have dramatic effects on our farmers. Let us look at a few facts. You cannot compare growing grain in South Australia with the United States and Canada. A couple of years ago I stayed with a friend on a farm in Nebraska. While I was there, in one week he got two cheques from the government. I ask members of the government: how can we compete with that sort of farming? Further, I had the pleasure of staying on the farm of a member of parliament, a former

defence minister of the United Kingdom. He invited me to stay at his very nice establishment.

I got up in the morning and he was showing me around. I said, 'Kenneth, this is great but something doesn't add up.' He said, 'What do you mean?' I said, 'I've seen what you have in your sheds. You have a big yellow header that has just arrived. I have one on the water. I know what they cost.' He had new tractors and new landrovers. He said, 'I will come clean. I'm getting a £190 000 subsidy from the European Union.' It is uneconomic farming. He took me into his barn where he was drying the grain and I picked it up, but in South Australia you would not be allowed to deliver it: the quality was so poor. We are setting out to give those people an equal shot at us. Why are you giving them a free kick?

Mr Kenyon: That is what the Farmers Federation wants to do.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am afraid that some of those people need to have a cold shower and come to their senses. I remember when the farmers organisation was a proud organisation which had thousands of members. What has happened to membership?

Mr Williams: More members than women in the ag bureau now. WRB has more members.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: If members look at this legislation, who will it benefit? If members look at these provisions, who will it benefit? It will not benefit the barley grower at Buckleboo, Coorabie or Appila; it will benefit people who apply for licences. Who are these characters? Are they acting on their own behalf or are they acting as front people for the large grain traders around the world? It will not be long before you will see their tentacles reach out and they will be calling the shots. One of the things they will do is gain control of ABB and those things, and then they will start shutting down receiving centres because they are not economical. They will start putting up the costs and the charges, and the long-suffering farmer will be a secondary consideration.

A couple of years ago, I was fortunate enough to meet one of the senior people at one of these large grain trading organisations in the United States in Omaha, Nebraska. This organisation had a budget bigger than the South Australian budget. Its headquarters overlooked a 40-acre lake. It was a very nice establishment, I can tell members. It makes the government offices here look very shabby indeed. I had a long discussion with this gentleman, the number three in this organisation, and he knew all about Australia. I said, 'What do you think of the single desk for barley?' He said, 'I don't like it, but you would be fools to get rid of it.' This was one of the competitors. I recall going to the Husker Harvest—

Mr Kenyon: Why aren't you out there on the streets? Why aren't you doing some sort of tractor parade? Where is the Farmers Federation?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I ask the honourable member to contain himself for a moment—all good things will come to those who wait. I went to the Husker Harvest Field Day, which is a very large show attended by thousands of farmers. I was walking down one of the pavilions and I came across the Nebraska Wheat Growers Association, so I thought I would make myself known to them. The woman was quite grumpy about Australian farmers. She had been fed this nonsense that we were getting subsidised. I had to explain our position to her. The first thing I said to her was, 'You want to be nice to Australians, we are actually standing side by side with you. You haven't got many friends around the world at the moment, and we have been very nice to you.' That took

her back a step or two, I can tell members. A few other people laughed.

I said, 'Our farmers do not get sent cheques every couple of weeks when the sun comes out. All we have is a single desk so that we have a fair chance to sell our grain.' If anyone wants an example why this will not work, look what happens to the coal companies when they trade with Japan and China. What happens?

Mr Kenyon: Record prices.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: What about in the past? What about four or five years ago when they got played on the break. The same thing will happen to the barley growers if they cave in and there is a shortage like last year. The crop was down and most farmers only had about a third of what they normally grow. Just wait until there is a glut. I remember when you had to line up for hours to deliver your grain—the silos were full. If you have bad weather and damaged grain, who will take it? Who will be the buyer of last resort? If you live out north or west, a long way away or on the border, they will not want to know you. Under this current system where we have had the Australian Barley Board—a grower controlled organisation—farmers knew that, if they delivered their grain, they would get paid. That is the first thing. They knew that the people who were involved would do their best to ensure they received the best price possible and that they would take all their grain. They were not going to be victims of unfair market practices. But, my view is they will be victims of unfair market practices. So, I say to the member for Enfield that he made a very good speech—

Mr Venning: An excellent speech.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: He made an excellent speech, and he reminded me of an old style Country Party member of parliament. That is what it sounded like. I am sure that he has been reading Jack McEwen's book, because it was classic Jack McEwen stuff. Jack McEwen stood up for the farmers and stood up for the people in the motor industry because he, like me, believed in the orderly marketing of products. We believe we should not be the victims of corrupt market practices. I say to the one National Party member in this chamber that I find it absolutely astonishing how she is going to cast her vote because the great supporters of the single desk for wheat are the National Party and those rural Liberal members of parliament in Canberra. I wonder whether the member for Chaffey's view equates with those of the senator from Queensland—

Mr Griffiths: Barnaby Joyce.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —Barnaby Joyce, or Mr Vaile. I wonder whether it equates with their views. I do not think it does.

Mr Kenyon: He would be on about cotton.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I did not hear the honourable member.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Look, you have put me right off. I will lose my place and get excited and will not be able to continue. Out of all the matters we are going to discuss in the next 12 months, this is significant because this is a step in a direction that will not improve the welfare of a group of our citizens but will put them at risk. Why would the parliament be so silly? Why would you swallow this gobbledegook? Some guru talks about some competition policy worth \$3 million a year when this government has thousands of millions of dollars of GST revenue like never in the history of this state; and a few weeks ago it received another \$60 million. That makes up for the competition payments, so

that argument is absolutely out the window. For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone would want to take a course of action that will downgrade and put at risk your own citizens. Why would you do it? Have you thought about it? Why would you be so unwise? I am proud to say that I come from a farming background, and so does my family. I declare my interest as a shareholder of ABB, as is my family. I never bought one share because we had them allocated to us.

Mr Kenyon: You got them in exchange for the silos.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I beg your pardon?

Mr Kenyon: You got them in exchange for giving away assets.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: That is right. He lost his asset. The silos he built are now in shares. That is a good point.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I declare my interest, so there can be no misunderstanding, in accordance with standing order 170. I am going to say at this stage that on a previous occasion we were debating a matter of a similar nature. The then deputy leader of the opposition (the now Senator Hurley, who I have to say is one of the most incompetent senators South Australia has ever had) made a personal attack upon me and the member for Schubert about an alleged conflict—

Mr Kenyon: We have had some pretty bad senators.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, that is absolutely true. She could not get out of a wet paper bag.

Mr Kenyon: That is not quite fair.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Of course it is. Nevertheless, she implied improper motives to me and the member for Schubert, and I want to put it on the record that she was wrong then, and to make sure that no-one can impugn or in any way criticise our actions, because ever since I have been in this parliament I have strongly supported orderly marketing of primary products. I have believed as a South Australian that we should look after the interests of South Australians. I believe it is in the interests of the industry and those small country towns that rely on the industry to have an effective marketing arrangement for our primary products—barley, in particular. The barley board has performed very well.

If you look at its annual report, it says that ABB export activities extend across the globe with companies boasting strong credits in key grain markets, and there are a couple of other interesting headings which I saw as I read through this document. It is a pity a few other people have not taken the time to read it and look at it.

Mr Griffiths: I have.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I know the honourable member has, because he is on the right track. Some others who have other views about this system ought to divert their attention from the non-productive activities they are currently involved in and look at some of these things.

[Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: In the concluding three minutes, I want to put it beyond doubt in relation to the pecuniary interest matters. I quote from page 420 of Erskine May, as follows:

Disclosure and registration of personal pecuniary interest.
 . . . in any debate or proceeding of the House or its committees or transactions or communications which a Member may have with other Members or with Ministers or servants of the Crown, he shall disclose any relevant pecuniary interest or benefit of whatever nature, whether direct or indirect, that he may have had, may have or may be expecting to have.

That every Member of the House of Commons shall furnish to a Registrar of Members' Interests such particulars of his registrable interests as shall be required, and shall notify to the Registrar any alterations which may occur therein, and the Registrar shall cause these particulars to be entered in a Register of Members' Interests which shall be available for inspection. . .

As I said earlier, my family and I have had shares allocated in ABB, as we have been longstanding barley growers, and we look forward to—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: And good ones.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN:—yes, and good ones—and we look forward to participating in the industry in the future. I do not know whether members of the house are aware that for a long time the best malting barley grown in South Australia was on Gibson's Peninsula just behind Streaky Bay. It was surrounded on three sides by the sea, so it ripened in the cool weather, and they grew a very good malting barley.

Mr Pederick: Did you ever get to reap it, though? That's the question.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: When you have a good north wind! I am disappointed with this legislation, because I do not believe that it will protect the barley growers, and I do not believe it will be of benefit to the people of this state. Therefore, I intend to oppose the second reading and the third reading, because there is only one course of action that should take place, and that is that it ought to be withdrawn. As a practical farmer who knows how to grow the grain, I am very happy to leave it to the experts at the ABB (Australian Barley Board) to market it on our behalf, because they have done a good job and will continue to do so in the future. They do not need these gurus from outside to be involved, whose only interest is pecuniary.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINING BOOM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is always a privilege to speak after the member for Stuart, who I hold in high esteem and affection and who, I must say, has educated me over the years, particularly on very long camping trips. Earlier today in a ministerial statement, I informed the house about further developments in the mining boom being experienced in South Australia. I informed the house that, on the major index that measures mining prospectivity, South Australia has moved from sixth of the jurisdictions considered to fourth, and that is a fantastic win for the state. It is a great result for South Australia, and that information stands.

However, in the course of my statement, I also said that, in one of the indices survey, South Australia ranks fourth, in terms of attractiveness of mining policies, out of 65. I understand that the information was provided by government officers based on an examination of the survey. I have since been informed that South Australia's ranking under this index is, in fact, fifth, not fourth. Overall, we are fourth out of 64 but, in one particular category, we are fifth and not fourth. This ranking, even the fifth, still places South Australia at the top of the Australian states in this measure. I just thought that I should inform the house at the earliest possibility, because sometimes you have to admit you are wrong to do what is right.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 December. Page 1526.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): I indicate that I am the lead speaker on this bill and that the Liberal Party will not be opposing the bill but will be supporting it. The bill sets out a range of targets that the government wishes to set in relation to greenhouse gas emissions and other measures. It also sets out ways of establishing voluntary sector agreements about the reduction of greenhouse gases, or in dealing with greenhouse gases. It also sets up a climate change council to advise the government. The bill really does not a lot more than is already available to the government under existing legislation or existing ministerial powers.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You announced it the day before I did.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Premier quite rightly says the Liberal Party announced it the day before he did. It was good of him to adopt most of our policy. He did not adopt the interim target policy of a 20 per cent reduction by 2020. As I say, essentially there are no new powers for the minister that are not already available under existing acts, whether that be the Environment Protection Act or others. There are no new powers for the minister in relation to setting up agreements. They can be done already through a whole range of other mechanisms. The government already has a sustainability round table advising the Premier and the government on climate change and other environmental measures in general. The bill simply sets out a series of existing functions or existing targets, ropes them into the bill and gives it a title. There is really nothing new within this piece of legislation. In fact, one of the environmental—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Then why did you announce it during the election campaign?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I announced the targets. I did not announce the bill, necessarily. We announced the targets.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: No, you said you were going to put in the legislation.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This is the point. Essentially the bill says that we are going to set a target and then work out, over a period of time, how we can meet that target. It can be done now under current administrative and government arrangements. The Premier knows that he—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Future governments might try to welsch on it, so isn't it good to put it in legislation?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Premier says future governments might try to welsch on it but the reality is that, under this bill, a future government can do whatever it wants because the bill is so drafted that any target, any agreement, can be changed by the minister at any time—certainly the targets can be—and the policies can be changed by the minister after consultation. The sector agreements are voluntary sector agreements, not mandatory sector agreements. If the government wanted to reach a sector agreement with anybody now, it could go out and do that. There is nothing new in relation to this particular bill. In fact, one of the environment groups came to us and said, 'The bill does nothing new.' I think that is a pretty fair assessment of the bill. It is more about marketing, in essence.

I will run through the three or four topics within the bill that need to be discussed to any degree. The first is that the

bill sets targets. There are no penalties if the targets are not met. The bill simply says that the government is going to have this target.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: A big political penalty.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Premier says there are political penalties. The political penalties can be applied against any target; for instance, your state strategic plan has targets; none of them are legislated but there are political penalties, or criticism, if you do not meet them. So, the targets in here are exactly that. They are simply targets and there is absolutely no impact on the government if the targets are not met. The targets that the Premier is setting, as he has already mentioned, are essentially the main target, which is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 60 per cent by 2050 and which was announced as Liberal Party policy at the last election, prior to the Premier announcing it.

The Premier has not set the other interim target which was announced by the Liberal Party, which is a 20 per cent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. I will be asking the Premier during the committee stage why they have not adopted that particular target and will be moving amendments to try to include it.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Make it mandatory.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: None of the other targets are mandatory. The reality is that there are other targets in here, namely, to increase the proportion of renewable energy generated so that it comprises at least 20 per cent of electricity generated in the state by 2014; and there is also a target of 20 per cent of electricity consumed being made from renewable electricity as well by 2014. The point I make about the targets is that they can be changed by the minister at any time. The reality is that a future minister can simply come in and say, 'I don't like that target', and the target is changed overnight. So, the value of the targets, I guess, has to be seen within that context.

The other issue is the voluntary agreements. Under the bill, the government wishes to have a mechanism to set up voluntary agreements with industry to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, or adapt to climate change. These are voluntary sector agreements. They can be brought in on a voluntary basis, either across the industry sector—so there might be one for the automotive industry or the wine industry, as I understand it—or you may actually do it at an enterprise level. For instance, you may go to the suburb of Kilburn and say, 'We are going to introduce a voluntary sector agreement', or they can bring it down to an enterprise level, so you could go, for instance, to the Bradken Foundry and say, 'We are going to seek to impose upon you a voluntary sector agreement.'

The principle behind those mechanisms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by some agreement would be available to the EPA today. The EPA already (as we speak today), through its mandated licensing system, has the power to put environmental licences on a whole range of businesses. They have an environmental protection policy (EPP) process that would also be available, if they wished to use that mechanism that is already available in the law. So, the voluntary sector agreement is not a new concept; it is simply new to this bill.

The Victorian EPA already uses its environmental protection policy mechanism to drive changes in energy use, and it has forced energy users who use over a certain amount of energy to go through an energy audit and then (within a certain time frame) take action. The EPA in Victoria already does that as part of its mechanism. There is nothing to stop

the EPA today from going out and reaching a voluntary agreement with any industry or group of industries, given that it is voluntary, about reducing greenhouse gas emissions or other pollution activity.

Where the voluntary sector agreements are heading is that after the 2010 election, if the Rann government is still in office, it will seek to bring in mandatory sector agreements, which will then be forced onto business and will have penalties attached to them. That is clear from all the information on the record about this particular bill. Ultimately, that may be where the voluntary sector agreements head, but at this stage at least we are not arguing against the concept of a voluntary sector agreement on the basis that it is voluntary.

The third issue is the Climate Change Council. The Climate Change Council is an advisory body to the government on climate change matters. It advises on future policy, the latest technology, changes in climate change, and what government responses may be. The government already has, through a whole range of mechanisms, a number of advisory boards to government (including the Premier's Round Table on Sustainability) that can easily undertake this particular function, but the Premier, for whatever reason, has decided not to do that. We have tabled amendments to make sure that the same policy applies to this council as applies to the council of advisers being set up under the new Murray arrangement, in that the advice to the government and the government's response to that is tabled so the parliament can see why the government has or has not accepted the advice of the Climate Change Council.

The bill also sets up a review of the legislation in 2010 after the next state election. We will be seeking to try to bring that review forward to before the election for obvious reasons. Why would you put it after the election which is still three years away? The bill seeks to establish various reporting mechanisms on the level of greenhouse gas that is being emitted in a whole range of areas. Those reporting mechanisms could easily be set up now by the EPA or the environment department, so there is nothing new in the bill in relation to that, other than that it is collated under one bill. I make the point that many issues in this bill could have been addressed over the past five years if the government had sat down and talked to either the EPA or asked the environment department how these particular outcomes could be achieved. A lot of that work would actually already have been done.

I thank the Premier for the briefing we had from his officers. I do not think it was the officers' fault that it took three months for us to get the briefing, but we finally got it a couple of weeks ago. I raised with the officers a number of questions in relation to the bill and they were kind enough to send through some answers earlier this week. I will bring these matters to the attention of the house. We asked what were the forward projections for the three targets established in the bill. In other words, we were trying to establish whether the government is already setting targets that it knows it is likely to achieve anyway in the bill.

In relation to the three targets, the advice from the advisers is as follows:

Below are some projections developed by the Sustainability and Climate Change Division:

(a) Renewable Energy Targets

- To increase the proportion of renewable [energy] generated so that it comprises at least 20 per cent of electricity generated in the state by 31 December 2014.

The other target is:

- To increase the proportion of renewable [energy] consumed so that it comprises at least 20 per cent of electricity consumed in the state by 31 December 2014.

On the consumption target, the advice is this:

The renewable energy generation . . . shown as a proportion of the state's electricity consumption is shown in the table—

which I will read in a second—

. . . Also shown is the estimated greenhouse reductions achieved by the target.

In relation to the impact of renewable energy consumption, this table shows the proportion of renewable energy generation based on energy consumption in 2006. In 2005-06, it is 7.1 per cent; in 2006-07, 10.9 per cent; in 2007-08, 14.6 per cent; and in 2008-09, 19.5 per cent. Regarding the 2014 target of 20 per cent, we already know that the government expects on current performance to achieve 19.5 per cent five or six years earlier. I think that we can safely say that we can give a tick to that target of the legislation, because 19.5 per cent is virtually the 20 per cent required. In relation to the generation target, the advice provided states:

South Australia currently imports up to 25% of its power from Victoria so the renewable electricity generated in South Australia is a much higher proportion of SA generation than it is of SA consumption. If South Australia continues to import power it is anticipated that the generation target will be reached earlier than the consumption target (ie before 2014). . .

We know that the consumption target will be reached some time probably in 2009-10, because in 2008-09 we will be at 19.5 per cent and the target is 20 per cent. In relation to the generation target, we are told that that will be reached earlier than the consumption target. So, as to the two targets—that is, the generation target and the consumption target—I think that 2014 becomes a bit irrelevant, on this advice anyway, because we will achieve them both well before 2014. My advice is that we will achieve both those targets in 2009-10, or earlier. Just prior to the March 2010 election, I expect the Premier to be out there saying, 'Aren't we good? We've reached our targets.' The reality is that the advice from the department is that we will reach those targets prior to or around the March 2010 election.

The only other target in the bill is one set for 2050, so we can only assume that we will not achieve that target between now and the March 2010 election. The interesting thing about this issue is that all those targets can be changed overnight at any time by the minister of the day. In relation to the 2050 projection (which is the 60 per cent reduction), the advice is:

The achievement of the 60% reduction target will be subject to a potential emissions trading scheme, research and development, improvements in energy efficiency, sequestration, and the uptake of renewable energy.

That will be of no surprise to any of us. We then asked this general question: if you have a target of 60 per cent reduction by 2050, how then do you take account of a new industry development that might be greenhouse emitting coming into this state and how is that mixed into the targets? I suspect that this is the reason an interim target has not been set—because the Greens Party (Mr Parnell in another place) has been in the media saying that it is his understanding that the Roxby expansion will generate as much greenhouse gas as all Adelaide combined, and it is coming on stream in the next 10 years. If that is true, and the greenhouse gas emissions out of Adelaide double, the task of reducing them by 60 per cent by 2050 obviously becomes a more difficult task.

It also raises this question: what about all the other industry development that will occur over the next 10 years

and how is that accounted for in relation to these targets? In the Premier's second reading explanation he makes the point that the government is looking at setting up a process whereby, when major projects are developed, the greenhouse gas emissions are somehow taken into account. Whether that means they will not proceed on the basis of those emissions is unclear, but the government appears to be looking at some sort of mechanism to make that judgment.

In relation to the Olympic Dam expansion, we asked: what is the estimate of the greenhouse gas emissions in relation to that issue? The information we were given by the advisers is as follows:

BHP Billiton are still in the process of writing their Environmental Impact Statement which will include information regarding projected emissions from the expansion of their project at Roxby Downs. There is insufficient information currently available to calculate the potential emissions that the expanded project could contribute.

The other issue is in relation to the target on government and what instrumentalities it includes in the target. The question was about SA Water and whether that was included in the target. My reading of the summary of the advice is that it is not included in the target (I suspect because of its high energy use with all the pumping from the Murray) and that SA Water is still trying to work with the government in relation to the Greenhouse Challenge Plus and other environmental programs.

The bill does not set up an emissions trading scheme; it simply says that the minister should work in association with other governments at looking at setting up emissions trading, taking into consideration national and international schemes. Now, a minister can do that today anyway; we do not need a piece of legislation to tell a minister that they can look at what is happening nationally or internationally. Ministers and departments do that every day.

To make it clear, the advice to me from the government is:

The legislation does not provide the power to enter into a national emissions trading scheme. I am advised that it is considered more appropriate and practical for an emissions trading scheme to be established under its own specific legislation with complementary commonwealth and state legislation.

In relation to your query as to whether the South Australian government can commit the state to an emissions trading scheme without reference to parliament [through these bills, which was the context of the question], I refer to the discussion paper by the National Emissions Trading TaskForce. . .

In there it very clearly says that 'legislation would be required to establish the basic framework.' So this bill does not set up any mechanism in relation to emissions trading; it simply says that the minister should keep track of it. Well, the minister can keep track of that any day he wants.

Those were the key points that I raised during the briefing from the officers and, again, I thank them for their contribution. As I said, I am not going to hold the house for long; the opposition has three or four amendments and I understand some other members also wish to contribute. The opposition generally supports the bill but makes the point that the bill essentially sets targets, two of which we know are already going to be met and the other targets for 2050. It is setting up voluntary sector agreements that can be done through other mechanisms that are available to the government and it is setting up a climate change council that (the advice is) can also already be gained through existing mechanisms available to the government.

There is really nothing new in this particular bill before the house; it is a collection of existing powers or functions wrapped into a bill. The government has grabbed some targets out of a press release and said, 'There we go. That's the bill.' As I said, we generally support the bill but we do have some amendments to move in committee.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): It is with great pride that I rise to support the Premier's Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I did not know that I was so important to the opposition. Former American vice president Al Gore released a documentary called *An Inconvenient Truth* and, in the short time that has been available to the public at cinemas and on DVD, it has become the third highest selling documentary in the history of documentaries—indeed, it is continuing to sell at the rate of a new release. I have watched this DVD (I am a great admirer of the former vice president's career, and watched with great interest when he ran for president in 2000) and I would like to go through some of the basic points it makes with the house today.

Category 4 and 5 hurricanes have doubled in the past 30 years, and the reason for that is that our waters are warming. The flow from glacier ice has more than doubled in the past decade, and global sea levels could rise by 20 feet as a result of the melting of Greenland and the polar ice caps. In fact, only a month ago the new federal environment minister made a claim that sea levels could rise up to three metres in New South Wales alone due to global warming.

Indeed, in the past 14 years we have recorded the 10 hottest years in our history, and a few examples from our region are Christchurch, New Zealand, which had its warmest February on record, and South Australia, where we have had our warmest February on record. In Fiji the sea levels are rising and, according to the United States EPA web site, the inhabitants at 16 sites have said that the shoreline has been receding by half a foot per year for the past 90 years. There has been a consistent decay of the shoreline. In America and Western Samoa there has been land loss. New Zealand has retreating glaciers. The average elevation for glaciers in the southern Alps have shifted up slope by more than 300 feet—that is 91 metres.

Mr Pisoni: You'd better give up smoking, Tom.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: If I were the member for Unley, after he disgraced his electorate yesterday by being thrown out for bad behaviour and left it unrepresented in this chamber for a full day, I would be very quiet. Given that he has no concept or concern that the greatest insult any member of parliament could have in this place is to be named and thrown out, obviously he wears it like a badge of honour. I have been here nine years and I have never been thrown out.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I did not know that, member for Schubert. I apologise. But it was he who informed me that the greatest insult that you could hand your electorate is to be thrown out of this place, and I have taken his advice. Once warned by the Speaker, I have always kept my mouth shut. Our coral reefs are bleaching; they are being destroyed.

Ms Chapman: Your electorate is going to be drowned in 10 years.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: This is the whole point of this bill. The mockery from the other side concerns me because, when I am out in my electorate and I tell them that the Liberal Party members are climate change sceptics, they do not

believe me. When I go to my schools and I listen to the kids about the research they do on their projects every day about their concerns about global warming and greenhouse gas emissions, I see that for them it is a very real and present danger. I see the hope in their eyes and they look to us to do something about it, yet I look to the members opposite and to our Prime Minister who are global warming sceptics and who do not believe the science. Even now, the Leader of the Opposition just got up and mocked the Premier's attempt. The reason we are introducing this bill is that there is no federal leadership on this issue. The Prime Minister is a sceptic; he does not believe it. He does not believe that the climate is changing, nor does he believe that man can have an impact on today's weather. If I were the Prime Minister I would go down to Louisiana to ask the victims of Hurricane Katrina whether man has had an impact. They have had regular category 4 or 5 hurricanes, more than on record in their history.

We know what the effects will be. We know that the ice caps in Greenland and Antarctica are now melting. We know it; we can see it. We have satellite images. One of the points made in *An Inconvenient Truth* is that the United States Navy has been mapping for a long period of time in the area of the northern floating ice caps where they can lift their submarines up for a nuclear launch, because it was the closest place they could get to the Soviet Union. They have been mapping those since 1950 and they can only penetrate 15 feet of ice. In 1950 they could penetrate only about 3 per cent of the ice caps to launch their missiles. Today, the United States Navy says that over 90 per cent of the ice caps is suitable. That is a massive increase. It is not a laughing matter. We have to act, and the unfortunate thing for us is that, as a state government, we are trying to lead the way and to set the example, as has California and a province in Canada. Unfortunately, we are governed by people federally who are sceptics, who do not believe the science and who do not listen to the scientists. This is no longer a political argument: this is now a moral argument. This is no longer Labor versus Liberal and it is no longer about whether we believe in a form of unionism, capitalism or industrial policy.

There can be no economy without a climate, and there can be no economy without a planet. We have to act. What really surprises me is that the people who the vast majority of members opposite represent are the ones who are hurting the most because of climate change, yet their members are the ones laughing about it. We are in the midst of a record drought, and some scientists are saying that this has a direct correlation with global warming. I do not represent farming communities; I do not represent barley farmers or wheat farmers, or people who raise cattle and sheep. Members opposite do, the Prime Minister does, and so does his party. Farmers are hurting, and that is because the land is crying out as a result of the impact man has made on the way in which our climate is working—and we have to act.

I understand the Prime Minister recently said that for every argument people from the left put about global warming there are counter arguments by respected sceptics. Who are these respected sceptics? At which universities do they teach? Where are they doing their research? Name just one working at a university who says that global warming is not happening. I am not asking members to name five, or a group, or a think tank paid by government funds in Washington or Canberra. I am talking about independent universities. I am asking members opposite to name one who

says that global warming is a furphy and that it is not real. Do we really think—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: The Fraser Institute.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: There you go, the sceptics have come up with an institute that is probably government funded but not independent with strict academic rules. The truth is that members opposite are sceptics, and I wish they were not, because one day they will govern. It may not be the current mob, but maybe their children, their heirs and successors. One day they will govern, and one day we will need to lead.

From travels in my electorate, I have noticed a greater awareness of what is going on in terms of climate change. The conversation at local groups and residents associations is often, 'Isn't this weather strange? Aren't things getting weird? What's with this drought? What's with this inland ocean? What's with record rain events in Sydney in August dumping more rain on one day last year than they usually get in a month? What's with the record drought? Why is our weather changing?' That is what has raised people's awareness, and that is why, all of a sudden, it is showing up in the polls. Whether members opposite like it or not, people are becoming aware of global warming and its impacts.

The federal government in Canberra is saying, 'Well, yes, we could sign Kyoto but unless India, the United States and China sign it we will be disadvantaging Australian industry.' Well, there are two points I want to make about that. I, too, was initially wary of Kyoto and of signing up to restrictive carbon emissions before the rest of the world had taken the plunge as well. However, sometimes you just have to take the lead and show the way and, when you take the lead, such as with tariff reductions and opening up our economy globally, there is some short-term pain initially, but you lead the pack and your economies are ready. Eventually, China, the United States and developing nations will sign these agreements, and they will enter into carbon trading. We cannot say it will not happen, because it will happen.

We can get ready now, 10 years ahead of that happening. If we do not act now, our economy will suffer. However, if we prepare ourselves now and get our economies ready we can invest in new economies of the future, economies that will be investing in global warming—that is, companies making better solar panels or providing better wind energy technology or alternative hot rocks energy—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Perhaps; but I think the current argument that nuclear energy creates more carbon emissions initially does not make it a viable alternative. However, if we can get our economies geared up to this, we can sell this technology to the rest of the world, because those countries will sign up; it is coming. So, let's cease being sceptics, let's cease trying to score points on this issue, and let's do the right thing. I am pleased the opposition supports this bill, but it is going to support it with a few jibes and a few punches.

What members opposite should be doing is ringing their colleagues in Canberra. They should be ringing up Christopher Pyne; they should be ringing up David Fawcett; they should be ringing up Kym Richardson. They should be ringing up their Liberal candidates in Hindmarsh and Adelaide, and telling them, 'Argue with the Prime Minister. Argue with the sceptics in the federal government and sign the Kyoto Protocol. Move forward for a national carbons trading emission. Invest more in alternative energies. Do something now before it's too late'.

We must act now. There is no more powerful organisation in this country than the federal government. We have seen

that it is prepared to use its power when it comes to the River Murray; it is prepared to use its power on other matters such as industrial relations. Perhaps it should use its influence and its majority in the lower house and the senate to actually make a difference to this nation that will benefit all of us, rather than playing sceptics, so that you do not have to force your mates in big industry to make changes that they are going to have to make 10 years from now anyway. They will have to make these changes eventually. It is all about the bottom line. It would be prudent for us to act now. So, I urge members opposite to become more informed. I did; I was a sceptic, I did not believe it. But, over a period, I have been reading more and more about it, and I have seen with my own eyes that our climate is changing.

Mr Venning: Born-again Tom! I've-seen-the-light Tom!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Born again! I can change. And, if I can change, some of you can change, but I am not quite sure about that; some can. I will try to convince the member for Stuart. All I can say to members opposite is that the people who bear the brunt of this first and pay the highest price are your constituents. So, act now and convince your federal colleagues to stop being sceptics.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): On 6 December the Premier announced this legislation with the following opening words:

Mr Speaker, today I am proud to introduce bold and historic legislation designed to tackle the single biggest threat facing our state and our planet—climate change.

Interestingly, about five weeks before, I was in England and I heard Prime Minister Tony Blair say almost the same words. Isn't that interesting! Instead of just California and Canada, it seems that Britain and other nations—so we are not actually the third place in the world to do this—have already taken the initiative. That does not surprise me because, frankly, I quite often google Tony Blair's website just to see what we will be doing in South Australia in the next bank of legislation. And, sure enough, out it trots and, predictably, some very interesting policies have turned up here. Almost word for word, they turn up in the South Australian parliament.

The Premier comes out and says, 'I've got breaking news here today and I need to be able to make this important announcement to South Australia'. But, sure enough, there it is, back on the English website; it is all old news. So, anyway, here we go. We come up with the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill 2006. The objectives sound good; in fact, they are so good that they have actually been stolen from our Leader of the Opposition, who announced this in the 2006 election campaign. He actually announced this policy before the Labor Party, but still the Premier comes in and presents this measure as his own—a bold and historic initiative for South Australia. Isn't that wonderful!

Now, what do we actually get? We get a promise that we will encourage and support industry generally—discretion as to whom—to achieve a certain emissions target in this state by a certain date, all of which can be changed. Any piece of this can be changed at any time by the minister in charge, but we are given a target which is a moving feast. As the leader has already pointed out, it sets out targets, two of which are on track anyway and two of which, frankly, we have a snowball's chance in hell of ever reaching. Nevertheless, they can be changed at any time by the minister. Just because we have a strategic plan and we have all these targets, when they

do not come to fruition the government changes them a bit. And that is exactly what will happen here, because when they do not achieve the targets that are set out in this proposal, the minister gets a chance to change them.

What is important in the amendments that will be put forward by the opposition and flagged by our leader is that we need time limits on this and we need some very clear directions in this legislation. Otherwise, it is a puff of wind that will mean nothing; it will be totally unenforceable and have no consequences if this government fails to achieve any of these targets. If the minister puts the file away to collect dust for the next 10 years, it will not make a scrap of difference. He or she will not be sacked and he or she will have no level of accountability. It is completely unenforceable and unrealistic in relation to some of the targets set out here.

I simply say to the house that it all sounds good but, as usual, with this government it is all talk and no action. I was stunned today to hear the cherry-picking Premier come in and say—again, breaking news—'I need to tell you Mr Speaker' that:

The most eminent authority in the world to survey mining company activity, the Canadian based Fraser Institute, has just released its latest survey for 2006-07.

He then goes on to expound the virtues of the fact that South Australia is the fourth in terms of attractiveness in terms of mining policies. He came in later to change it to the fifth because he made a mistake. When he came back into the house he said:

I understand the information was provided by government officers.

This is his excuse for making a mistake. He went on to say:

Based on the examination of the survey, I have since been informed that South Australia's ranking under this index is in fact fifth. The ranking still places South Australia at the top of the Australian states in this measure.

That is not the best of it. The Fraser Institute is apparently the most eminent authority in the world to survey mining company activity. When we look at the Fraser Institute, we find that it is a think tank based in Canada (we know this because the Premier told us so). We understand that it was founded in 1974 by Michael Walker, an economist with the University of Western Ontario. We find that it has a multi-million dollar turnover and some very interesting policies, that it started with a grant from Patrick Boyle of the forestry giant, MacMillan Bloedel Limited, at the time when it was in—

Mr O'BRIEN: On a point of order, sir, I query the relevance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Kenyon): The deputy leader must stick to the substance of the debate.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will be outlining the published views of the Fraser Institute.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Is the Fraser Institute relevant to greenhouse emissions?

Ms CHAPMAN: I think with just a little bit of patience, sir, you will find that it is. I will outline some of the important aspects of this organisation. In 1999 the Fraser Institute was attacked by health professionals and scientists for sponsoring two conferences on the tobacco industry entitled 'Junk Science, Junk Policy? Managing Risk and Regulation' and 'Should the government butt out?' That was its view in relation to the tobacco industry's many attempts to discredit authentic scientific work. It went further to make some statements in support of legalising marijuana.

Ross McKittrick—this is very important to this debate—a senior fellow of the institute, has been a prominent critic of some scientific opinion on climate change. Do you know what position this eminent world authority takes? It is that carbon dioxide has nothing to do with global warming! This is the Fraser Institute! A senior fellow of the institute, who is the resource authority—in fact, the most eminent world authority—has been quoted in the parliament today to support the alleged position that South Australia has in the world in relation to its mining policy attractiveness. The Premier comes in here and tries to cherry pick what suits him. He has someone in his office working away on Google to find out where South Australia might feature in the world. Somewhere someone will say it is doing a great job.

He rushes in here with breaking news to tell us from the institute; he stands here in this parliament and professes to be the great advocate who is going to have bold historic initiatives on climate change and do something about it, and what does he do? He comes in here on the same day and trots out the Fraser Institute, one of whose directors is a strong opponent to the view that carbon dioxide has anything to do with climate change. What hypocrisy! That is the level to which this government will go, first, to try to promote itself and, secondly, to conceal its real objective. Its real objective is not to be serious about providing for the environmental protection and future of this state but to come out and make all sorts of grandiose, shallow promises and never deliver them, because that is what it does all the time.

One of the aspects that the government could seriously deal with, if it were to be serious about dealing with emissions into the environment, which includes the disposal of waste, is the astronomical amount of electronic waste that we have in this state and across the country, and which is the direct responsibility of state governments. Along with the reduction of greenhouse emissions, e-waste is looming as the area of environmental neglect where Australia has arguably fallen behind global standards. Just in case the Premier has actually decided that he wants to do something useful, let us hope that he might deal with the whole question of our environment and its protection, which he professes to be such an advocate of.

Let him consider the fastest growing rubbish pile in this country, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which is placing an increasing burden on councils' capacity to recycle, unfairly transferring those costs to the ratepayer, and that is this escalating e-waste in our country. In January this year, the New South Wales Local Government Association President said:

Clearly, it is time for state governments to prevent computers from being dumped in landfills and mandate producer responsibility for collection and recycling. It is not just councils that are calling on the state governments to act. The recycling industry, environmental groups and even the Association of Electronic Goods Manufacturers are all advocating the regulation of e-waste recycling.

New South Wales has had an act in place for five years. You would think that that is probably a good thing, but that enabled ministers to mandate extended producer responsibility on the manufacturers if the volume of the waste is a concern and there is no voluntary scheme in place. Just in case the Premier is taking notes about some useful things to do, the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act is the act that covers that in New South Wales. Because there is no upstream system that actually has the price of recycling built into the product, it can encourage dumping. Unfortunately, for some reason the government does not want to regulate

according to the law, so the 2001 legislation is just sitting there. The regulations have not come into place.

Perhaps our Premier could do something useful and get on the phone to his colleague in New South Wales and find out about that legislation and how he might hurriedly get on with the regulation and do something useful. I note that the Western Australian government is set to finalise its own Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Bill early in this financial year, but the bottom line is that here in South Australia we have not even got the draft out for consultation. Stakeholders do not know anything about this. If the government were serious about doing something about major issues that face our environment today, there is just one of them.

Do not cherry pick some institute over in Canada, which actually is about the most anti-climate control, anti-recognition of human involvement, in relation to how we might be causing damage to the environment. The government should not pluck that out and use it when it suits to promote its mining position in the world, or parade it around the parliament to try to present to the people of South Australia that it is the most—and he said this the other night at the state dinner—pro-mining, pro-business government this state has ever seen. He then comes into this place and tries to pretend that he is serious about climate control in this state, and it will not wash. It is absolutely shallow and without foundation. It is time the government understood that, when it addresses a serious issue in this state, it must deliver.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): It gives me great pleasure today to speak in support of this ground-breaking legislation. I know that you, sir, are certainly interested, having studied environmental management. In 1963 John F. Kennedy said:

The supreme reality of our time is the vulnerability of our planet.

More than four decades later these words still resonate with an undeniable and urgent clarity. For far too long we have ignored regular warnings about the deteriorating health of our planet. Despite ever-mounting evidence we, as a society, continue unchecked in our quest for more convenient and comfortable lives, but in doing so we have forgotten the fundamental duty that we owe to successive generations—a duty to pass on to them a world that is both sustainable and undiminished in its natural beauty and resources.

Only now are we starting to realise—some quicker than others—that the legacy we leave behind may not be one of which to be proud, for it is the unforgiving impartiality of history that will judge us on our response to the greatest single threat facing our planet, that is, climate change. Right from the outset I say that climate change is a reality. It is a fact. There is no use denying it, downplaying it and hoping that things will eventually improve, or passing the buck on to someone else to find the solution. I for one am sick and tired of seeing disclaimers every time a report is produced, an opinion aired or statistics cited on this topic.

A collective 'burying your head in the sand' is precisely what has precipitated this current situation, and no-one has done it better this year than the Liberal Party. Its members have surpassed themselves in climate change scepticism, but even I was surprised recently to read the disclaimer to end all disclaimers. It was a resolution that called on the commonwealth 'not to take any drastic action to address alleged man-made global warming until there is more conclusive scientific evidence of its existence', and who was responsible for this ridiculous and irresponsible statement? None other than the

supposed future leaders of our country, the Young Liberals at their annual convention in January.

Two things struck me about this resolution: first, that it was presented in 2007; and, secondly, that it was passed. I only wish that I had invited them last year to attend my screening of Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*. It made me wonder what the federal Liberal government's real stance on climate change is. However, given their complete and continuing lack of national leadership on this issue, I suspect that what the Young Liberals did is to expose the true agenda of their parliamentary counterparts, and history has now shown us and continues to show us what a short-sighted and blinkered agenda it is.

The Howard government has repeatedly said no to the Kyoto protocol, no to a national emissions trading scheme, no to increasing mandatory renewable energy targets, no to long-term greenhouse gas emission targets beyond 2012, no to incorporating a greenhouse trigger in federal legislation and no to the appointment of a climate change minister in its recent cabinet reshuffle. All that the Howard government has said yes to is showing the world how out of step and out of touch Australia has become. I cannot emphasise enough that the jury is no longer out on the issue of climate change.

The evidence is in; the case is closed. The focus of attention must now shift from whether climate change is linked to human activity or whether the science is sufficient to ask, 'What on earth are we going to do about it?' We only have to look at the latest assessment of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change of the environmental threat posed by global warming that was released last month. I must say that I am more inclined to believe a report produced by some 600 authors with 620 expert reviewers and unanimous agreement from 113 governments than a resolution passed by a bunch of Young Liberals.

It is a chilling report which leaves no room for doubt. The key findings of the panel are:

- Warming of the climate system is unequivocal and is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice and rising global mean sea levels.
- The cause is 'very likely' man-made and man-made emissions of greenhouse gases can already be blamed for fewer cold days, hotter nights, killer heatwaves, floods and heavy rains, devastating droughts and an increase in hurricane and tropical storm strength.
- Climate change would continue for centuries even if greenhouse gas emissions were stabilised, due to the time scales involved in reducing the level of gases from the atmosphere.

The outlook for the end of the century is:

- Temperature rises between 1.8° and 4° Celsius with a likely range of 1.1° to 6.4°.
- Sea level increases between 18 and 59 centimetres with an additional 10 to 20 centimetres being possible if recent melting of polar ice caps continues.
- Increases in the frequency and intensity of drought, cyclones and flooding.
- Sea ice shrinking in both the Arctic Circle and the Antarctic.

It is doomsday stuff, but I believe it will be a tragedy if world leaders take the message of the report in the wrong way and throw up their hands in despair. If they start asking themselves the question, 'Well, if climate change will continue for centuries, no matter what we do, then what is the point?' then we are headed for big trouble. Although the report does state

that climate change will continue for some time, it also repeatedly makes the point that the actions we take now will have significant and mitigating repercussions for the future.

Unfortunately, here in Australia the Howard government seems to have written off the report with a resigned shrug. The Prime Minister has iterated his refusal not to sign the Kyoto Protocol and has stated that his government will simply continue on with its current environmental policies. In fact, he seems more concerned with using the report as a political justification for his nuclear power argument than giving the report any credibility whatsoever.

The federal Minister for Finance, Senator Nick Minchin, has said that he does not believe that climate change even exists and, even if it did, Australia's role would be meaningless unless the major greenhouse gas emitters of the world did not come to the party; and the federal Minister for the Environment and Water, Malcolm Turnbull, has dismissed the report with a stunning indifference with statements such as, 'The science in this report is important but it is not new', 'The government is already working to address the problem,' and 'While meeting Kyoto targets is virtuous, it would not stop global warming.'

These sorts of comments only serve to highlight the total lack of understanding that the Howard government has always had for this issue. Australia has as much a part to play as any other country. While we or anyone else may not be able to stop climate change dead in its tracks, our fundamental duty is to now work together to reduce its effects as much as possible for future generations. If we sit back and do nothing there is no doubt that the impact upon our planet will be far more catastrophic than if we all come together in a united effort.

I wholeheartedly welcome this report. I fervently hope that the worldwide call to arms this report is generating will be a sufficient galvanising force which will ensure global cooperation. Here in South Australia I am pleased to say that the Rann government has long recognised the impact climate change is having and will have in the future. We do not need to wait until April for the panel's next instalment to know what is in store for us. We have sweltered through the past two years being the hottest on record, with 10 of the past 14 also making it onto the record books. We have experienced our driest winter in 100 years and we are facing our toughest water restrictions yet. We have known for some time that climate change is real and that we must act accordingly. In 2003 we contracted CSIRO to produce a report on the implications of predicted changes to climate for South Australia, and in 2006 we contracted them again to update their report as part of the greenhouse strategy process. In September last year the Premier tabled the updated report, entitled 'Climate change under enhanced greenhouse conditions in South Australia'. Projections made by CSIRO using 2030 and 2070 emission scenarios included:

- Increases in annual average temperature (0.2° to 1.8° Celsius in the north and 0.2° to 1.6° in the south by 2030 and 1.2° to 5.5° Celsius in the north and 0.5° to 4.7° Celsius in the south by 2070).
- Increases in the frequency of extreme maximum temperatures and decreases in the frequency of extreme minimum temperatures.
- Average annual rainfalls tending dominantly towards decreases (projections in the range plus-25 to minus-45 per cent by 2070), particularly in agricultural regions of the state.
- Massive reductions in winter and spring rainfalls.

- Increase in the frequency of droughts towards the end the century.

What this means for South Australia is more droughts and fires, destruction of coastal ecosystems, floods and sea surges, loss of species, loss of infrastructure and billions of dollars in lost production and export earnings—just to name a few.

It is against this background that the South Australian government committed itself at the 2006 election to introducing climate change legislation that would set a target for cutting greenhouse emissions by 60 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050. We are positioning ourselves to take immediate and decisive action, which is not to say that we have not been active in the climate change debate before now. We have been working extremely hard over the past five years to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state, and we have firmly established ourselves at the forefront of Australian environmental policy. South Australia is a leader in the supply of renewable energy. Already wind power accounts for about 8 per cent of South Australia's energy supply. With just 7.8 per cent of Australia's population, we are currently home to 51 per cent of the nation's installed wind power capacity.

In 2002 there were no wind farms. In 2007 we now have six, with another two due to be finished in the next two years. We have invested more than \$1 billion in reducing South Australia's greenhouse footprint by saving more than 1.2 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year. In the area of solar energy, we have 45.5 per cent of our nation's grid-connected solar power. We have placed solar panels on four key buildings—Parliament House, the Art Gallery, the South Australian Museum and the State Library—saving a further 129 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions every single year. We are also in the process of installing solar panels at 250 state schools over the next 10 years, and we are responsible for leading much of Australia's effort in the development of geothermal or hot rock energy.

We have introduced many energy and water saving measures into the building sector including the following:

- all new houses and major renovations must be five-star energy rated;
- all new homes must have plumbed rainwater tanks; and
- all buildings and major renovations must have solar or high efficiency gas hot water systems.

We have always shown a resolute commitment to climate change and, once again, South Australia has the opportunity to lead with the introduction of this legislation. Only two jurisdictions have enshrined their targets in legislation—the province of Alberta Canada and California—and I am delighted that South Australia will be the third. The paramount objective of the legislation before us today is to contribute to a more sustainable future for South Australia. It will accomplish this by:

- setting statewide, sectoral and specific targets;
- promoting a commitment to action to address climate change;
- encouraging and facilitating business and community consultation and early action;
- enhancing the ability of South Australia to contribute to and to respond swiftly to national and international developments;
- recognising bodies and persons who have committed to addressing climate change; and
- providing for reporting on progress in meeting all the targets every two years.

This legislation establishes the statewide target: first, to reduce by the end of 2050 greenhouse gas emissions within the state by at least 60 per cent of 1990 levels; secondly, to increase the proportion of renewable electricity generated so that it comprises at least 20 per cent of electricity generated in the state by the end of 2014; and, thirdly, to increase the proportion of renewable energy consumed so that it comprises at least 20 per cent of energy consumed in the state by the end of 2014.

The three principles on which this bill is based—collaboration, flexibility and sustainability—will enable us to keep ahead of the pack as developments occur in respect of climate change. However, I would like to comment briefly on one of the aspects of the legislation which have drawn some criticism and that is its use of voluntary mechanisms to encourage and support action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I am of the firm view that a collaborative approach is the best manner in which to foster and facilitate a proactive ethos to tackling climate change. A shift in attitudes and work practices towards a more profound and enduring understanding can much better be realised through consultation and recognition than through compulsion and punishment. To those detractors who believe that the latter is the only way to go, I implore you to give the government's collaborative approach a chance.

We can always take stock of the situation at the four yearly review of the legislation, if the government's approach has not yielded the results we hoped for. I personally am very proud of this legislation and what this government has achieved in the area of environmental reform over the past five years. Just briefly for those people who think that it is only we in South Australia who are concerned, in the early hours of this morning I was reading *la Repubblica*, the Italian newspaper—part of my parallel universe. I know that the Premier will understand this when I read it in Italian. I will not read it all, and I will translate. It states:

Il presidente della commissione Ambiente della Camera sui dati relativi ai fiumi italiani forniti dalla Protezione civile: piogge scarse e poca neve sui monti.

'Situazione critica in molti bacini'. . . 'Il Po ha una portata analoga a quella della siccità dell'estate 2006. L'Arno è al 50 per cento della media stagionale, mentre il Tevere è ancora più basso'.

Mr Koutsantonis: Si.

Ms CICCARELLO: Si. It continues:

'È oramai evidente che ci troviamo di fronte ad uno scenario anomalo, versosimilmente causato dall'accelerarsi dei mutamenti climatici.'

Essentially, the article says that the situation in Italy currently is critical. It is winter there and most of their basins have less than 50 per cent of the water which they should have to date. The president of the parliamentary commission on the environment has said that this is very critical and they put it down to the accelerating problems of climate change, and they are taking steps to remedy it.

We all have a part to play in the global solution, no matter how big or small, and perhaps I can say I am a classic example of this philosophy because, whilst my bike riding and wash board instead of a washing machine may not add up to much in the worldwide scale of things, it only takes one person to start a chain, and that can make a difference. I started this speech with a quote from John F. Kennedy and I would like to end it with another. He said:

Our problems are man made. Therefore, they may be solved by man. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings.

I commend the bill to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before I call any other speaker, I want to mention that I was watching the member for Norwood and it seemed that she was sticking very closely to notes that she will make available to Hansard. But, clearly, that speed is not acceptable to Hansard, and I would ask other members, if they are not sticking exactly and precisely to notes, to speak a little more in a manner that is conducive to the *Hansard* record.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am speaking in support of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill. I commend the Premier for bringing it to the parliament. Before turning to the bill, it is important to recognise that we have turned a corner in terms of public consciousness about climate change in the last year or so. I remember when I was at primary school in the early 1970s people started talking about the environment as if it was some concept to consider and something we had to take care of. Before then I do not think people were even thinking about it in terms of a specific area of human concern, at least in our western society. Over the past 30 or 40 years, there has developed that consciousness of the environment to the point where we have ministers for the environment and so on. So, now, our minds are beginning to see the light in relation to climate change. We are also beginning to see the light in terms of our responsibility for it from the point of view of industry, from the point of view of our nation and from the individual responsibility point of view.

The legislation does a couple of good things. Even if it did not do anything, it would at least increase the level of consciousness that people have about climate change and would encourage them, I hope, to take personal responsibility for improving their own situation. The first thing to refer to is the targets set out in the bill. The proposal is to reduce the state's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 60 per cent from 1990 levels by 2050. The second target is to increase renewable electricity generated by people in the state to at least 20 per cent of total electricity generated by 2014. Thirdly, there is a goal to increase renewable electricity used by the state to at least 20 per cent of electricity use by 2014. The other important aspect of the bill is the reporting mechanism, whereby there will be a climate change council reporting every two years. Of course, it is important, if one is to have targets, to have some respectable body to monitor them.

The targets that are set are, I am afraid, deficient in two respects. First, it is nowhere near good enough to suggest that we have to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in South Australia by at least 60 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050. It is relatively meaningless to people in 2007 to have 2050 targets. I will be moving amendments to introduce two interim targets: to have a target of at least a 20 per cent reduction by the end of 2020 and to have an additional 20 per cent

reduction by the end of 2035, with the remaining 20 per cent (obviously, as stated in the legislation, 60 per cent) by 2050. There is something quite catchy about having a public program 'reduce 20 by 2020', as in 20 per cent greenhouse gas emission reduction by the year 2020. It is something that I thought might appeal to the Premier. I acknowledge that the Liberal opposition has brought in some amendments which have something of the same flavour as the amendments which I have prepared.

The other amendments that I will be suggesting change the reporting periods. I think it is important to keep the pressure on both Labor and Liberal in the next couple of years by having a reporting period before the next election, not after. I suggest that a reporting date of 30 June 2009, with subsequent reports every two years, would be more appropriate than the Premier's option of a reporting date in 2010, after the next state election. In relation to the amendments, I acknowledge the valuable advice I have been provided by the Conservation Council, and I particularly pay tribute to Julie Pettett, the Chief Executive Officer, and also Julia Winefield and Jamnes Danenberg, who have been working on this proposed legislation.

The other thing about the targets that have been set in the legislation is that, I am sorry to say, they are rather phoney, particularly when it comes to the targets for renewable electricity generation and renewable electricity use. I have available a table that shows that the projected proportion of renewable electricity generation in South Australia is anticipated to be reduced by 19.5 per cent in the 2008-09 financial year. In other words, in about 2½ years from now, on current projections, we expect to reach the renewable electricity generation targets provided in the legislation. By the time it wanders through this house and the upper house, the target will almost be achieved, and that makes it a ludicrous target, especially when in the legislation the target date is 2014.

The letter I have before me from the Deputy Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet states that, in relation to the generation target, if South Australia continues to import power from Victoria (currently about 25 per cent of our power needs), the generation target will be reached earlier than the consumption target. What I referred to earlier was the consumption target, and currently we expect that to be reached in about 2½ years. So, even before then, we will have reached the generation target. In other words, these 2014 targets are relatively meaningless. They are phoney, and it is disappointing that the Premier has brought those targets to the parliament in this proposed legislation. Surely we can have something a little more ambitious than that. To demonstrate the projections which I have summarised, I seek to have inserted in *Hansard* a table which I assure you, Madam Deputy Speaker, is purely statistical in nature.

Leave granted.

Table 1. Impact of renewable energy consumption target¹

	Units	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Published wind generation projections (ESIPC) ² plus new committed projects and non-wind renewables (DTEI calculation) ³	GWh	846	1 372	1 859	2 535
Proportion of renewable electricity generation based on energy consumption 2006	%	7.1%	10.9%	14.6%	19.5%

Table 1. Impact of renewable energy consumption target¹

	Units	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Estimated greenhouse reductions based on 0.52 tonnes CO _{2eq} per MWh ⁴	kT	440	714	967	1 318

¹Based on 2006 annual planning report, Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council.

²Only known and committed wind projects are included in ESIPC wind data.

³The projected output of Snowtown wind farm and other renewables added to ESIP data.

⁴Emissions factor based on SA wind power study by ESPIC, March 2003.

Mr HANNA: I go on to refer to the other options available to the government. I want to bring to the attention of the parliament a brilliant idea which is currently used in Victoria: the weekly greenhouse gas indicator. As of 8 January 2007, *The Age* newspaper has been publishing a weekly greenhouse gas indicator. It appears as a little series of columns that show exactly how much greenhouse gas has been emitted and how much it is going up or coming down each week.

It is a new initiative which allows Victorians to see how much their use of coal-fired electricity, petroleum and natural gas is adding to the state's greenhouse emissions. The concept has been developed by a group called The Climate Group, which was founded in London in 2004. It now has bases in New York, California and Melbourne. As is common internationally, data is compared to 1990 emission levels. For example, the 8 January 2007 indicator shows that there has been a 25 per cent increase in greenhouse gas emissions since 1990 in Victoria. I suspect it would be something similar in South Australia.

The great value of a little device like this is to further increase public consciousness. Although the broad concept of greenhouse gas emission can seem a little daunting or vague for many people, having that weekly reminder, I feel, would surely lead people to modify their behaviour to ensure they are not contributing unduly to the problem. I would welcome an endorsement by the Premier, in the course of this debate, of a similar sort of article to be published in Adelaide on a weekly basis. I know the Premier has good relations with *The Advertiser* newspaper and maybe it would be willing to do it on a cooperative basis with government.

I have another very good idea which will contribute positively to greenhouse gas emission reduction, and it is simply this: the feed-in incentives to which the Premier has already referred. The Premier has said that legislation is being prepared to give people a bonus if they generate their own electricity through rooftop solar power. This power can be fed into the grid during peak demand times. It is not only saving the individual household, or perhaps business, energy costs but it is also generating power for the grid; that is, the community demand for electricity.

The current cost of a photovoltaic system might be \$15 000, it might be \$25 000; it is extremely expensive and it is a very strong disincentive for the average home owner. However, if the home owner was paid twice the retail price to generate power through this sort of system, it would be a significant incentive to increase the uptake of photovoltaic systems, and with increasing energy prices it would promise an even higher relative return in the future. Australia's photovoltaic solar market growth is currently about 15 per cent per annum, but I am advised that global growth is about 50 per cent per annum.

In Germany, for example, despite having fewer sunny days than we have in beautiful Adelaide, they have seen an

increase from a 6 megawatt market in 1992 to a world market lead of 840 megawatts from solar photovoltaic installations. Germany pays (in Australian dollar terms) 85 cents per kilowatt to photovoltaic producers, so I am advised. At the moment AGL in South Australia will charge somewhere a little over 18 cents per kilowatt for summer rate power; I take that from a January 2007 AGL bill. So, even if we do not go anywhere near as well as the market leaders in Germany, we could pay twice the retail rate back to consumers and give home owners a very strong encouragement to have photovoltaic solar power installed on their rooftops.

I have not sufficient time to go into some of the other options, but clearly carbon trading and, even more importantly, carbon taxing, need to be considered. I am somewhat sceptical about carbon trading schemes because they can be viewed as permission to pollute. In other words, we can do something bad and as long as we do something good then we have made up for it and that is acceptable. Well, it is not really acceptable if we are actually making the problem worse as we go along. I think a carbon tax would provide a stronger disincentive and would provide governments—in this case I suppose it would be the federal government—with funds to do something more effective to actually reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

In summary, this is a good bill. It will help to raise public consciousness of the importance of greenhouse gas emissions, but the targets are phoney and they need to be improved. The long-term targets also need to have interim targets for them to be meaningful. We can also, as I have said, improve the reporting times of the proposed climate change council to add political pressure by having reporting before, rather than after, state elections. I have suggested that there are a couple of other things the government can do and I look forward to the Premier's response to those proposals.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I congratulate the Premier on this legislation. I am also speaking to highlight the importance of a major solar thermal project for Whyalla and for South Australia and to promote this project. I acknowledge the role of the Premier in recognising the threat posed by global warming. The 20 per cent renewable energy target by 2014 and the recently released discussion paper on residential photovoltaic feed-in changes are steps in the right direction. Although we can point to a number of positive initiatives at a state level, the overall increase in renewable energy capacity in South Australia is directly linked to the federal government's MRET.

The inadequate 2 per cent target set by the federal government will certainly soon be met. Currently, South Australia claims the lead when it comes to grid-connected solar capacity, but this is really more a reflection on how poorly we are doing as a nation when one considers that the grid-connected solar capacity in South Australia, out of the

total name-plate generating capacity of over 3 000 megawatts, is just over two megawatts.

Victoria has been willing to enter into a partnership with the federal government and the private sector to develop a large solar project using Australian-developed technology. The Victorian project will provide nearly 70 times more solar electricity than the total installed grid-connected solar capacity in our state. When the company involved in the Victorian project was asked why it picked Victoria, the answer was because of the tangible support offered by the Victorian government and the Victorian mandatory renewable energy target.

South Australia has also been offered an opportunity to become part of a serious solar project. Prior to the last federal election, the Prime Minister made a qualified commitment to the Whyalla Solar Oasis project, a combined solar thermal desalination project. The commitment was dependent on private sector backing and support from the South Australian government. Unfortunately, the Whyalla City Council gave a very premature presentation on the project to the South Australian cabinet when they visited Whyalla some time ago, and it certainly acknowledged that the presentation has not helped the development of the project. However, the project has evolved since then and there is now serious private sector backing for a staged development, and there has been active encouragement by federal public servants with respect to the project.

Formal submissions have been lodged with the National Water Commission due to the desalination component and with the Australian Greenhouse Office to cover the energy storage component of the project. The technology at the heart of the project has been developed over 30 years at the Australian National University. Their concentrating solar thermal technology is acknowledged as one of the leading solar thermal technologies. The private sector has entered into a partnership with the ANU to commercialise the technology.

The private sector, the ANU, the federal government, the local council and the Economic Development Board are all willing to support a demonstration project in Whyalla. The technology demonstration phase would be followed by a pre-commercialisation stage leading to a third-stage commercial project. We now require the support of the state government. There seems to be little understanding about solar thermal technology and its potential to provide serious cost-effective greenhouse friendly energy. There also seems to be limited interest in growing a new industry sector.

In a report by the Cooperative Research Centre on Sustainable Coal looking at energy options, concentrating solar thermal was considered to be the stand-out renewable energy technology and the one with the potential to directly compete on a cost basis with fossil fuel energy production within the next decade. The reason CST was rated so highly, in addition to cost, was its capacity to meet the needs of two major electric power markets. CST can meet the needs of large-scale dispatchable markets made up of grid-connected peaking and base-load power. It can also meet the needs of a rapidly growing distributed markets entailing both on-grid and remote off-grid applications.

Both wind and photovoltaic source of electricity are intermittent in nature and lack cheap forms of energy storage. In addition, photovoltaic electricity is very expensive compared to solar thermal and wind. Concentrating solar thermal is a far more flexible technology platform in that it generates heat steam and electricity. Given the high temperatures that can be generated, cost-effective thermochemical

energy storage is available and it enables solar thermal plants to be run as base load or peaking stations. Because of the availability of heat and electricity, the collocation of solar thermal with other industrial processes has advantages. Collocation with desalination, whether reverse osmosis or thermal processes, is especially advantageous.

Solar thermal is about to copy the development path of the wind turbine industry. Due to the inherent flexibility of solar thermal, it will overtake wind, especially in the world's sun belt nations. Those regions that get in early have the potential to build a significant new industry base. Look at the export dollars and the employment base that has been created in Denmark, Germany and Spain as a result of first-mover/early-mover advantage in the wind sector.

How many of the turbines used in South Australia come from those European countries? Both Germany and Spain are looking to invest in solar thermal. It would be a great pity to see us once again failing to capitalise on our research and development. A real opportunity exists to put South Australia at the forefront of concentrating solar thermal development. We have the opportunity to capture and enhance over 30 years of technology development undertaken by the Australian National University, and the ANU has expressed a desire to work with UniSA (which has a campus in Whyalla) on a solar thermal project in Whyalla. Private sector companies are willing to invest a significant amount of money to commercialise the technology in our state, and we have very strong local support, including support from the combined union movement and the Chamber of Commerce.

South Australia is well placed to provide a genuine lead in reducing greenhouse gas emissions with a combination of concentrating solar thermal, geothermal, wind, gas, and energy efficiency. I would like to see the solar thermal project work for South Australia and to do our bit, in partnership with others, to get this Australian technology to the starting line. I congratulate the Premier on this legislation, and I urge that Whyalla be supported in its proposal to lead in this major project.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I read the speech of the Premier—who is now the country's first self-ordained and proclaimed minister for sustainability and climate change—on climate change and greenhouse reduction. It was full of self-congratulatory claptrap and expensive tax-paid gimmicks. I thought, 'What an opportunity lost.' In it, the Premier sets out his case for the bill and states that 'the imperative for action is becoming clearer and more urgent by the day'—a statement with which most of us agree. He mentions big names and endorsements to help his credibility—namely, Mikhail Gorbachev, Tony Blair, Vice President Gore, David Suzuki, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Sir Nicholas Stern, Morris Iemma, and John Thwaites—and even the Queen's Speech at the recent opening of the United Kingdom parliament gets a mention.

In summing up, he states that the bill seeks to bring about practical change for the better to maintain South Australia's national and international leadership in relation to climate change and to secure the long-term prosperity of our state. The empty rhetoric that accompanied his grand words was embarrassing—I suspect not only to me but also to anyone with a knowledge of the issues facing the world and our role in them. I really believe that we as a small state have an opportunity to provide national and international leadership that could make a significant difference to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

However, while we happily play on the world stage by selling our uranium, we are not taking responsibility for our actions. As a mother, I know, as all parents do, that every right carries with it responsibility and that every action has a reaction. We teach our children that there is a price to pay, a cost for the benefits we enjoy. We must go to school, and we must work in jobs and earn money for the things we want for us and our families so that we can enjoy the good things in life. We know that we must pay taxes to our governments if we are to have the health and education services we want.

I believe that our good fortune in having uranium in the ground that is wanted by much of the rest of the world so that they can catch up and enjoy the lifestyle we already enjoy is a responsibility and has a cost for which we must pay the price, as we will enjoy the benefits from the money they pay for it. It is my view that this state should take back the radioactive waste that is produced when our uranium is processed.

We have a stable political system, which the Premier so happily espoused today as one of the reasons we are near the top in the world for mineralisation, exploration and development. This is just another reason that we must take responsibility. There are many other countries which do not have the benefit of our wonderful democracy and whose governments are at the whim of some very unpleasant dictators. If they got their hands on plutonium produced from uranium from South Australia, blew up people and damaged our environment, I would feel at least in part responsible. I ask you, Madam Deputy Speaker: wouldn't you? The twin towers disaster would look minimal in comparison with the carnage that would be caused.

We also have some of the best, most stable geological formations where the waste can be stored. The Maralinga area—where some of the atomic bomb testing was done years ago—is accessed from my electorate of Flinders, and I understand that could be one such place. It has an area that is close both to the contaminated areas and to the railway that links the north and south as well as the east and west of Australia, and that could bring in waste from all over the world, if necessary, via ports around the country. It is sparsely populated and has coastal areas where a direct port could be established if required. It is not as if we would not be well compensated by companies that would like to pay someone to take the waste.

The Premier, washing his hands (like Pontius Pilate) of the responsibility for uranium once it has left our shores, saying it is not a problem, does not recognise that we live in an increasingly global world—as he pointed out in his speech—and this cannot be accepted by any decent-thinking people.

Last but not least, we could, in this bill, undertake to do some serious research into thorium nuclear technology. This could be the solution to the uranium conundrum, and we are also blessed with having some of the largest deposits of thorium in the world. For some excellent information regarding thorium I recommend the article 'New Age Nuclear' by Tim Dean in the April 2006 issue (issue No. 8) of *Cosmos* magazine. My views can be found in my speech to parliament of 3 May 2006, which is under 'Speeches' on my website at www.lizpenfold.com.

The Premier could undertake to put a trial thorium reactor at Maralinga, which would have the potential of using the uranium waste that accumulates there and reducing its life to a fraction of what it is at present while also providing cheap power for the Australian power grid. Iluka, Challenger and Zinifex are among those companies that currently need power

in the region. There will be a massive need for power with the nearby Gawler Craton mineralisation being developed, as well as a need for the water that could be produced by the proposed desalination plants. A thorium reactor has the huge advantage of not producing plutonium but of burning it up, and it is impossible for thorium reactors to either blow up or melt down. If we really are to live in a sustainable environment on this planet, and take responsibility for ourselves and the footprint we leave on this earth, then now is our opportunity to do so.

In his speech the Premier talks about retrofitting expensive solar panels on government buildings, 250 schools, and the Adelaide Airport. These already have power, and this would only cause ongoing depreciation and maintenance costs. The millions spent on these gimmicks could have been put into providing real power to some of the state's regional communities that really need it. The Premier boasts about South Australia being home to about 51 per cent of Australia's installed wind power capacity; I would like to know where he was when I started with the first of the wind generation proposals during the time of our Liberal government. I received very little support from either side of the parliament, and when Babcock and Brown wanted to do their first community presentation they could not get a politician to come and speak. Much to my great pride I was called upon, and made the first speech (I believe) by a politician in the state of South Australia on this subject.

The Premier speaks of these gimmicks, and of the doubling of uranium mining at Roxby Downs and the benefits that will bring, as if it was of his own making, when he could instead be doing great things, things that have world significance, things that would really help reduce our dependence upon coal and greenhouse gases and make the world not only a cleaner but also a much safer place. Such as it is, I support the bill.

Mr PISONI (Unley): The opposition has indicated that it will be supporting this bill and, of course, I also support it. Like the member for West Torrens, I too was once a sceptic regarding global warming and the problems that greenhouse gases were causing to the climate until I visited China in 1993. I think that one of the important things that any sceptic should do is visit a place such as China to see what happens when there is development at any cost and without planning.

I was in southern China just north of Hong Kong in Guangzhou. I was looking at a furniture factory at the time. I was very pleased that Mr Ha, who was the factory owner, made the trip into the heart of the furniture factory with us because it was a part of China that was not used to seeing Westerners, unlike the case in larger cities like Shanghai and Beijing where their street signs are written in both English and Chinese. We were able to get to the destination but not before catching a train to the top of Hong Kong, then from there we took another train in an hour or two into an industrial area in Guangzhou, then onto a bus which was at least 50 years old. I remember quite distinctly that at the time the bus was chock-a-block full with young Chinese workers on their way to work.

My wife had quite blonde hair at the time, and it was obvious that they had not seen blonde hair before and they all came over to feel my wife's hair. It was quite an interesting experience. The shock came when we had to get out of the bus, because it had been raining the previous day; we were supposed to use the new underpass that was being built underneath a railway line, but it was so full of water that we

had to get out of the bus, cross over the top of the railway line and hop onto another bus on the other side to travel another hour or so to reach the factory. We saw horrific standards there: dirt floors in the factory, workers with bare feet and workers holding chair legs with their feet while they were moulding them with angle grinders, which was quite an extraordinary sight.

China has changed a lot since then and in that change we have seen an enormous growth and development there. One of the things I noticed, particularly in the later stages of my trips to China from 2000 onwards when I was a regular traveller to Shanghai, was that visibility on a good day was about 500 metres, and the amazing thing about it is that, although you could see skyscrapers everywhere, you could only see about 500 metres. But as you drove around there were skyscrapers all over the place and traffic of course in Shanghai is an awful mess. The concern we have here is that, although China is trying to be responsible with its power generation and its growth, it is still a developing nation and it is still a nation that is using very old technology in some areas. We are seeing this because China still burns coal and builds coal plants for providing electricity and, unfortunately, it is not building enough nuclear plants to be buying more of our uranium and providing cleaner fuel for itself. It is still building coal plants because they are cheaper to build.

Every eight months the Chinese economy contributes the equivalent of the Australian economy in greenhouse gases into the air. So, every eight months we are seeing the equivalent of a new Australia coming on board and producing greenhouse gases adding to the world's greenhouse gases. I think that, as a country and a state, we should be very concerned about that and what we do in our own backyard. We should be leading by example and we should be putting ourselves in a position whereby we can export green energy technology to countries like China, India and Thailand. Thailand is another booming economy, with the largest Mercedes factory in the world being in Bangkok. What is happening in the way of unregulated and uncontrolled development in Asia is quite extraordinary.

I was interested to hear some of the points made by the member for Flinders. She is right when she says that, even as a small state, we can make a difference. I hope this legislation will make a difference for South Australia and for the world.

An article in the 'Environment Watch' column in the very reputable publication *Unley Outlook* (which is produced by the member for Unley) talks about what the small state of Iowa in the United States is doing. The United States is the largest contributor of greenhouse gases in the world. The interesting thing about Iowa is that its economy is similar to that of South Australia. It is certainly less centralised than South Australia, but it does have a large rural sector to its economy. It also produces heavy machinery, particularly farming machinery. In Iowa, you will also find the Winnebago factory. Anyone who enjoys a motor home holiday would be aware of the Winnebago factory. The article states:

When in Government the Liberal Party paved the way for the use of wind power in our state by initiating the Starfish Hill Wind Farm north of Cape Jervis, the first wind farm in South Australia. But it's not only the hillsides of the Fleurieu Peninsula that are sprouting windmills. In Mason City. . . in the United States they are encouraging the use of electricity-producing windmills everywhere—even in homeowners' backyards.

It is interesting that we are seeing an expansion of the use of windmills. The article goes on:

Mason City recently became the first Iowa town to set rules that allow windmills in commercial, industrial and residential zones. The City Council unanimously approved these changes. This bold step will allow small wind systems in residential backyards: a very sensible option considering increasing electricity prices—

that is the main motivation for these Iowa farmers. I think they are more concerned about the rising cost of electricity in the United States—

and the universal issue of global warming. Mason City requires permits for windmills and regulates where they can be built. Residential windmills placed in backyards can't exceed 30 metres in height. The backyard also has to be big enough so that if the windmill topples it doesn't cross property lines.

That is an interesting point. So, these windmills probably would not be suitable for an electorate like Unley. In Mason City, you cannot build a windmill on your back fence, and your block of land has to be big enough so that, if for some unforeseen reason the windmill falls over, it will not affect your neighbour because it will stay within your own property. So, it is your risk and your problem. The article goes on:

A Mason City Architect installed two 10 metre windmills outside his office. Combined with solar-energy panels this renewable energy produced 90% of the electricity used by his business.

The increasing popularity of wind energy is part of a surge in the development of alternative energy sources. Midwest USA is leading [the way in this]. . . surge [and] in the popularity of wind energy as an alternative energy source, evidenced by:

- Minnesota passing a law last year that encourages new windmills by cutting red tape and offsetting some construction costs.

So, red tape for the introduction of windmills. The article goes on:

- Michigan's public service commission changed its policies last year to allow consumers to sell excess electricity from windmills back to utilities.
- North Dakota last year reduced application fees and made it easier to get permission to build windmills.

Tax credits and low-interest loans are making windmills more affordable. A small home-based system costs about \$AUD50 000. South Australia needs to make the use of renewable energy easier and more accessible to the public.

We need more than a few micro wind turbines on government buildings and spin from [the] Premier. . . to make a [real difference in global warming]

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): This bill before us will, no doubt, reflect well on the Premier, and that is probably the object of the entire exercise. I say that because when you read through the bill, read its various clauses and provisions, you find there is little in it that actually requires a bill or an act. In fact, most of what is in it would have been amply dealt with had it been a government policy document, a glossy brochure, an objective set out in the State Strategic Plan or in some other form. There are no penalties mentioned in the bill, no compulsory demands of people in the bill. There are some volume targets set, as mentioned by other speakers, most of which will be easily achieved in respect of renewable energy and the proportion of renewable energy consumed so that it comprises 20 per cent of electricity. There are those two 20 per cent renewable energy targets and the much harder one to achieve, that is, that by 2050 greenhouse gas emissions within the state will be reduced by at least 60 per cent, to an amount that is equal or less than 40 per cent of 1990 levels. Of course there are no mandatory requirements in here. There is little set out.

The functions of the minister could have easily been set out by a Premier's directive. The forming of the Premier's climate change tax council could easily have been mandated in some other way. None of it requires a bill, so why do we have a bill? We have a bill, I suspect, so the Premier can say,

'We have a bill', so he can say, as he has, that we are the fourth nation in the world to have introduced this bill—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Third.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Third; I beg your pardon. That must have come from the Fraser Institute in Canada. On reading the Premier's second reading explanation, I say with the greatest of respect to the Premier that it is a little self congratulatory, to say the least: the accolades he recites to himself from David Suzuki and Al Gore as if they are his best buddies, and various other reports in that second reading explanation frankly border on being a little bit embarrassing. I note early in the second reading that it says:

It is the first climate change legislation to be introduced in Australian and only the third of its kind in the world after California and the Canadian province of Alberta.

It is probably the least meaningful. I say that in the sense that it is a gesture. As a gesture I say to the Premier that it is worthwhile because I suppose it is signalling an intent. On that basis it is worth supporting, and for that reason I will support it. It is trying to send a message, but it did not need to be done in the form of a bill. That is all about the real object here, namely, the Rann legacy. We had the Dunstan legacy and that was the arts, a period of social change, the early 1970s. People remember Don fondly. The Premier was media adviser and a minder for Don. It must have occurred to the Premier: what will be my legacy, and what will people remember me for when I am gone? This is clearly the Premier's legacy. The Rann legacy will be that he was a visionary on climate change. What Rann left to the people of South Australia was a vision on climate change: he really did something about it. I cannot think of a single other thing—

Mr Pengilly: WorkCover.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, and the billion dollar WorkCover liability. Sorry, there are a few other things and a couple of major infrastructure projects that have stuffed up. And there was the Ashbourne scandal. But I will not be distracted. The Rann legacy is to be an Al Gore/David Suzuki vision for South Australia on climate change. I know I am being facetious, but in some respects I think that is a commendable gesture and I do not mean to diminish it. One thing I share with the Premier is that this is a very serious subject. I just think that the theatrics and the spin are fairly obvious, to the point of being almost embarrassing and painful.

I did receive the 30 June 2006 glossy brochure, which I think we all got. There was probably one in every letter box in South Australia, produced at great expense to the taxpayer, full of accolades and lots of nice photographs of the Premier—which seemed to be the same photograph that was there in 2002, so it is about five or six years old now, although it is a very nice photograph and I did read it with great interest. There is no argument from me that this is a most important issue, but the house needs to be aware that there is no need for this bill whatsoever. This bill is about promoting the Premier as the climate change visionary. I do not deny the Premier's right to do that, but we need to be transparent, open and honest about it. Let me now just expose some of the interesting peculiarities of the bill.

One of them is that it sets this voluntary target—no mandatory aspect to it—to reduce greenhouse gases to 60 per cent, which is a proportion of 1990 levels. Of course, that will be extraordinarily difficult because demand for energy in Australia and in South Australia is growing exponentially. In fact, energy demand in Australia will grow by more than 65 per cent by 2030, requiring new generators producing an extra 30 000 megawatts, costing \$35 billion and casting

doubt, in my view, over the Rann government's plans to cut emissions to 60 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050. That is a view echoed by ESAA Chief Executive Brad Page, who was quoted as saying precisely that in *The Advertiser* of 16 December 2006.

In South Australia, peak demand is expected to grow by 1.7 per cent or 60 megawatts per year during the next decade, according to the Electricity Supply Planning Council in *The Advertiser* on the same day. Energy demand in South Australia is growing extraordinarily and, as it is growing, this bill is setting voluntary targets to considerably reduce emissions. I suppose the obvious question to ask is: how will it be done? The bill says that it will be done partly by renewables and it sets the two 20 per cent targets for renewable energy use that we are supposed to achieve. There is no discussion in the bill as to how that might be done. I give the Premier some credit for his commitment to wind energy, and I am speaking with my shadow Minister for Energy hat on when I say that I think that has been a positive.

Of course, it is massively subsidised by the taxpayer, otherwise it simply would not be viable. There would be no wind energy, as, indeed is the case for solar energy. I was reading an article in *The Australian* on the weekend that was making the point that the cost of solar panels on the average rooftop, when you factor in the full cost—and the member for Newland might be able to help me—is something like \$1 000 per megawatt hour compared to a much smaller cost for buying the power per megawatt hour over the grid.

Wind, solar, bio and all these other renewables are extraordinarily expensive and heavily subsidised, which raises the question that I would like the proponent of the bill to address when he responds to the second reading, namely: how will the renewable targets be funded? There has been a lot of talk tonight about Kyoto and carbon trading. The issue of carbon taxing is being debated nationally. The Switkowski report on nuclear energy commissioned by the federal government talked about the fact that the cost of energy will go up, and it will go up extraordinarily.

The bottom line is that, if we really want to do something about getting greenhouse gas emissions down, we must make the burning of coal more expensive. Now, whether we do that through taxation, carbon trading or through some other device is a matter for debate, but it will have to be made more expensive. Nothing in the bill tells us how that process will unfold. In fact, the glossy brochure the Premier put out makes the very point, and I quote from it, as follows:

The legislation does not specify the actual architecture and requirements of the voluntary emissions offset programs.

Indeed, it does not, because I do not think the Premier really has any idea how those emissions will be met. Of course, that strikes at the nub of the issue, and this is where I think there needs to be some meaningful contribution from the Premier and the government about how we will get to the destination this bill talks of, that is, renewable energy, climate change, water and this question of nuclear energy: they are all joined at the hip, as it were—where our energy will come from.

So, unless the Premier can tell us from where our energy will come, there will be remaining question marks about the viability of this entire bill and the targets set in it, particularly the major target which will be the most difficult to achieve. Various members tonight have talked about renewable energies, and I noted the article by the member for Newland in *The Australian* last weekend imploring the Labor Party to give up on the argument that nuclear energy is a danger to the

environment. He knows that it is not so. The science is overwhelmingly against that proposition, and I think that the Premier also knows that. He knows that, because he has completely given up on the argument that nuclear energy is damaging to the environment. His argument against nuclear energy now is completely and solely that, in his view, it is not economically viable and that it would be too expensive, which caused me to go back and reflect on—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The same as Iain Evans' position.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, actually, the leader and I agree on this subject almost entirely, which is another interesting thing. I notice that the Premier has been going around talking about how we did not agree. As a matter of fact, we agree on two things, that is, that—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Only two?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, there are several, and one of them is that it is probably extremely unlikely that we will ever see a nuclear power station in South Australia, and the reason is that we have abundant supplies of gas. I do not think that it will occur for a long time: I think that the leader said 20 or 30 years, and he is probably right; it could be even longer. Someone may come up with a viable economic proposition before then. I have my mind open to that proposition, unlike the Premier. The leader and I agree on that completely.

We also agree that we would trust some of the nation's leading businessmen to develop a business case on anything rather than the Premier, the Minister for Energy and the Treasurer—anything at all. I do remember another big business venture in which the Premier was involved. It was called the HMAS State Bank. The name of the captain of the HMAS State Bank was Bannon, and the chief engineer—with his cap on—was his senior minister, Mike Rann. A cabin boy on the bridge, bobbing about with a cup of tea, was the Treasurer who, at the time, was a senior adviser to the Premier. Various other people— aspiring Labor MPs—were bobbing about down in the engine room. Of course, that was a brilliant bit of investment decision making, and we did have the Premier come in here and describe Tim Marcus Clark in glowing terms!

The Premier does have form on business decisions. That is why I was interested to read his 1982 booklet for the Australian Labor Party on why we should never build Roxby Downs. It was fascinating. The uranium industry was a shocking evil that 'should never be embraced'. 'Roxby Downs should remain sand in the desert.' Indeed, it was a mirage in the desert, we should never have it, it was absolute anathema. In relation to the nuclear energy industry, well, that means conversion, enrichment and nuclear power. That was a booklet built on principles. Well, this bill before us today is a document built on pragmatism—and very much so. It is about image creation. The principles are out the door and getting re-elected is in the other door. There are no longer any principled moral objections to nuclear power. In fact, the Premier is happy to export thousands of tonnes of uranium oxide. He wants to personally wrap it up, put a ribbon around it, put it on the ships and send it off to India and China so they can build nuclear power stations.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Not India.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You are enthusiastic about nuclear power stations in China using our uranium—but not here. Neither am I. I do not think it will ever happen here. It may—I am open to it—but I doubt it will ever happen here; it may happen elsewhere in Australia. It raises interesting questions. Will we refuse to take their energy? Will we refuse

to export our uranium there? Will we refuse to remain connected to a grid that is coming from a nuclear power station? Will we pass a bill banning academics at South Australian universities from studying nuclear science in case they get a job there? It raises all those anomalies. I make the point that we should keep an open mind.

I draw the Premier's attention to the findings of Switkowski—and other members may like to take note. He said that nuclear power is the least cost, low emission technology that can provide base load power, is well established, can provide base load power and can play a role in Australia's future generation mix—probably not in South Australia but maybe elsewhere in Australia. Even Tim Flannery agrees with that, and he has written an article in *The Australian* accordingly.

I have an open mind. What I would like to hear from the Premier and members of the government are some ideas on how Australia and South Australia can generate renewable energy. The future Australia and South Australia I would like to see are those where all our energy needs are met by renewal energy—solar, geothermal (which I think shows great promise) and other forms of completely renewable energy. I think anyone who is informed on this subject, given future growth in demand, knows that will not be scientifically sustainable. We will need clean coal technologies and nuclear power somewhere in the global mix. Probably the best thing South Australia is doing for global warming and climate change is exporting its uranium to China so they can build more nuclear power stations and not coal-burning polluting power stations—but that is another issue.

I simply say to the Premier that I think the goal is a fine goal, but the goal is to badge the Premier's legacy of being the climate change Premier. This will be the lasting legacy of this government. This is what it will be. This is what we will hang our hat on. I do not know whether we need this bill in order to do that. It is a useful device and I will be supporting it because I care desperately about climate change. I agree with the Premier completely that this is the transfixing and focusing issue for the world and South Australia. We do need to do more. This is a step in that direction and for that reason I will be agreeing to it. The only thing I say to the house, as we go down this journey of finding a solution to climate change, the water problems we face and our future energy needs—those three problems joined at the hip—is: let us keep an open mind. Let us not ram down the shutters on any option before us. This is about our children and grandchildren and their future.

We can have these arguments, rule out options, play political games and try scaremongering campaigns—and the classic one is occurring at the moment about nuclear power—and pass a world to our children that is unsustainable; or we can embrace whatever options offer a solution and find some meaningful solutions for our children and our grandchildren. I look forward to supporting the bill. I think the goals are commendable. I would like to see how the Premier will achieve them, particularly the emission reduction goal, and I hope that it will be done.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr KENYON (Newland): I rise very briefly to make a few comments. I note the comments of the member for Waite (as always interesting) decrying the fact that the bill lacked mandatory targets, but I suspect that the other side of the house would be in here crying foul and screaming to the high heavens if there were in fact mandatory targets. I would suspect that they would be opposing the bill and voting against it if there were mandatory targets. It is a bit rich for the member for Waite to criticise the government for not having mandatory targets. I disagree with the member for Waite on a number of issues that he has raised, but especially I disagree with him about the cost of nuclear energy. He is suggesting that it is the lowest cost renewable power. That is not true: it is not the lowest cost renewable power. For a start, it is not a renewable form of generation—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr KENYON: Even if you accept, as I do, that it is a zero emission generation source, it is still not the lowest cost. A number of lower cost options are available and nuclear is not the lowest cost. One thing that we need to be very careful about when we enter this whole debate on greenhouse emissions is that we do not increase the cost of energy. The ultimate goal should be to decrease the cost of energy to our economy. The ideal goal would be a zero emission power source that decreases the cost of energy—and I look forward to that happening. There is an unseemly haste in the way in which the member for Waite has rushed to the media saying that we should have nuclear energy. Certainly members opposite and members of the federal Liberal Party have demonstrated an unseemly haste to impose a 50 per cent cost burden. We have the federal Liberal government trying to impose a 50 per cent price rise as its greenhouse solution. That is it.

I refer members to an article on page 12 of last Thursday's edition of *The Australian*—an excellent article if I do say so myself—saying that the Prime Minister's nuclear power solution is a 50 per cent price rise and that is it. That is all it has come up with. No leadership on an emissions trading scheme; no leadership on research. It has done a few things on geothermal power by giving start grants and ready grants, but it is haphazard. There is no coordinated response. Having a bill such as this at least gets that process rolling and gets some sort of coordinated response. For members opposite to say that it is not good enough but they will vote for it anyway is a bit beyond belief. I think they are voting for it for political reasons because they understand that they cannot get away with voting against it, although ideally they would love to.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I would not have joined in a debate such as this five or six years ago but, certainly, the issue of climate change and the world response to it has gathered momentum, particularly in the past 12 months, and in this case I commend the Premier—and he has walked back into the house and I will have to keep my remarks fairly tidy. I know that even China is talking about reducing its productivity to accommodate a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and I note the earlier comments by the member for Unley.

I am excited by the new ideas that are being generated as a result of the need to address the climate change issue. Some of these may seem minor, and they are. One example is the decision to phase out the use of standard incandescent light bulbs and use compact fluoro lights. I say that is very Mickey Mouse and I do not believe it will have any effect at all. In

fact, I have been using these things for many years and I do not like them because they do not have the long life that they are supposed to have and they are expensive, but it does get the message out, and people are being educated in this way. As we did with the carpet python and trying to save energy—

Mr Williams: The door snake.

Mr VENNING: The door snake. Okay, they were crazy things, and minister Conlon brought that in, but it is all about getting a message across to the people. And, yes, it will do that because, without a doubt, the little fluoro lights certainly save energy. But the most efficient lighting still is, and should continue to be, the incandescent tube—that is, the long fluoro tube that we have had for many years now. But the message that we are putting out is that every little bit helps.

The other day I received an email from the Clayton Bay community in South Australia, which is keen to see the end of street lights to help save the planet and reduce light pollution at the same time in the night sky. I was quite taken aback by that. I have never considered having an end-of-street-lights policy, because it uses a lot of energy and also it uses the slack power being generated during times of low use at night. Evidently the community has enjoyed a no-street-lights character since its creation in 1858. I am not sure the idea will catch on, for safety reasons, but it may be appropriate in some areas and it shows that people are really thinking about ways to cut power usage. So, people are certainly talking about it, in all different ways, and everyone in their own personal use and own personal situation seems to come up with a solution to help.

We have to tackle the bigger issues in relation to power production methods, and I have spoken on the record many times about this. I was here during the Roxby Downs debate. Nuclear power is clearly an option we have to consider, given the resources we have in this state. I was rather annoyed last week, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the Premier said on radio, 'There will be no power station in South Australia while I am Premier.' It was shades of Gough Whitlam, and I thought, 'Listen to the tone of voice', as the Premier of the day was talking about Roxby Downs. Lynn Arnold was very strong on this matter: it was a mirage in the desert. We now have the largest uranium mine in the world, with twice the capacity to out-produce anyone else, and today the Premier comes in here (and I support what he said) championing our mining industry as being fourth in the world. Beauty, fantastic—but you have to say then, 'We will dig it but we are not going to process it and we are not going to use it.' As federal minister Alexander Downer said, it will take a lot of fluoro watches to use up that amount of uranium. I think that the Premier has his tongue in his cheek somewhat. He knows—and he hopes, I think—that he can remain in office, but the powers that be will see that it is an option that we must choose.

It is quite ludicrous for the Premier to support the export of uranium from South Australian mines but reject out of hand the idea of a nuclear power station being built here in South Australia. Will it be the same as the debate on the location of the radioactive waste dump? Will it be okay if it is built a few metres across the border in New South Wales, or in Victoria, perhaps? Emotion and parochialism hijack these debates.

I now want to introduce another subject. I applaud the actions of the Premier over the last few weeks in relation to his debate with the federal government over the control of the River Murray. I would say that he was one of the first Premiers in Australia to say, 'Yes, I'm going to go along with the Prime Minister, but on the condition that there be an

independent body.' He won the day, and he can take the accolades for that—I don't care—but does the same thing not apply (and I am pleased to see the Premier sitting here) in relation to a nuclear waste dump? No-one wants it, but we are all Australians. A lot of the material is used in our hospitals but, because it is generated at Lucas Heights in Sydney, does the waste have to go back to New South Wales? I think it is high time that it was an Australian decision.

We should have an Australian nuclear waste dump somewhere in Australia, in the best place for Australia, rather than on a state basis. I really believe that. I again commend the Premier for his stance on the River Murray. However, I think the same principle applies with respect to an Australian nuclear waste dump. I firmly believe that, as technology advances, there is less and less of this material going to waste. In fact, a lot of it is being reprocessed as we speak, and it will be a very valuable resource.

In 1982, Mr Rann wrote a booklet. Remember that one, Mike? He wrote a booklet for the ALP opposing uranium mining and export from Roxby Downs and nuclear energy developments anywhere in the world. I think I should reprint and distribute it. However, he is very happy to praise the uranium mining industry today in the house. He now gladly accepts the huge benefits that these mines provide to the South Australian economy. I am happy to say that I support the industry. Both the member for MacKillop and I are associated with the mining industry here in South Australia, and we are so pleased that it has gone ahead, irrespective of a Labor government, because over the years Labor has never been an active supporter of mines. They have seen the light now, because if it was not for the mining industry where would our economy be as we go through these tough and strained times? It is the mineral boom that is keeping our economy where it is.

The Premier is now pushing the line that it is okay for other countries to have nuclear power stations if they cannot source other fuels. The Premier is clever with words. Every day I think the Premier is taking a slightly softer line; he is moving bit by bit. I do not mind that, as long as he takes the debate with him—as long as we are allowed to debate these subjects, because it has been taboo. He could not even discuss it. Even on our side of the house we were not allowed to discuss nuclear. At least the member for Newland had the guts to speak about the subject in his maiden speech. Shock, horror! But it is on the record, and I thank Tom. There is life after Chernobyl.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I can't remember yours. His was worth while. With respect to the matter of parochialism, what about thinking about the possibility of benefits for the whole of Australia and the world's climate? People talk about countries in the world that have a clean image. France, arguably, has some good wine. It is a beautiful country, but where does France get its power from? Some 48 per cent of it is nuclear.

Mr Williams: It's 72.

Mr VENNING: It's 72 per cent, my colleague tells me. Is France paying a price? Every time one buys a bottle of French wine one thinks 'Ahh, ah'. Nuclear wine—does it glow in the dark? Of course it does not. It has made no difference at all. France has a wonderful image in relation to 'clean and green'. I challenge any member here to hire a light plane next weekend and fly over the Port Augusta power station.

Ms Simmons: I haven't got your money, Ivan.

Mr VENNING: No, \$25 or \$30 will get you over. Just fly over Port Augusta at about 6 or 7 o'clock in the morning. It is the most horrific sight that you will ever see. It is the filthiest, dirtiest situation, when you see the crap that comes out of that chimney and where it goes; it is absolutely dreadful. We are burning one of the dirtiest, low energy coals in the world up there and, really, I think the Premier would raise his credibility if he said, 'Look, we're operating one of the dirtiest coal power stations in the world. We should put a ceiling on it and say, right, after a certain number of years there will be no more.' They are running out of coal at Leigh Creek, anyway. So, why does the Premier not say that we are placing a ceiling on this, and after a certain date no more brown lignite coal will be burnt there? Instead, we could use coal that is imported from interstate, or we could gasify it, or we could close it. However, if we close it, we must have another option.

It is quite a big issue. We must discuss the world's climate in relation to what we are doing. The Premier has announced that he will legislate to hold a referendum on nuclear power generation in South Australia should the federal government legislate to override the state government's ban on local nuclear power plants. He knows that the public's perception at the moment would not support that, and I know that. We are all pragmatic enough to know what the result would be. But is the Premier handing the responsibility to somebody else? I say, again, that it has to be an option, and we should have a debate about it. Again, it is parochialism—look after ourselves and do not worry about the rest of our Australian counterparts.

I am not saying that nuclear power is the only solution to reducing our greenhouse emissions, but I firmly believe that it should be part of the solution; it should at least be debated. It must be an option. I believe the final solution is a mixture of all that is available: wind generators, solar cells and nuclear energy. However, at the moment, we are not even allowed to debate it. I will quote from the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet's *Uranium Mining, Processing and Nuclear Energy Review*, received last month. Under Health and Safety (chapter six), it states:

All human activities, even domestic living, working and travelling involve risks to health and safety. The whole life cycle of any activity must, therefore, be examined to assess its overall impacts. Any technology choice must inevitably require balancing of the full life cycle costs and the benefits of competing alternatives. The health and safety costs of uranium mining and nuclear fuel use, including waste disposal, are significantly lower on a unit of energy produced basis than current fossil fuel-based energy generation when coal mining, preparation and eventual waste disposal are considered.

If the Premier is now opposed to a nuclear power station solely on economic grounds, and not on principle as in the past, I hope he has his economic facts right, but we all know he has not.

I understand that there are 443 nuclear reactors operating in 31 countries around the world producing 15 per cent of the world's electricity right now. The review previously quoted goes on to state the following:

The health and safety performance of nuclear power facilities has improved significantly over time, and is expected to improve even further with new generation reactors.

I know they can be bought off the shelf, and Chernobyl, after all this time, cannot happen with a modern reactor; it is physically impossible.

There will be much more debate on this issue, and I welcome it being brought here. As has been said, we, the opposition, support it; and, as the Premier said yesterday,

bring it on. However, let us not take too long over debating the issue because decisions need to be made and actions taken sooner rather than later if we are to achieve our targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

I believe that this bill is at least a start for South Australia in setting targets for the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in this area. It is a start to getting the message out to the people. Just the tone of the debate in the house tonight is quite a cultural change for all of us, particularly me, and I am probably one of the least green people in this place. It is amazing how we have come such a long way. We have a role to play, and this is a start.

Possible amendments could include an interim target of a 20 per cent reduction by 2020, and a review by the CSIRO every five years. It could be said that the Premier has introduced the bill for altruistic reasons. Not only do we the opposition support it but we want to take it even further. I know windmills and photovoltaic cells are all the go, but they are not the answer. Have any members of this house ever lived in a house that was not connected to mains electricity?

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Yes, say the member for MacKillop and, I believe, the member for Stuart. Certainly, for the first 15 years of my life, my family did not have mains electricity. I know what it is like to rely on a windmill, on an array of batteries, and a generator. The generator becomes your baseload of power. Back in those days there was not much money around and there was only so much petrol put in the generator and, when it ran out, you went to bed.

I welcome the installation of the wind turbines which are doing a bit. I certainly welcome the introduction of community-based photovoltaic cells, but with the understanding that when the sun is not shining and the wind don't blow, what are you doing? You are rubbing two sticks together, or you go to your baseload. In our case, we went to the shed and started the generator up. What are you going to do in relation to the state? You have to have a baseload somewhere. It cannot be stored in a battery. You have to have something out there which is going to give you power, particularly for emergency services. I believe this is where we have to have a nuclear option. I think we can reduce our power use by a huge amount and bring it back to a reasonable level. That is one thing, but you have to have that baseload of power there for people to use.

I agree with the speakers tonight that Australia is a small player in the world of pollution, but we have to lead by example, as a developed country. We have to go back to Kyoto. I know the Prime Minister has been hesitant to do that for reasons well spelt out. We have to immediately ramp up the principles of carbon trading and raise it to the next level. We have to get people out there to actively trade carbon credits. People will grow trees so they can trade that credit away. Australia has a good supply of good coal but, of course, in South Australia we have the worst coal—as I said earlier about Port Augusta—it is absolutely terrible. We have vast supplies of gas, but we need to use it much more efficiently. We have, as I think the member for Waite said earlier, huge potential with our geothermal capacity, but we are not moving fast enough on that. I do not know why. We have been looking at it now for nearly 10 years, and progress seems to be very slow.

I would like to see the Premier at least look at it and make some announcements (as he does very well) and throw a few dollars at it to give it some encouragement. On the surface it seems to have huge potential but we are not seeing progress

there and not enough is happening. Right across the population we are encouraging people to do their bit. We are encouraging the fitting of photovoltaic cells in houses, which I think is a good move, particularly with the federal government's initiative to subsidise the purchase of household photovoltaic units. I know several people have done that, at a cost for a basic house of about \$12 000 to \$14 000. It takes a long time to get that money back, but people do it because they think they are doing their bit for the environment and doing their bit for energy consumption.

I know many people get pleasantly surprised when their power bill is negative in some months of the year because these things turn their power meters back and they are actually putting power back into the grid. It is a great move, and people are prepared to spend the money. If you work it out it is certainly not worth spending \$12 000, particularly when you also tack on the cost of a solar hot-water system. It certainly takes a long time to get that money back. In fact, it does not stack up, but people are not looking at it in that way; they are looking at it as doing their bit for the environment. The opposition is keen to cooperate in every way possible and to advance it. Overall, we have to leave this nation, this country and the world in a better condition than we found it for generations to come. I support the bill.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I indicate to the house straight up that I will be supporting this bill, just as I support motherhood. I could never vote against motherhood and I do not think that I could, in all conscience, vote against this. I do not think voting for it is going to cause too many problems either, because this is a little bit of nonsense legislation which is going to do very little, if anything.

Mr Kenyon: You sceptic!

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes; I am a sceptic when it comes to this sort of nonsense, because unfortunately in South Australia we have plenty of rhetoric, plenty of talk, plenty of headlines, but bugger all action. That is the problem we have in South Australia. There are a number of issues that I want to take up with regard to this piece of legislation. I am always concerned, being a sceptic, when the Premier starts speaking and he uses the 'e-s-t' words: the biggest, the tallest, the widest; or when he says words such as 'first'. This piece of legislation has got a lot of those sort of words. In the second reading speech the Premier has got many references to 'the first', 'the greatest initiative' and 'I am a hero'. That starts to make me think, because my father—who has not been with us for a long time, but I always reckon he was a pretty wise man—taught me at his knee that self-praise is no recommendation. I think that was pretty wise counsel. So, if you have a point to make, it is worth making, it is a good point and it is well made, you do not have to indulge in self-praise.

I would ask you, Premier: did Mikhail Gorbachev write to you unsolicited? Is he reading the Adelaide *Advertiser* on a daily basis to see what the Premier of South Australia is doing to save the world? Did he, in an unsolicited way, say, 'What a marvellous man. Here is the hero of the 21st century. Here is the hero. He is going to save the planet and I am going to write him a letter.'? I doubt it very much, Mr Premier. You have named a whole heap of other people here. Tony Blair is a mate of yours; what if he wrote to you unsolicited, what if he patted you on the back and said (what did you say he said?), 'I applaud you; I applaud your leadership on climate change and the goals you have set in your new bill.' I am absolutely certain that Tony Blair is so

relaxed with his own position that he is reading the *Adelaide Advertiser* and he is reading the daily *Notice Paper* from our parliament and he rang you up and he said, 'I applaud you.' How fantastic! Give us a break, Premier. If this was the single biggest threat facing our state, and indeed our planet, we would be taking it seriously. Mr Premier, neither you nor I is taking this really seriously at the moment.

I can report to the house that I have two grandchildren now and I do take these matters seriously, because I have a very direct and bold—in fact it might even be the boldest—interest in the future. I do take it seriously. I am concerned that we will be diverted by a piece of nonsense and not take what we should be taking seriously at all seriously. I am very concerned about that. There are a number of things that in a practical way we could do as South Australians and, Premier, you fail miserably to do them in this bill. I will come to those in a few minutes.

Let me just talk about the bill a little bit and why I am concerned about your bill. The Premier talks about a reduction of 60 per cent, to an amount that is equal to or less than the 40 per cent of the 1990 levels, by 31 December 2050. That is a fantastic target. I would love to have been at school with the Premier being the master, and being marked in that sort of way. I would have loved it. It would have been fantastic sitting for my year 12 matriculation exams, and being tested, assessed and marked 30 years out. I would have loved it. Academically, I would have been considerably more successful than I was, because I am sure I could have got away with that. If that was the rule, I am sure I could have got away with it. It gets worse: how are we going to assess the baseline? Well, the minister—who happens to be the Premier—can determine the method for calculating the baseline. He can determine how it is done. At the moment, when we are setting this target, we do not even know how we are going to set the baseline.

Mr Pengilly: Ring up Tony Blair.

Mr WILLIAMS: That's pretty good. Yes, ring up Mikhail Gorbachev; I think he's the man. This is nonsensical.

Mrs Geraghty: You know everything.

Mr WILLIAMS: No, I don't know everything, but I do know—as would anybody who actually reads this—that it is nonsense. If you had read it, you would know it is nonsense too.

Mrs Geraghty: That is your opinion because you are a very opinionated gentleman, and I use that term loosely.

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, you'll have an opportunity. I do not think, sir, that the honourable member has taken her advantage to speak on this bill. I would like the member to contribute and tell me—because she obviously knows a lot more about this than I do—how the minister will determine how the baseline will be set. So, we are setting a target for which the box needs to be ticked in 35 or 40 years. That is the target, we are going to tick the box in 35 or 40 years, and we do not even know the baseline. I would love to be playing footy and, every time I kick the ball out of bounds on the full, I would say, 'That's where the goalposts were' and get six points, because that is what the Premier is doing. He is saying, 'I want to start the game, but don't tell me where the goalposts are yet because I'm not quite sure which way I'm going to kick it. I'm not quite sure which way the wind's blowing, but, believe me, within 30 years I'll have made up my mind.' That is what he is doing. Within 30 years he will have made up his mind—and it goes on.

Mr Kenyon: Move an amendment.

Mr WILLIAMS: Move an amendment? I tell the member for Newland that there is not much here to amend. I have allowed myself to be distracted by some of the interjections, sir, and I know that that is disorderly. I will try to stop that from happening any further.

I said a few minutes ago that there are a number of things that we can do. The Premier keeps talking about wind farms and, when he talks about wind farms in South Australia, he talks about 'our wind farms', the Premier's wind farms. Apart from the little fan on the top of the State Administration Building, the Premier has not committed South Australian taxpayers' money to wind farm development in this state. The biggest wind farm development in this country is in my electorate. Two companies, International Power and Babcock & Brown, are building a wind farm which, when completed, will be the biggest wind farm in this nation. It probably is already a significant wind farm development which was built in spite of the South Australian government.

The Minister for Infrastructure has been helpful in going through the process and in getting the planning development and the development plans for the power routes, and getting the approvals. I have had meetings in his office and I have taken constituents to talk with him. However, the reality is that Babcock and Brown started building wind farms at Millicent in my electorate without any support or help from the government. It did not court Babcock and Brown and encourage it to come to South Australia. In fact, my friend and neighbour, the former mayor, Don Ferguson, did a fantastic job in courting Babcock and Brown and getting it to build stage 1 of the wind farm in my electorate. Premier, I am a little affronted when you talk of 'our wind farms' and imply that they are something to do with the government. I am sure that the good people at Babcock and Brown wonder when the direct support will arrive—because at this stage it has not done so.

One of the things we can do in a positive way is continue to support wind farms through the development application process—and we could go even further: we could put some taxpayer dollars into providing the connections, the nodes where wind farms can connect to the grid. One of the big problems in developing a wind farm is that you have to connect it to the grid. Quite often, in a lot of places where wind farms can viably be established—namely, where there is a good wind energy source and where it will not upset the locals (so quite often they are isolated)—it is a problem getting the power from the wind farm into the grid. In neither the Premier's second reading explanation nor the bill do I see any commitment to going down that path.

Premier, I have long railed against your government's policy on the forestry industry in South Australia. Forestry is one of the few things we have available in our tool chest to combat global warming, carbon emissions and greenhouse gases. South Australia has never been blessed with a lot of forest, although we have had a very viable industry based on plantation forestry in the South-East. The policies of this government have not supported that industry in the way it would like to be supported. I mentioned this to the Premier when he was in my electorate a few weeks ago celebrating—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: And I gave you a very generous acknowledgment.

Mr WILLIAMS: You did, Premier—and my constituents and I acknowledged that when we spoke about it afterwards. I was pleased to have you there, Premier, because I think that it is important that you come to the regions, get on the ground and see what is happening. The forestry industry is one that

I have always supported, and I would like to see it receive considerably more support from the government of South Australia. When we are talking about global warming, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, I think that forestry is one of those win-win industries, and there are not many of them. It provides economic growth, employment and all those things we wish to attain for our communities in South Australia. It also provides benefits in regard to greenhouse gas emissions, so I think it is an important industry that should be supported.

The other hat I wear on behalf of the opposition is in the area of minerals. Geothermal energy is an emerging technology (I think that the member for Newland is well aware of this issue), and it needs an incredible amount of support. It is nowhere near proven, it is incredibly complicated, and it needs serious dollars.

I am delighted that the federal government recently announced it would put \$5 million into the work of Petrathern in the far north of South Australia. I believe it has also put some other money into the efforts of Geodynamics, and I know that through the PACE program a small amount of money has gone towards the cost of drilling some holes. I believe that it is an area for which state government funding of \$10 million, \$20 million or \$30 million would be eminently justifiable, and I would like to see this government go down that path and put serious money into this. If we are to be world leaders in a serious way we should develop geothermal technology not only for South Australia and possibly Australia, but also so that we can sell that technology to other nations around the world, because even though we have people harnessing some geothermal energy they are doing it in a (for want of a better term) pretty Mickey Mouse sort of way. There is a huge opportunity there.

Every time I talk to people about the advent of climate change, the problem of global warming and greenhouse gas emissions I cannot help but come back to the problem that will face us over the next 20 years, principally in China and India. Each year China is developing electricity generation capacity equivalent to the whole of that in Australia—they have already started doing this and will be doing it until at least the year 2020—and the vast majority of that will be coal fired. In reality it will not even be as clean as the coal-fired power generators that we use here in Australia today, the old technology used in New South Wales, 30 or 40 year old technology burning black coal. It will not even be as clean as that. If we were serious we would be very concerned about that and we would be doing everything we could to ensure that they were able to produce energy in a greenhouse-friendly way.

I defy any member of this house to stand up and suggest that people in China and India and other developing countries should not aspire to the sort of lifestyle we enjoy, the sort of lifestyle they see on their television screens on a daily basis. I defy anyone to stand up and say that they should not aspire to that because I can tell you that they do, and they will work diligently until they achieve it. It should be our job to ensure that they can do that in as greenhouse-friendly a way as possible. If we were to be really serious about tackling this problem (and I am not talking about just South Australia, I am talking about the western developed world), we would say to those communities in China and India and the other developing parts of the world, 'We will help you build nuclear power stations and we will supply you with uranium to drive them.' That is the only technology we have available at the moment that would answer that challenge.

It does not matter how much we would like to see it all done with windmills and solar panels and all those technologies; the cold hard reality is that that is the only way we will stop a heck of a lot more problems. If you think we have serious problems with CO² and other greenhouse gases entering the atmosphere at the moment, just imagine what it is going to be like in 20 or 30 years. That is why I started out by saying that I will be supporting this because I have always been in favour of motherhood, but I do not think it is actually going to achieve very much. In a global sense I do not think it is going to achieve anything at all, but I could not bring myself to vote against motherhood.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change): I thank members for this illuminating evening. I am interested in a number of things that have been said. There seems to be a bit of a split amongst the opposition's leadership team. From memory, at one stage, we had the Leader of the Opposition saying that the 20 per cent target for consumption in South Australia by 2014 and the 20 per cent target for generation in South Australia by 2014 could be easily achieved ahead of time and, therefore, they were not worthwhile having in there, which seemed a bit odd because they are massively ahead of anywhere else in the country. But the Deputy Leader of the Opposition seemed to be saying that she well knew that these targets were—from memory, unless I heard her wrong—unachievable, and that we would downgrade them in the later stages.

Again, we have a split between the top two Liberals about what is happening. Then there is a suggestion that it is all wind and puff. Maybe it is wind, because let us just remember that within about two years I am advised that we will have 730 megawatts of wind power in South Australia, which is more than we would get from using the interconnector from interstate, getting coal-fired power, which is massively more than anywhere else in Australia. In fact, last year's figure was 51 per cent. If what we are doing is not worthwhile and it is just a limp lettuce, why is it that in South Australia last year our figures showed that we generated 51 per cent of the nation's wind power? That is more wind power than all of the other states and territories combined, including New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia—massively more, in fact.

Someone interviewed me today and said, 'But you are just using the federal government's MRET scheme to get this. You are not putting money in'. The MRET scheme is available to all the other states. The fact is that we have that amount of wind power in South Australia because we have invited it; we wanted it and we have gone out and fast-tracked planning; we welcomed it, as opposed to all of the balderdash that has gone on in the other states. If it is all just about nothing, why is it that, with 7.5 per cent of the population of Australia, we have about 46 per cent of the grid connected solar power. We did that because we tried to lead by example, by doing things like connecting solar power to the parliament, the library, the art gallery and the museum, and we are rolling it out to schools. We have \$1 million worth going to the airport. It is interesting that, despite the fact that this is all motherhood, was there any wind generation prior to this government coming to power?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: No; we were a bit short of money.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You were short of money—that was it. That is interesting because it just shows how silly they are, because we are not spending money on it. We have been fast-tracking it—it is private sector investment—and the

shadow minister responsible does not seem to know that. We have not been forking out millions of dollars to create wind power, so I just do not understand.

We heard about the Fraser Institute, which has all sorts of professors who put forward different views, but they also have a mining survey. Its 2005 annual report states:

The Fraser Institute's Annual Survey of Mining Companies has become a powerful tool for mining executives to judge the quality of the regulatory environment in jurisdictions around the world. The survey's primary focus is on uncertainty. Miners spend years in exploration and development and require a predictable regulatory climate to know that they will maintain their rights at the end of this long process. Everyone from miners to environmentalists should seek certainty in regulation, so that the go-ahead depends on having a good project rather than political power.

The importance of the survey was well explained by writer Leonard Melman in a special Fall 2005 supplement on the mining survey in the *Western Standard*. 'Few industries are as dependent on overall regulatory conditions for their prosperity as the mining industry, but until 1997 there was no convenient way for mining executives to compare geographical and political regimes. Since 1997, the Fraser Institute has filled that need by conducting an annual survey of metal mining and exploration companies to assess how mineral endowments and public policy factors such as taxation and regulation affect exploration investment,' he wrote.

I have the annual report of the Fraser Institute, which our learned friend and legal colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has attacked. I can see US Vice President Dick Cheney there, and I can see the Prime Minister of Canada, Stephen Harper, addressing the institute's AGM in Calgary in April, before he became Prime Minister. So, it seems pretty reputable to me, and it is one that is held up constantly by the mining industry. Also, I was told that I was very keen to sell uranium to India—absolutely not—and that I believe in selling uranium to China, because it agrees with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty but will not support the export of uranium to India while it refuses to do so or abide by its rules.

We have mentioned wind power and solar power, and geothermal energy has been mentioned. Why aren't we doing more on hot rocks they ask. Ninety per cent of the nation's exploration expenditure in hot rocks is in South Australia. Geothermal hot rocks companies such as Geodynamics, whose Chairman, Martin Albrecht AC, who I met at the weekend, is talking about eventually setting up a 500 megawatt power station to supply virtually emission-free power to Roxby Downs. This might be flim-flam, and it might be the wet lettuce, but why is it that we are absolutely leading Australia—and we weren't before this government came to power.

However, there has been some constructive debate tonight, and we have covered a whole range of subjects. But the important thing about this legislation is that it lays down a framework in which we can move forward and add in. It is interesting. We have two targets for production, generation and consumption that no-one else in Australia, no other state in Australia, has the guts to enshrine in law as a target. Other people are saying that we will not reach it, but apparently the Leader of the Opposition believes that it is just a lay-down misère and we will reach it easily.

On the sectoral targets—these volunteer targets—that have been dismissed, it appears that opposition members want us to introduce mandatory targets. I am happy for them to put up some amendments on that front. If this is so irrelevant, I want you to listen to the following letter from the South Australian Wine Industry dated Friday 2 March 2006. It states:

Dear Premier

Thank you for your letter of 27 February 2007 regarding the State Government's proposed industry sectoral agreements under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill 2006.

On behalf of the industry [the South Australian Wine Industry Association Incorporated]. . . is pleased to accept your invitation to work towards the conclusion of such an agreement. We are excited by the opportunity to assist the industry's efforts in both the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions, and adaptation to potential accelerated climate change.

This will be of interest to the member for the Barossa, because it is from the wine industry. The letter goes on:

The timeliness of the Bill is borne out by recent press—and importantly, moves by trade buyers in response to public opinion—particularly from our largest export market, the United Kingdom . . . We were recently contacted by senior representatives of Sainsbury's regarding the industry's carbon balances. In that correspondence they state, in part—

this is the biggest wine buyer in Britain—

'We are talking to as many people as possible in the wine industry and the new carbon offsetting organisations involved with setting standards and helping companies offset their deficits.

A few standards are emerging, the most robust standard we have found so far is the carbon zero standard from New Zealand. . . We need to gauge the industry understanding and ability to deliver carbon neutral wines in the future. What we can't afford to be is complacent on this issue. UK media have grasped this issue fully and seem to have quickly moved on from organic and fair trade.

So, the wine industry is extremely supportive of what we are doing, and Linda Bowes, the chief executive, says, 'We commend your government on this initiative'. If members opposite believe that Al Gore would have come out and saluted what we are doing simply on the basis that I know him, I advise the house that I have never met Al Gore in my life and have never spoken with him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting about meeting Arnie. I hope that later this year I will get a chance to meet Arnold Schwarzenegger. We have almost parallel careers. He started in the movies and went into politics and I am doing the reverse. I am looking forward to sharing our views on climate change. I welcome the support of the opposition. I want to be able to work constructively with them on this area. We are easily leading Australia in the area of sustainable energy.

Someone asked why there was no mention of emissions trading. The Council for the Australian Federation, which is all the premiers and chief ministers, has announced that if the federal government is not prepared to support national emissions trading we will do it on our own and have a national emissions trading scheme up and running by 2010. I hope we will be able to make progress with the commonwealth in this regard, and I am very pleased that the Prime Minister seems to have had a conversion on this subject. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The CHAIR: The amendment process is a little tricky. We are suggesting that the leader move his amendment and the member for Mitchell move his amendment as an amendment to that amendment.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Does that mean there will be a vote on my amendment before there is a vote on the member for Mitchell's amendment to my amendment?

The CHAIR: No; we go backwards. The member for Mitchell's amendment will be voted on first—the amendment

to the amendment—and then the amendment will be voted on so that we consider the form in which the amendment to the bill is considered.

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

Page 3, after line 10—Insert:

(ia) by setting an interim target in connection with the SA target; and

Whilst I am moving just the first amendment, the next two amendments are consequential. If I do not win this amendment I will not move the next two, in order to save the committee some time.

Essentially, what this group of amendments to clause 3 and one consequential amendment to clause 5 do is introduce an interim target. Under the bill, the minister has the opportunity to introduce an interim target whenever the government wants. In fact, the government can now set an interim target without the bill whenever it wants. We argue that, given that the minister has the opportunity to change the target based on advice at any time, putting an interim target does send a signal to the community of the government's intention as to what the reduction should be at that time. We went to the election with a policy of having an interim target of a 20 per cent reduction by 2020. This set of amendments seeks to introduce that target into the bill.

In response to the amendment, the Premier might like to outline the reasons why he opposes it. Is it because of the Roxby expansion, because the volume of greenhouse will be so big over the next 10 years that the government cannot meet a target, which has been put out there by some people in the media? We are moving the amendment to set a minimum target of 20 per cent reduction by 2020 as per the election policy that we went to the 2006 election with.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The government recognises the merits of considering additional targets, and that is why we are laying down a framework. We put in the 20 per cent consumption and 20 per cent generation to demonstrate the measure of our earlier resolve on the way to achieving the larger target later. We have also announced that we want 20 per cent of the government's own power demands for hospitals and schools etc. to come from renewables, and that is again putting our money where our mouth is. We do recognise that we want to have interim targets and additional targets, and that is why provision is made to add into it.

Clause 5 of the bill already provides for the minister to set interim targets. Clause 7 provides for a process of ongoing review of the targets on a two-yearly basis. The only accepted pre-eminent international target is a 60 per cent cut in 1990 emissions by 2050, and I am advised that no other target has such international standing. Within Australia, Victoria and New South Wales have committed to this target, but South Australia is the only jurisdiction wanting to legislate for it. I acknowledge that the 20 per cent reduction of the 1990 emission by 2020 is emerging as a significant target and I understand that the European Union environment ministers have supported it but it is yet to be agreed by European member states. So, the government is prepared to look at the 2020 target in the passage of the bill between the houses.

Mr HANNA: I move the amendment as follows:

Delete the words 'an interim target' and insert in lieu thereof 'two interim targets'

There seems to be a fair bit of agreement on the issue. I believe that, having a target set out as far as 2050 by itself is not sufficient. It just seems logical to me to have a couple of signposts along the way. My amendment to the amendment

moved by the Leader of the Opposition is the same as far as 2020 is concerned, so we are both agreed that there should be a target of at least 20 per cent by 2020, and I am glad to hear that the Premier is sympathetic to that, at least. I also think it makes sense to have some sort of signpost between 2020 and 2050, hence my amendment is a variation to what the Leader of the Opposition proposed.

It has an additional requirement that there should be a reduction by 2035, so you have three blocks of 20 per cent reductions to get to the convenient target of 60 per cent reduction relative to 1990 levels by the time we get to 2050.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very happy to look at that as well. We will not look only at the international standards. As I say, I am really very keen to put in interim targets as well as sectoral targets. One reason we want to set up the Climate Change Council is that the whole debate on global warming issues is constantly changing, and we want to make sure that we get it right. That is why we are putting out a template, a framework, with some immediate targets as well as long-term targets. I am very keen to fill in the gaps. We are happy to have a look at it.

Amendment to amendment negated; amendment negated.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question relates to subclause (1)(a)(i). I note that the renewable energy targets are to increase the proportion of renewal energy generated so that it comprises 20 per cent of electricity generated, and a subsequent target to increase the proportion of renewable energy consumed so that it comprises at least 20 per cent. This is consistent with the generally accepted wisdom that 20 per cent of renewables is a sustainable contribution to the grid. My real question knits to the other target, which is the aim to reduce by 31 December 2050 greenhouse gas emissions within the state by at least 60 per cent to an amount that is equal or less than 40 per cent of 1990 levels.

How did the Premier come up with that figure? Was modelling done; and, when he came up with that figure, was the modelling based on certain outcomes being achieved as to how we would generate our energy? Did the Premier assume that we would continue to burn coal and gas at the same proportions as we presently are, or was there some other formula?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: How did we get that figure? Well, it did not come out of thin air. In fact, it was announced by the opposition the day before we made the announcement. I think the opposition had been tipped off that we were announcing that the following day; but neither of us plucked it out of thin air. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came up with that position. That position has also been adopted by Great Britain (obviously advised by the Stern review), as well as Sweden, New South Wales and Victoria. My information is: New South Wales, 60 per cent cut on 2000 by 2050; Victoria, 60 per cent cut on 1990 by 2050; and the UK, 60 per cent cut by 2050, which will be legislated.

The other two are just a target. Really, we are doing the same as Britain is doing. Sweden's is the target but not legislated. Basically, it is what the worldwide climate change expert scientific opinion is recommending. That is why we are going with it, and it was great that there was a snap of bipartisanship with respect to the target.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am interested in exploring that further. I note that other jurisdictions have adopted that as a target and I also note that we had it as our policy; and that is commendable. I am exploring the science of how we arrived at it and how we might achieve it. It is set as a

voluntary target. We have a different energy mix in this state, compared with Great Britain and the other states you have mentioned. We have brown coal burning power stations in the north and we have some access to gas. There are other issues we face. The renewable targets of 20 per cent will help in that direction but they will not be enough on their own. Given that energy production (not households) is the main polluter, I wonder how we might get to the target.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It will be a mix of things. We are actually in a better position. You mentioned brown coal. We are in a massively better position than other jurisdictions. One of the questions I was asked today in an interview with the ABC was why we are not spending a fortune like Victoria is with its VRET scheme. That is to get up to 10 per cent and we want to go to 20 per cent and we are not spending a fortune. I think that is because we are doing it differently. They have got big coal-fired power, and so have Britain and other countries, but we have a better mix. Let us not discount what we are doing. We are going to 20 per cent renewables, largely wind power. It puts us in an international leadership position. How we will get to the targets will be a mixture of our commitment to renewables and energy efficiency, as well as emissions trading, but we are in a much better position than most other places to be able to reach the target.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This clause deals with the interpretations or definitions of certain terms within the bill. Greenhouse gas emissions are defined as a number of gases—which are listed. Is there any reason why those gases are not defined under environment protection legislation as pollution?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think you will find it is because it was stalled at the federal level in the Ministerial Council on Energy and the Ministerial Council on Environment. I think there were some problems with the commonwealth on this front, so that is why we have dealt with it separately.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This clause talks about renewable electricity meaning 'electricity generated from renewable energy sources'. Is there a list of what this legislation considers to be renewable energy sources and/or a list of what it does not consider to be renewable energy sources so we are crystal clear about the target we are taking as being generated from renewable energy sources?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As far as I am aware—and I am always ready to be corrected—it is wind, solar, geothermal, tidal and hydro.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This clause deals with the targets. One of the subclauses talks about how the minister will determine the method for calculating greenhouse gas emissions. Surely there is already an international measure of greenhouse gas emissions. If we are adopting the international target through the IPCC (International Panel for Climate Change), why are we not adopting the method of calculating greenhouse gas emissions that is used by the International Panel for Climate Change? The way this bill is drafted, South Australia can come up with its own unique way of measuring climate change. I cannot work out why the inconsistency.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: One of the problems in this area is that the standard keeps changing because the science keeps changing. It was apparently revised in 2004. As this is an area that is currently being looked at internationally, we thought

it was wiser to do it this way so that we could keep up with the standards.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If it is the Premier's intention to keep up with the standard, then why not draft the legislation in a form that says: 'It will be calculated as per the standard applying at the time', and then, as the standard internationally changes, we automatically adopt it. I know you would never do this Premier and none of your ministers, but down the track there may be a cynical minister who, for purposes of political gain, decides not to adopt the new standard that is adopted internationally—and this gives the minister that discretion. If the Premier's intention (as he just stated) is to adopt the international standard, then why not write it in a form that says 'the international standard' (whatever the wording is) 'that applies at the time'?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I refer to part 3, 'Administration', division 1—'The Minister', clause 6—'Functions of the minister'. Paragraph (m) provides that one of the functions is to undertake monitoring and other programs to assess the extent of climate change that may affect the state, and to collect, collate or assess information relevant to issues associated with climate change. I am happy to have a look at that between the houses: it does not fuss me at all.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Premier was talking earlier today about breaking the mineral sector and mining and this is a great prospect for us. There will be a need to fuel the energy needs of that mining industry as it grows, and as these targets approach and the time frame closes, the government of the day will want to ensure we meet the targets that the Premier is setting in this bill. What would be the government's response if an economically viable proposition came forward completely funded by the private sector to support a mining venture with one of the new range of examples of small nuclear power plants similar to those used in nuclear shipping which exist including, for example, the South Korean SMART reactor designed for generating up to 100 megawatts or thermal applications such as seawater desalination; the Westinghouse IRIS system, an advanced third generator reactor; and Russia's 35 megawatt KLT 40S reactor used in icebreakers and now proposed for wider use in desalination?

These devices are able to power a small mine, a small settlement or a small undertaking. They are quite different from the sort of device talked about by the Minister for Energy, who clearly does not have much knowledge of the subject in relation to 1500 megawatt stations. They are quite small. I wonder whether the blanket 'We won't consider it' approach would hold if the target is approaching, the timeline is closing and this emerges as a completely economically viable, no-government-money-involved proposition that would reduce greenhouse emissions and be an alternative to, say, a coal-fired plant or an oil fired plant at the same venture.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can answer it in different ways. First, certainly no mining company has put that proposition to us at all. Secondly, it would be illegal under commonwealth law. I have already announced the state government's position, but it would not be legal under commonwealth law, I am told. I am aware of a proposition by companies to supply geothermal hot rock power for the Roxby Downs expansion.

I should say that people have said to me, 'How does the Roxby Downs expansion deal with, for instance, this type of legislation?' The expansion, of course, provides the opportunity of an unprecedented mining and resources boom for South Australia and is set to create thousands of jobs at

Olympic Dam and across the state. Such an expansion will obviously create more greenhouse gas emissions. I am advised that Olympic Dam is currently responsible for emitting around 1 million tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.

This information, by the way, is publicly available, and has been for some time. The exact increase of the emissions from the expansion is yet to be determined but I am told that it will remain a small percentage of the state's overall greenhouse gas emissions, which is currently an estimated 30 million tonnes per annum. I am advised that final energy demand is subject to investigations under the EIS process undertaken by BHP Billiton. I am told the EIS is likely to be made public later this year in an effort to contribute to the state's greenhouse gas emissions target.

I am pleased that BHP Billiton has engaged with the state government through a memorandum of understanding to explore the use of renewable energy for the desalination plant planned for the expansion. BHP Billiton has also made a submission on the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill. In the submission it says:

BHP Billiton recognises the social and political imperative on which this proposed bill is based and understands the South Australian government's desire to take an international lead on what is a critical issue globally. We share the government's concerns and are acting across a broad span of initiatives to address this issue through our operations, both locally and globally, and we are conscious that as one of the largest operations in the state we are already a large emitter of greenhouse gases, recognising that we are constantly seeking various means of improving our energy efficiency, reducing our greenhouse intensity and reducing emissions.

The submission goes on further to say:

We are actively seeking the means to improve energy efficiency and reduce the energy intensity in greenhouse gas emissions of our existing operations. We shall seek to ensure that any planned expansion incorporates best practice in terms of plant, ancillary services, systems and processes, as well as evaluating renewable and low emission energy sources and technologies.

I think the important point is that Olympic Dam will continue to be powered by electricity. This creates opportunities to use renewable and low emission energy options, including geothermal energy. I have also been advised that BHP Billiton is monitoring the development of hot rock technology as a potential source of energy for expansion in the future. The government is working actively with BHP Billiton on progressing these options.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: During the Premier's right of reply, I think, on the second reading, he mentioned being advised that 730 megawatts of wind power will be in place by a certain date, which I cannot remember—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is 2009, I think, from memory.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am sure the Premier's adviser will be able to tell him. Can he confirm that that figure is contained in the calculations given to the opposition, or is that a different figure? Is all of that 730 included? The opposition asked the question and was told about the published wind generation projections, which was followed by a list of figures. I want to know whether these figures reflect the Premier's commitment that he already is aware of 730 megawatts of wind power being available in the state?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My adviser has just said that he believes that it does.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will come back to you if that is not right.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

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

Page 8, line 30—Delete 'by the end of 2010' and substitute: and tabled in parliament by the end of 2009

This amendment simply asks that the first report into the legislation be tabled in parliament by the end of 2009—before the March 2010 election rather than after it. It is only a matter of six months difference in the time frame but, of course, the political climate is significantly different before and after an election. We do not need to expand on it. I think the reasons are obvious to all.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In the spirit of bipartisanship, I accept the leader's amendment.

Mr HANNA: In a spirit of tripartisanship, I will not be proceeding with my amendment to the amendment.

Amendment carried.

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

Page 8, after line 30—Insert:

- (5) The first report under this section, and thereafter every alternate report, must incorporate a report from—
 - (a) the CSIRO; or
 - (b) if the CSIRO is unwilling or unable to provide a report—an independent entity designated by the minister by notice in the *Gazette*, that assesses the extent to which any determination or target made or set under section 5 is being achieved and, if it appears relevant, should be revised.
- (6) In this section—
CSIRO means the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.

This amendment nominates the body to do the two-yearly report. The Premier's legislation provides that there will be a two-yearly report into the effectiveness of the bill, and the targets and policies, and so on, which possibly can be adopted. That happens every two years, and currently it is just before the election and then every two years after. We are suggesting that we adopt now the body that we want to undertake the independent report, and that we do so in a bipartisan way (or tripartisan way, depending on the night), so that the independent review is not tarnished by the allegation that the person or the group appointed is somehow politically motivated or simply the mouthpiece of the government.

The classic example is the Switkowski report on nuclear energy. The federal Labor Party came out and said, 'Well, Mr Switkowski was simply doing the Prime Minister's bidding'. By nominating now who we want to do the independent report and having such an esteemed body such as the CSIRO nominated as offering to do that report, it brings a sense of independence to it, so that we know that we will be getting independent advice from the CSIRO and not from some group appointed by the state government.

My understanding is that the state government has previously used the CSIRO to report on sustainability and climate change matters. That is the principle behind it. If the CSIRO is unwilling to do it—the amendment is that it be invited to do it—then obviously the government would have to ask somebody else. I think that it is highly unlikely that the CSIRO would decline the invitation.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The CSIRO is used, including by us, to assist us in looking at the past impacts. It measures what has happened and, in fact, we have seen one over the last century quite recently in terms of climate change and its impact on South Australia. The government is prepared to subject the two-yearly report now, occurring before the election, on progress towards the target to independent

assessment. However, the most appropriate body, we believe, to provide independent advice under this legislation is the Climate Change Council. So, we do not accept that, but we will be influenced by the CSIRO, which obviously played an important role in this.

The CHAIR: In terms of procedure, the reason we dealt with the leader's amendment first is that both amendments amend the same thing. We received notice of the leader's amendment first. They are, however, alternative amendments so, if the leader's amendment fails, the Premier will be invited to move his amendment. If the leader succeeds then we will still try to work it out.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 8, after line 30—Insert:

(5) The first report under this section, and thereafter every alternate report, must incorporate a report from the Premier's Climate Change Council that assesses the extent to which any determination or target made or set under section 5 is being achieved and, if it appears relevant, should be revised.

My amendment, of course, is basically a compromise in recognising what the leader has put forward. I move this amendment in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I want to confirm my reading of clause 8, which provides the power of delegation. The way I read it is that the minister can delegate all powers and functions, including the power to set targets, establish voluntary agreements—every power—so you could have a bureaucrat in charge of this, potentially.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is revocable at will and, therefore, does not derogate from the minister's powers.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 and 10 passed.

Clause 11.

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

Page 10, after line 34—Insert:

(4) The following requirements apply in connection with the operation of paragraph (a) of subsection (3):

- (a) any advice to the Minister under that paragraph must be provided or confirmed by the council by instrument in writing;
- (b) the minister must, within six sitting days after the end of each quarter, cause a copy of any instrument received under paragraph (a) of this subsection during the quarter to be laid before both Houses of Parliament;
- (c) the minister must ensure that any instrument tabled under paragraph (b) is accompanied by a statement from the minister in which the minister sets out the extent to which the minister has acted on the relevant advice, or intends to act on the relevant advice.

This simply states that, when the minister receives advice from the climate change council, the advice is tabled in the parliament within six sitting days of the end of each quarter, so the parliament gets a quarterly update, in effect, and the reasons why the government has not accepted the advice of the council. The Premier fought on the Murray issue for this very clause, or a similar principle at least, to be placed on the federal minister in relation to the Murray. We argue that, given the issue we are dealing with—being a greater threat than terrorism, in the Premier's own words—the parliament deserves to know what advice the government is getting and why the government is rejecting it. As I say, it is a quarterly rollover. That is the simple principle. We are asking exactly

the same thing of the Premier as he asked of the Prime Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The requirement for the council to provide its advice in writing and to have that advice provided each quarter to the parliament would, I believe, make its operations cumbersome and unworkable. The real difference with the River Murray commissioners is that they are full-time commissioners. We are saying that they would have decision-making abilities as full-time Murray-Darling commissioners. However, if, on buying out licences, for instance, the minister went against their decision or overrode their recommendations, that would be provided in writing.

We believe there is sufficient scope in this bill for the council to make its independent views known to the parliament. Clause 13 obliges it to report annually to the parliament. The amendment agreed to previously will ensure that it reports every two years, as well, on the minister's department's own report and, therefore, amendment No. 7 is not supported.

Mr PISONI: My question relates to clause 11(3)(ii). What is in place to measure the impact of the operation and implication of this bill on businesses? Will the Premier explain what he may have in place to measure that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It will be covered in a number of ways. First of all, the agreements are collaborative and voluntary agreements with business. I made that point. If the honourable member wants them to be mandatory then I would suggest he moves an amendment. We are entering into voluntary sectoral agreements, such as I read out from the wine industry. We are finding out that people want to do that because they can see, in that case, that it is of great benefit to their business. Also, we are going to use the business cost calculator, which we have already announced, and, as the honourable member would be aware, nationally (in terms of a decision made by COAG) the emissions will have to be reported. I think, in that way, obviously there is an opportunity for business to see what is going on and for the impacts to be monitored.

Mr PISONI: Does the minister suspect that it may cause an increase in red tape for business? The government's own strategic plan states a wish to reduce red tape by 25 per cent, so where will the Premier be looking at removing red tape to allow for the additional red tape that may be applied to businesses, in order to comply with this voluntary code?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The mandatory reporting that the Prime Minister has agreed to is all about streamlining. At the moment all different jurisdictions are doing things differently, so it is absolutely about that. In terms of the business cost calculator, business have asked us to do that because it is about, basically, measuring the impact of regulations on business. We are very committed to reducing red tape. The Economic Development Board is working on this. You saw reports about how, in terms of the mining industry, it is much less here than in other states, and we want to keep our foot on the accelerator. The member for Unley would be aware of the KPMG report in 2004, a survey of 99 cities on business cost competitiveness, where South Australia came out, I think, tenth in the world; first of the Australian cities that had been measured. In the most recent update last year of that it showed that we had gone from tenth in the world to third. It is very important for us to keep our foot on the accelerator of reducing regulation.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 12 and 13 passed.

Clause 14.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Subclause (2) provides:

The minister must, in acting under this section, seek to achieve consistency with the policies adopted by the state government. . .

I would have thought, if it involves policies of the state government, the minister would automatically be obliged to adopt them. The minister himself is setting the policies under this bill and his own bill says that, having set the policy, the minister must attempt to achieve consistency with his policy. I cannot quite work out why you need that subclause at all. Is it not stating the obvious?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It probably is. It says here:

The minister must, in acting under this section, seek to achieve consistency with policies adopted by the government to promote sustainability within the state.

That is not just in the government sector, but beyond. I do not think it does any harm. It is a harmless add-on and one which I am sure that in future years people will reflect on late at night when they are reading *Hansard* in retirement.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: When people are reading *Hansard* and wondering about the value of this clause, I would point out that subclause (3) provides:

The minister may vary a policy under this section at any time.

Is it not impossible for the minister not to be consistent with his own policy that he has set and can vary at any time? Is not that whole section a nonsense? The minister is setting the policy, the minister has to seek to be consistent with the policy; if the minister is not consistent with the policy they simply vary the policy.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can assure you that the Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change's policies will be entirely consistent with the Premier's policies, given that they are one and the same.

Clause passed.

Clause 15 passed.

Clause 16.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Will the register of the sector agreements be open to the public and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It will and, in fact, organisations that have indicated an interest in entering into a sectoral agreement with the South Australian government to date include: Adelaide Brighton, the Adelaide City Council, the mining industry, Business SA, the City of Salisbury, Village Green Environmental Solutions Pty Ltd, the Electronics Industry Association and the Wine Industry Association that I mentioned earlier.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

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

Page 15, after line 8—Insert:

(6) Subsection (1) operates subject to the qualification that the first review must be completed by the end of 2009.

I believe that is consequential on the earlier amendment.

The CHAIR: I have had a good look at that and it is not exactly consequential but it is similar. It is the same but different.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You are right, Madam Chair; it is the same but different. This is the review of the act as distinct from the first report being tabled, and the same principle applies. We think the review of the act should be completed by the end of 2009 rather than after the election.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It does not make any sense, because you basically saw some kind of Machiavellianism which I am too naive to understand. Originally, the report was to occur only after the election. I brought it back to before the election to make it consistent and now you are saying that, in terms of the review, you want it not after four years but after two and a half. So, fair shake of the sauce bottle!

The government does not support bringing it forward to the end of 2009. This would bring the review forward by about 18 months, being insufficient time for the initiatives set out in the bill—such as the sector agreements and the carbon offset register—to be developed and have even a history of operation. In fact, such a requirement would make the legislation farcical. Voluntary sectoral agreements are pivotal to bringing change to industry. To review their efficacy in such a short time span would be setting these agreements up to fail, and that is the last thing you would want or I would want.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 22 passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.35 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 8 March at 10.30 a.m.