

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 1 June 1999

The PRESIDENT (Hon. J.C. Irwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to the following questions on notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: 126, 128, 147, 173, 176, 177, 179, 187 and 189.

POLICE, YORKE PENINSULA

126. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. Why have the police taken the decision to run Yorke Peninsula police operations from Kadina to Nuriootpa in the Barossa Valley?

2. Will there be a reduction in police numbers or police facilities on the Yorke Peninsula?

3. Will police response times change in any way?

4. How many police, per capita, are based on Yorke Peninsula?

5. What is the average for South Australia?

6. How many police were stationed on Yorke Peninsula during the years—

- (a) 1993-1994;
- (b) 1994-1995;
- (c) 1995-1996;
- (d) 1996-1997; and
- (e) 1997-1998?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has been advised by the Police that:

1. The amalgamation of the two Divisions into one Local Service Area was part of SAPOL's 'Focus 21' reform program. This enables a tactical co-ordination group at management level to be established from the two previous small divisions to develop an effective Crime Reduction Strategy.

2. The creation of the Local Service Area deleted a level of management and did not warrant the retention of a Chief Inspector at Kadina. There was no reduction in the number of operational police on Yorke Peninsula. There is no reduction in police facilities.

3. Response times should not vary.

4. Yorke Peninsula 1:689

5. South Australia 1:422

6. Police establishment positions on Yorke Peninsula

1993-94	37
1994-95	37
1995-96	41
1996-97	41
1997-98	41
1998-99	
(to 10/2/99)	43

SPEEDING OFFENCES

128. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. How many motorists were caught speeding in South Australia between 1 October 1998 and 31 December 1998 by—

(a) speed cameras;

(b) laser guns; and

(c) other means;

for the following speed zones—

60-70 km/h;

70-80 km/h;

80-90 km/h;

90-100 km/h;

100-110 km/h;

110 km/h and over?

2. Over the same period, how much revenue was raised from speeding fines in South Australia for each of these percentiles by—

(a) speed cameras;

(b) laser guns; and

(c) other means?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has been advised by the police of

the following statistics concerning speeding offences issued and expiated between 1 October 1998 and 31 December 1998:

Motorists caught speeding by:

Speed cameras 64 165

Laser guns No separate data available

Other means 17 708

For the following speed categories (speed camera offences only, and relate to a variety of speed limits and speed zones):

60-69 km/h 113

70-79 km/h 47 920

80-89 km/h 7 072

90-99 km/h 5 436

100-109 km/h 1 739

110 km/h and over 494

Unknown 9

Revenue raised from:

Speed cameras \$7 198 963

Laser guns No data available to match question

Other means \$2 365 689

COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN

147. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. Following recent calls for a Commissioner for Children—

(a) Does the Government have any plans to establish a Commissioner for Children, similar to moves undertaken by the Governments of New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania; and

(b) If not, why not?

2. Considering the response by the Minister for Human Services in the *Advertiser* of 4 January 1999, page 13, in which he states 'the most effective model for a Commissioner for Children would be a Federal one to look after the interests of all Australian Children'—

(a) Has the Government had any discussions with the Federal Attorney-General or relevant Minister on this matter;

(b) If not, why not; and

(c) Does the Government have any plans in the near future to hold discussions concerning the appointment of a Commissioner for Children with the Federal Attorney-General or relevant Minister?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

The Minister for Human Services has provided the following response:

1. Children are valuable members of our society, and it is important to ensure that their specific needs are not overlooked. This Government takes its responsibilities for children very seriously.

The South Australian Government has a long history of commitment towards children. South Australia was the first, (and until recently the only), State in Australia to establish a body to advise Government and the community on children's issues. The Children's Interests Bureau was established in 1983, and its specific functions are outlined in Section 26 of the Family and Community Services Act. In summary, these are:

- to increase public awareness of children's matters
- to carry out research or conduct inquiries into matters affecting the welfare of children
- to develop within the department, services for the promotion of the welfare of children as directed by the Minister
- to provide advice to the Minister on the rights and interests of any child who is, has been, or is likely to be, the subject of care and protection proceedings
- to monitor, review and evaluate the policies of Family and Youth Services

The major functions of a Children's Commissioner model are already being undertaken by the Bureau. In addition, the Children's Interests Bureau Advisory Board provides the Government with independent advice on children's matters.

2. These comments were made in the context of discussion about Children's Commissioners in general.

In principle, the Government supports further exploration of mechanisms and processes which encourage consistency and complementary policy and service delivery among States and Territories. This is best achieved through improved dialogue and interstate agreements.

PROJECTS DELIVERY TASK FORCE**173. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. Does the Treasurer consider the Government's Projects Delivery Task Force to have been a success?
2. If so, why is it being disbanded?
3. What department will now take over the role of Projects Delivery Task Force?
4. From its inception to its disbandment, what major developments was the task force involved with?
5. How much were the developments worth—
 - (a) individually; and
 - (b) in total?
6. How much were the five private enterprise members on the task force paid for their involvement?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Premier has provided the following information:

1. Yes.
2. The Project Delivery Task Force was only established for a twelve month period, which ended in December 1998.
3. The role played by the Project Delivery Task Force was not intended to be an ongoing one. However, on the basis of experience gained in working with the task force, the Government is implementing the following arrangements for facilitating projects of significance to the State:
 - A Major Projects Cabinet Committee, chaired by the Premier, will provide overall direction and oversight for key projects;
 - A panel of private sector consultants will be established to provide advice and/or assistance on projects as required by the Premier or Cabinet Committee;
 - A position of Major Projects Coordinator will be established in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to coordinate major projects across government agencies and to facilitate contact between developers and agencies;
 - The Department of the Premier and Cabinet will also convene a Major Projects Task Group to enhance inter-agency coordination on projects and to advise the Premier and Cabinet Committee on project management matters generally.

4 & 5. The major developments with which the task force was involved, and their approximate individual and total worth at December 1998, are as follows:

Project	Approx. worth (\$m)
Glenelg/Holdfast Shores	180
West Beach boat facilities	11
Riverbank Precinct/Convention Centre	55
National Wine Centre	35

Memorial Drive	20
Barossa Valley Resort	30
Barossa Water	90
Hawker Airport	>1
North Terrace boulevard	>5
Virginia pipeline	22
East End	>10
Southern Vales pipeline	7
Kangaroo Island tourism development	>10
V8 Super Car race	>5
Student housing	10
CBD broadband cabling	20
John Martins redevelopment	70
Total	>\$581

6. The five private enterprise members on the task force were paid a total of \$302 798.00.

AQUACULTURE, OFFSHORE LEASES**176. The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:**

1. How many offshore leases have been granted to successful aquaculture applicants in the Robe-Kingston area of the south-east of South Australia?
2. What is the total area of leases granted in this region?
3. How many applications were received by Primary Industries and Resources South Australia for leases in this region?
4. (a) What is the area and exact location of each lease granted;
(b) To whom was each lease granted;
(c) When was each application lodged; and
(d) What is the fee for each of these leases?
5. How was the allocation of leases to successful applicants determined?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development has provided the following information:

1. No offshore leases have been granted to date. However, three fish farming sites adjacent Cape Jaffa and Kingston have been approved by the Development Assessment Commission and licensed by PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture Group.
2. The total area of approved offshore aquaculture sites in the south-east region amounts to 60 hectares, or 20 hectares per site.
3. There are currently thirteen applications proposing offshore aquaculture in the coastal waters of the south-east that are being held by Primary Industries and Resources South Australia. Over the past year, a further fourteen applications have been finalised due to lack of information being provided by the applicant or refusal of tenure due to non-compliance with the South-East Aquaculture Management Plan.
4. The area, location, operator and lodgement date for each aquaculture site is listed in the schedule below:

Site	Location AMG 66 Zone 54	Area (ha)	Applicant	Lodgement Date
1	383425 E5913095 N	20	South-East Atlantic	1 May 1996
	383660 E5912774 N		Salmon Farms	
	383253 E5912481 N			
	383020 E5912805 N			
2	384656 E5913976 N	20	South-East Atlantic	10 July 1996
	384890 E5913654 N		Salmon Farms	
	384483 E5913362 N			
	384250 E5913686 N			
3	395129 E5928389 N	20	Charles Peel	22 November 1996
	395529 E5928389 N			
	395529 E5928889 N			
	395130 E5928889 N			

On 6 December 1995, Mr Charles Peel made application for a one hectare research and development site which was subsequently approved by the Development Assessment Commission. As with all research and development sites, a reserved area is provided for in the event that the applicant wishes to apply for a larger area. Hence, the approval of Site 3 to expand an existing research and development

site caused the revocation of the former site.

Sites 1 and 2 are located approximately 2 and 3 kilometres respectively north north-east of Cape Jaffa. Site 3 is located approximately 5.5 kilometres north north-west of Kingston. See attachment.

Fees vary according to the authorisation being sought or

maintained:

- Fees associated with new aquaculture development applications include a lodgement fee of \$27.20, two referral fees of \$54.50, a public notification fee of \$54.50, a development assessment fee of \$54.50, an administrative fee of \$20, and the cost of the public notice. At the time of the assessment of the approved sites, the application fees were slightly less. There is no fee for maintaining the development approval.
- Fees associated with a finfish farming licence are based on a fee-for-service that is negotiated anew with industry for each licensing year. For the 1998-99 licensing year this amounts to \$558 per site. There is no fee upon application. A regulated fee of \$60 on application applies to minor trials and small research sites. There are no annual fees for minor and insignificant trials.
- Fees associated with the issuance of a lease and creation of title include:
 - 1) a lease preparation and conveyancing fee (Crown Solicitors Office), \$500;
 - 2) a registration fee for Application for new Certificate of Title (Land Titles Office), \$80;
 - 3) a New Certificate of Title fee (Lands Titles Office), \$48;
 - 4) a Registration fee for Memorandum of Lease (Land Titles Office), \$80; and
 - 5) a stamp duty fee, \$1 per \$100 of the lease fee.
- A Surveyor's fees (Land Titles Office) may also apply, \$635. Additionally, an annual rent of \$401 applies to every site greater than 10 hectares and up to 20 hectares.

A lessee/licensee must also provide a guarantee from its bankers or contribute to an indemnity scheme to provide financial capability to rehabilitate the site should the need arise. The level of rehabilitation contributions is initially \$20 per leased hectare per annum.

The fish farming operators in the south-east have, at this stage, not applied for the issuance of leases and creation of title. Occupancy of the sites is permitted under the provisions of the relevant fisheries licence which provides for rights of occupancy.

The policy for allocating the seabed for aquaculture purposes as used by Primary Industries and Resources SA is based on the principle of 'first come, first serve' within any given zone.

Applications seeking licence and tenure are dated by the relevant government agency according to the date of submission. These applications for licence and tenure are normally attached to the development application which are then received by either the Development Assessment Commission or Primary Industries and Resources SA. Accordingly, subsequent applications are dealt with in the same way resulting in the establishment of a queue of applications within a zone.

This policy was used to determine the queuing of applications in the coastal waters of the south-east of South Australia.

SPEED CAMERAS

177. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. (a) During 1997-1998, what were the twenty non-metropolitan South Australian country roads and/or highways which raised the most revenue from speed cameras; and (b) How much was raised at each location?
2. On these roads or highways, and for the same period, how many motor vehicle accidents occurred in which people were injured and/or were killed?
3. For the same period, how many times were speed cameras placed on these roads or highways?
4. (a) During 1997-1998, what were the twenty non-metropolitan South Australian country roads and/or highways which had the most motor vehicle accidents; and (b) How many accidents occurred on each of these?
5. For the same period, how many times were speed cameras placed at each of these locations?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has been advised by the Police of the following information—

Top 20 Rural Camera Locations which raised the most revenue from speed camera offences 1997-98

Road	Revenue *	Expiation Notices Issued	No. of Times Worked	Casualty Crashes
NATIONAL HWY ONE	\$76 000	842	44	24
DUKES HWY	\$71 000	782	55	27
PENOLA RD	\$53 000	583	22	4
STURT HWY	\$49 000	541	52	44
MAIN SOUTH RD	\$39 000	430	20	8
STUART HWY	\$38 000	424	28	19
VICTORIA PDE (PT. AUGUSTA)	\$28 000	318	18	8
VICTOR HARBOR RD	\$28 000	312	8	22
PRINCES HWY	\$24 000	270	40	28
PORT ELLIOT RD	\$22 000	246	4	2
NICOLSON AVE (WHYALLA)	\$19 000	218	9	11
JUBILEE HWY WEST (MT. GAMBIER)	\$17 000	194	13	7
JUBILEE HWY EAST (MT. GAMBIER)	\$16 000	185	14	1
BROADBENT TCE (WHYALLA)	\$15 000	172	9	1
MCBRYDE TCE (WHYALLA)	\$15 000	169	6	2
LINCOLN HWY	\$15 000	166	22	15
OLYMPIC WAY (ROXBY DOWNS)	\$13 000	150	14	2
NEW WEST RD (PORT LINCOLN)	\$10 000	111	7	1
SWANPORT RD (MURRAY BRIDGE)	\$10 000	110	9	8
THREE CHAIN RD (PORT PRIE)	\$9 000	105	11	3

* Calculated from the no. of expiation notices and the average revenue received from rural expiation notices.

Top 20 Rural camera crash locations 1997-98

Road	Revenue *	Expiation Notices Issued	No. of Times Worked	Casualty Crashes
STURT HWY	\$49 000	541	52	44
PRINCES HWY	\$24 000	270	40	28
DUKES HWY	\$71 000	782	55	27
EYRE HWY	\$4 000	48	10	25
NATIONAL HWY ONE	\$76 000	842	44	24

SOUTH EASTERN FWY	\$6 000	67	5	23
VICTOR HARBOR RD	\$28 000	312	8	22
STUART HWY	\$38 000	424	28	19
RIDDOCH HWY	\$100	1	2	18
ADELAIDE-MANNUM RD	\$7 000	82	10	17
BAROSSA VALLEY HWY	\$8 000	94	5	16
ONKAPARINGA VALLEY RD	\$2 000	28	5	15
LINCOLN HWY	\$15 000	166	22	15
BARRIER HWY	\$3 000	35	21	14
NICOLSON AVE (WHYALLA)	\$19 000	218	9	11
STRATHALBYN RD	\$5 000	56	4	10
KADINA RD	\$780	8	2	7
KANGARILLA RD	\$-	-	-	7
KAROONDA RD	\$-	-	-	7
MEADOWS RD	\$-	-	-	-

Calculated from the no. of expiation notices and the average revenue received from rural expiation notices.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT RATES

179. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** How much, in total, did South Australian councils collect in costs awarded in connection with court proceedings for late payment of rates in—

1. 1996-1997; and
2. 1997-1998?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

The Minister for Local Government has provided the following information.

The information sought by the honourable member in relation to the amount collected by South Australian councils as costs awarded in connection with court proceedings for late payment of rates, is not available.

This data is not collected by the Office of Local Government, and the Courts Administration Authority has advised that the information sought is not able to be provided from records held by the Courts Administration Authority.

TAXIS

187. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. What was the average time passengers had to wait from the original telephone booking to the arrival for a suburban taxi in Adelaide during 1997-1998?

2. What was the average time passengers had to wait from the original telephone booking to the arrival for a suburban taxi in Adelaide during the Christmas/New Year period, Friday, 18 December 1998 to Friday, 1 January 1999?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. The average waiting time for a metropolitan general licence taxi during 1997 was 10.9 minutes from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm daily and 11 minutes from 6:00 pm to 6:00 am. As reported in the quarterly reports provided by each of the Centralised Booking Services (CBS's), the average waiting times for the period 1 January to 31 December 1998 for a metropolitan general licence taxi was 9.9 minutes from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm daily and 12 minutes from 6:00 pm to 6:00 am.

2. Information regarding waiting times for the period 18 December 1998 to 1 January 1999 is incorporated into the quarterly report for the period October to December 1998 provided by each CBS. The average waiting time for metropolitan taxis during this quarter was 10.1 minutes from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm daily and 13.6 minutes from 6:00 pm to 6:00 am. The taxi CBS's have stated that some delays were experienced by customers during peak periods on 18 December 1998 and 1 January 1999, particularly between 4:00 pm and 8:00 pm and between 11:45 pm and 4:00 am on Saturday, 19 December 1998, with the maximum wait identified by the CBS's as 20 minutes. All the CBS's have stated that the waiting times for customers on 1 January were similar to those experienced on 18 December 1998.

ADELAIDE CENTRAL MISSION

189. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. How much funding did the Adelaide Central Mission Small Business Emergency Service receive from the State Government in—

- (a) 1997-1998; and
- (b) 1998-1999?

2. Why did the 1998 Annual Report of the Adelaide Central Mission Small Business Emergency Service fail to contain a financial statement?

3. Will next year's Annual Report contain a financial statement?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for Industry and Trade has provided the following information:

1. The Small Business Emergency Service commenced in March 1997 and received the following funding from the Department of Industry and Trade—

Year	Funding	Expenditure
1996-97	\$100 000	\$33 933
1997-98	\$190 000	\$164 975
1998-99	Nil	\$91 092 (budgeted)
Total	\$290 000	\$290 000

These figures exclude expenditure on evaluation.

2. There was no obligation for the Adelaide Central Mission to provide an Annual Report specifically for the Small Business Emergency Service. To date this information has been incorporated into the general financial statement of the Adelaide Central Mission.

3. That is a matter for the Adelaide Central Mission as the operator of the Service. The Adelaide Central Mission has indicated that it is willing to provide a separate accounting for moneys in subsequent annual reports.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—
Report, 1998

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

SABOR Ltd—Financial Statements, 1997-98
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Rules—Principal.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I lay on the table the Report of the committee on the Pilchard Fishery.

TAXATION REFORM

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Premier on the subject of national tax reform.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAIL LINK

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: My question is directed to the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning. Can the Minister guarantee that the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link will eventuate despite the significant funding shortfall and, more recently, the report of the rail project's task force which indicated serious reservations about providing further Federal financial assistance? Can the Minister advise whether the Government will be lobbying the Prime Minister for further Federal funding despite the task force report?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am not sure what evidence the honourable member has for her claim about a significant funding shortfall in terms of the three bids. I think it is a presumption on her part, but certainly the Premier has already—

An honourable member: She's fishing.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, she is probably fishing, but it is a big presumption—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Do you know? Have you been briefed? Have you been told?

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Not you personally, but you have been briefed—

An honourable member: It's hearsay.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is not here to ask questions.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is interesting: I think the honourable member is fishing around or relying on a week old *Advertiser* article. I almost think she wishes it to fail. But this Government does not wish it to fail, and it will be doing everything within its power to ensure that this line goes ahead.

The shadow Minister would be aware (if she read the paper more recently than the *Advertiser* last week) and would appreciate that the Premier is meeting the Prime Minister tomorrow on this matter and also with representatives of the Northern Territory Government in order to progress this very important rail link, not only a link that was promised by the Federal Government when members voted in this place in 1911 for the Federal Government to be responsible for this rail link north but also in terms of jobs in this State. To presume that there is a funding shortfall, let alone a significant one, is most counterproductive. It is speculation and I think the honourable member should also do better and know better.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: My questions are directed at the Treasurer, as follows:

1. How does the Treasurer justify the deferral of South Australian Asset Management Corporation budget contribu-

tions anticipated in last year's budget at \$189 million into the 1999-2000 budget?

2. Does he believe that the budget treatment of this item, which places the 1998-99 budget in deficit to the tune of \$65 million compared with a forecast surplus of \$1 million, accords with proper accounting standards?

3. Does he also agree with the Premier's economic adviser, Professor Cliff Walsh, who commented on this matter in this morning's *Advertiser* that 'inconsistency in definitions and treatments of budget items creates distrust'?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, I certainly do believe that the treatment of not only that item in the budget but all others do accord with proper accounting standards. It is a bit rich for the Hon. Mr Holloway to be talking about the accounting treatment of Asset Management Corporation dividends when, for a decade or so, the Bannon Government used the distributions from SAFA into the State budget on 30 June in each and every year to make adjustments to the recorded outcomes of both the previous year's financial statement and the projected statement for the following year.

I might indeed ask the Hon. Mr Holloway, when we come to debate this in the Committee stage and when he will have an opportunity to respond more than once, how he might see that the accounting treatment by the Bannon Government for a decade or more was indeed any different from the accounting treatment that this Government has used in relation to both superannuation and the Asset Management Corporation.

I do not have the Auditor-General's Report with me, but I think the Auditor-General in either his last report or the one prior to it made some comment about the accounting treatment of superannuation by this Government over the past five or six years. As I said, I do not want to misquote him, so at this stage I will not endeavour to recall exactly what he said, but I will paraphrase it by saying that he certainly found no great fault or criticism with the Government's accounting treatment of superannuation at the end of each financial year and the start of the following financial year.

From the Government's viewpoint, the timing of the dividend flows from the Asset Management Corporation can be viewed in a similar light to the Government's treatment of superannuation, and indeed the Government's treatment of SAFA dividends, although they are at a much lower level now than they were in the days of the Bannon Government. As I said, it is not that much different from the Bannon Government's use of the SAFA dividends during the 1980s in particular.

I can only repeat that I have no concerns. All the advice that I have received from my Treasury officers and others is that the accounting treatment of this matter, and indeed other matters, is in accordance with accepted accounting practice and procedures.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about health funding for drug and alcohol abuse.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I notice in the budget figures that the amount made available for Aboriginal Affairs has remained the same, and that is basically a cut of around 2 per cent. It is quite clear that drug and alcohol abuse is a problem that is impacting not only on the broad community but also, in particular, on the Aboriginal communities in South Australia. As I have reported in this place by way of question

and explanations given in relation to questions, all bases appear to be loaded for prevention and/or cure of the problem.

I have been made aware of a seminar that was held in Canada in relation to Foetal Alcohol Syndrome, which, in the main in South Australia and Australia, is not a recognised public disease or public problem. The call by Aboriginal people for assistance in dealing with this largely unrecognised, untreated problem has started to come across my desk, if you like. The only areas of support to which you can direct Aboriginal people are in New Zealand. As I said, in Australia it largely goes unrecognised. The Health Commission in South Australia believes that, based on the current figures, at least 2 000 children go unrecognised as being susceptible to FAS, which is a problem created by pregnant mothers drinking alcohol throughout the length of their pregnancy and the harm of that impacting on their unborn child.

There are ways in which Governments can improve public health by acting in ways which do not impact on the budget. I refer to the use of labelling as a method where the private sector can, by way of labelling warnings or advice—education—improve public health with little or no cost to Government. In the United States, Jacobs Creek has a warning on its labels which warns women (and I shall read the Government warning) as follows:

(1) According to the Surgeon-General, women should not drink alcoholic beverages during pregnancy because of the risk of birth defects.

(2) Consumption of alcoholic beverages impairs your ability to drive a car or operate machinery, and may cause health problems.

We have been down this path of public health and education with cigarettes, and I think that to some extent the warnings are adequate and that most people in the community are responding by trying to give up cigarettes in some cases or giving up completely, while at the other end of the spectrum a lot of young people are taking up the habit. Jacobs Creek is made by Orlando, an Australian company, yet in Australia or South Australia the warnings are not mandatory.

The questions being posed to me by people working in Aboriginal health and by the NPY Women's Council (an Aboriginal Women's Council which operates in Central Australia) indicate that they unfortunately have nowhere to turn for assistance because, as I have said, the program for which they seek support in relation to their problem within their communities goes largely unfunded and unrecognised. Will the Government investigate and implement an immediate campaign for improving public health and welfare using labelling on food and beverages, including alcoholic beverages, as a method of public warnings and education?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the question to the Minister for Human Services and bring back a reply, but I will also have a look at it in terms of the Status of Women portfolio.

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES EXPENSES

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about supplies and services expenses within the budget estimates.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The estimates statement released last week within the State budget reported that expenses under the heading 'supplies and services' in 1998-99 were \$2 078 million. This figure stands in stark contrast to the year's estimate of \$1 750 million. This \$328 million

blow-out was 18.7 per cent over budget. That means that 51.7 per cent of the budget blow-out was in the supplies and services line alone. It is worth noting also that this is one-quarter of last year's total budget, yet if one goes through the budget papers there is in fact very little detail to explain precisely where the money is spent within this supplies and services section of the budget and, more importantly, no indication as to where and why a blow-out of this size occurred.

I note that this year's estimate for the year 1999-2000 is \$2 046 million, which shows that the blow-out of \$328 million was not a once off. Will the Treasurer explain what has caused a \$328 million budget blow-out of supplies and services costs during 1998-99, and will he return to this place with more detail in relation to that budget line?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I had noticed some criticism from the Leader of the Australian Democrats of this particular line in the news media, and he and the Labor spokesperson went on to say that this was an example of the Government spending out of control, a Government blow-out and various other unflattering comments about the inability of Ministers and the Government to maintain control of Government budgets. It is disappointing that the honourable member did not at least take the trouble to try to establish the facts before he went into the public arena with his position. I am delighted that he has asked a dorothy dixer of me this afternoon as it will save me having to ask one of my colleagues to ask the question. I am delighted that the honourable member has been injudicious enough to serve up the dorothy dixer himself. As the honourable member knows, we are only a phone call away from supplying information if he has a particular—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: I was just asking now.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You were not just asking now, because you spent the weekend on the radio criticising the Government for a blow-out, for profligate spending by the Government and its Ministers and an inability to rein in control of expenditure, and the honourable member said that this was one of the reasons why the Government was having to institute revenue measures on the revenue side of the budget. I have sought advice on this issue, knowing that more often than not the Hon. Mr Elliott gets his facts wrong.

I am advised that almost two thirds of this increase—\$190 million—is a reclassification of expenditure and accounting treatment which is different from 1998-99. It relates to the accounting treatment of administering the sale of Cooper Basin gas, which in 1999-2000 has pushed up nominal expenditure by \$190 million. This means that on the one hand the Government's expenses have gone up by \$190 million, reflected in the supplies and services operating expenditure line to which the honourable member referred, but it is entirely offset by \$190 million in a revenue line—the sale of goods and services line—on the other side of the ledger, with no net effect on the budget.

The Hon. Mr Elliott has been revealed for what he truly is, although not everything that he truly is. He has again been found guilty of inadequate and inept research and an unwillingness to at least ask the question of the Government and/or its advisers. He has the information provided to him at a stage where he can spend time looking at these lines. If he has any questions he knows that the Government is always willing to assist, and had he asked we could have prevented him from embarrassing himself and his Party by making these sort of extraordinary claims about what is in fact almost \$200 million in accounting treatment that is offset in the revenue lines, so the increase in expenses is offset absolutely

and completely by an increase of exactly the same amount in the revenue lines. He could have saved himself and his Party the embarrassment of some of the statements he has been making since the budget was handed down. I am seeking further details—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, if he is not embarrassed he ought to be ashamed of himself, because he should be. If he can make statements such as that which are so wrong and then has the gall to indicate in this Chamber that he is not even embarrassed—if he has got himself to the stage where he has made such a galling error and is not embarrassed—I think that is shameful. I am disappointed that a political Party could be led by somebody—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If you make a mistake, you own up to it: you front up and indicate that you have made an error.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Don't try bluff to bluster when you do not know and do not understand particular figures. All the resources in my office are available to the honourable member so that he can seek to prevent embarrassing himself any further regarding his analysis of the State budget. If he is prepared to ask questions, we can assist him and provide him with answers. If the honourable member is unhappy with those answers, obviously I will be pleased to hear public comment from the him and further questions from him in the Council which may well seek to be critical of the Government and its budget strategy. Let me be honest and say that any Government—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: You're going to start that now, are you?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, at least we have started, and that is more than I can say for the Hon. Mr Elliott. He left this Chamber saying that he would never return to the Legislative Council because he was going to the House of Assembly. He said that we should mark his words that he would never return. That is an indication in relation to the Hon. Mr Elliott. He stood with the Federal Leader of the Australian Democrats prior to the last election, obviously fully aware of what was going on, and made a series of statements and claims in the last week of that election campaign.

Any Government with a budget as big as the one that this Government has would readily acknowledge that there are pressures, problems, stresses and strains. There are areas where we save money and others where there is over-expenditure. If that over-expenditure can be sheeted home to the Government, the Government must accept the responsibility and the blame and seek to set in train processes to correct that. As Treasurer, and representing the Government, let me acknowledge that.

However, it is unfair when members and leaders of political Parties race into the public arena with an accounting treatment which is completely offset by a \$190 million revenue line and seek to portray that as profligate spending and blow-outs, saying that that is the only reason why the Government has had to raise revenue in other areas of the budget. That does no credit to the honourable member, his Party or the parliamentary process.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As a supplementary question, I ask the Treasurer to explain why the first three budget lines within individual portfolios that are examined show blow-outs of the same proportion. 'Premiums' show a blow-out

from \$20 million to \$23 million. If you look at Primary Industries—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I'm just giving you the proportions—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is one member on his feet.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As I said, these are the first three items that I looked at. The next is Primary Industries, which increased from \$50 million to \$61 million, and the Attorney-General's increased from—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to ask his question.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: In fact I am asking a question, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: But the honourable member is embellishing it. I ask him to come straight to the question.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: You're boring us witless.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: You have a head start on that. The Attorney-General's increased from \$24 million to \$30 million.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I would be very happy to check those figures. If this is the extent of the criticism that one particular line has blown out, in the honourable member's words, from \$20 million to \$23 million—\$3 million in a \$7 billion budget—then I do not think that there would be too many people who will see that as some form of stunning indictment of the Government's budgetary policy and budgetary accountability. I have no direct knowledge of those items that the honourable member has raised. I will again take advice on those issues, and if there is anything useful that I can add to this response some time later in the week I will do so.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Premier, a question about the Year 2000 problem and the State Disaster Plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: The theories and predictions that surround the Year 2000 date problem have received wide publicity, and both the Government and businesses are making or have made arrangements to become Year 2000 ready. Governments play a critical role in raising awareness in the community as well as providing legislative backing where required in dealing with its own computing networks.

Many of the real effects of the Y2K are largely unknown and a wide range of scenarios have been presented by experts, from total chaos to much smaller effects. Governments world-wide are starting to enact 'contingency emergency management planning' which is biased towards the 'worst case scenario'.

As we approach 1 January 2000, an increasing amount of attention will be placed on this issue. It is a serious problem that will need to be confronted, as it affects not only the information technology sector but all facets of today's modern society. Some governments have even simulated a Year 2000 melt-down to learn of the possible consequences of Year 2000 associated system failures. Given the potentially wide-ranging effects and the unique nature of this problem, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Has the State Disaster Committee taken into consideration the possible impact resulting from the Y2K problem and, if so, has the State Disaster Plan been modified to take those issues into account?

2. Will the State Disaster Committee or the Office of the Year 2000 Compliance be conducting a Year 2000 simulation for South Australia and, if so, which agencies will it involve?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will take advice on that issue and bring back a reply.

CRESCO 2000

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Cresco 2000.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: It has been confirmed in the press in the past couple of days that the company Cresco 2000 has collapsed financially. The South Australian Farmers Federation has confirmed today that it knows of at least 15 farmers who have lost \$250 000 and will not be delivered with their superphosphate orders, but it estimates that the figure involved could be both double the number of farmers and double the amount of money. The proprietor of Cresco 2000 is Mr Tennyson Turner, who to my knowledge was disbarred from the legal profession many years ago, something like 30 years ago. He served time in prison for fraud and has been involved in a number of schemes involving farmers, particularly farmers on Kangaroo Island, in the past 10 years or so. Presumably, therefore, his business reputation is somewhat questionable. My questions are:

1. What protections are in place to protect consumers from dubious companies?

2. Is there any way that people can be warned of the reputation of questionable traders before they make purchases?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am constantly issuing press releases around the countryside about people taking some care about the commercial and other arrangements into which they might enter—not, admittedly, with respect to this matter but more generally in relation to scams. I am not suggesting that what Mr Turner is doing is a scam, but I am constantly seeking to give advice to the citizens, whether private citizens or in business, that they do have to take particular care to understand the nature of the transactions into which they might be entering, do some checking in respect of the people with whom they might be dealing, and generally take care. For example, with occupational licensing, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and I give constant warnings about those tradespersons who might hold themselves out to be qualified and licensed but who trade from door to door and take people for a ride, moving from one victim to another. There is a limit to the extent to which the Commissioner and I can give warnings that people take notice of, because ultimately people have to accept responsibility for their own decisions.

It is very important to ensure that people do not flick-pass everything back to the Government and decline to accept responsibility for their own decisions. In our society, whilst we certainly want to provide as much guidance, assistance and support as we can to those who are disadvantaged and provide information to those who seek information, we are not in an environment where governments can hold everybody's hands on every occasion when they might be entering

into a transaction. That applies equally to businesses as it does to private individuals.

Having said that, in relation to the particular example given by the Hon. Caroline Schaefer of Mr Turner and Cresco Fertilisers, I will have to take that part of the question on notice. I am aware that the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has been monitoring that business and the practices in which the business has been engaged. It may be inappropriate to say any more about that at this stage, but I will take some advice and if I am able to bring back some further information I will do so.

In relation to information about whom to trade with and whom not to trade with, there are opportunities to do, for example, a relatively inexpensive company search through the Australian Securities and Investment Commission which will give some information about a company. It may be that a trading organisation has access to the Credit Reference Association of Australia or some other credit reference organisation, and a check may be able to be made in relation to the credit worthiness of the person with whom in this instance the farmers may have sought to deal. There are any number of sources of information where some checking can be undertaken, together with even the general reputation ascertained by making inquiries of professional organisations about particular businesses, without having to make searches through bodies such as the Credit Reference Association.

So, to some extent people have to take some responsibility for their own decisions, particularly in relation to those with whom they might trade if they are carrying on business, but there are avenues by which they can check if they are uncertain. In relation to occupational licensing, people should always ask to see the photographic licence of the tradesperson with whom they may enter into some contract to do trades work. They should always do that, and they are also entitled to ring the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, which has a publicly—

The Hon. T. Crothers: Not all tradesmen carry photographs.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: They do these days; plumbers, gas fitters, electricians and carpenters now carry a photograph.

The Hon. T. Crothers: The Almighty gave it up some 2000 years ago, and that is why I gave it away some 20 years ago. I apologise for not being *au fait* with the current position.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member's photograph might need updating if it is 20 years since he had one taken. Of course, on the other hand, he may not want to update it. But, there are photographic licences and a register is publicly accessible in relation to occupational licensing, but not necessarily in relation to company directors. I will take the rest of the matters on notice and bring back a reply.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, representing the Minister for Local Government, a question on the local government emergency services levy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I was present at the Radisson Playford Hotel on 29 May 1998 for a forum on what was then the newly unveiled consultation draft of the Local Government Bill. On that day, the then Minister for

Local Government (Iain Evans) addressed representatives of the local government sector on the subject of the proposed emergency services levy. Mr Evans outlined how, when the State Government collected all funds for emergency services through the new levy, councils would no longer be required to contribute funds directly to the CFS and the MFS. Councils' only contribution in future, he said, would be the levy imposed on council owned property as all other property owners would have to pay.

The saving to councils at that time was estimated to be up to \$9 million. Now, however, because of the enormous size of the Government's emergency services levy on all property, including council owned property, the actual savings to councils are likely to be in the order of only \$6.5 million to \$7 million. However, the main point is that Mr Evans gave a commitment that each individual council would be able to decide for itself what would happen to its share of that money. Some may have wanted to return it to ratepayers by lowering rates and others may have wanted to improve services; they would have had that discretion. That commitment was given by Mr Evans at the Radisson Playford Hotel on Friday 29 May 1998.

One year later, last Thursday, 27 May 1999, the Government broke that promise. In addition to the emergency services levy to be levied on council owned property, the State budget also includes \$4 million which the Treasurer expects to receive from councils in the next financial year. The Local Government Association views this as an attempted clawback of some of the money which the former Minister (Mr Evans) said would not be clawed back. I understand that negotiations are going on between the LGA and the State Government on this matter and that the LGA does not want to jeopardise these negotiations—and I quite appreciate that.

In return for helping to balance the State budget, it is seeking to negotiate some functional reform, but the negotiations are taking place at a time when most councils are trying to finalise their own budgets. I presume that most councils when framing this year's draft budgets have relied on the assurance given last year by Minister Evans and have not factored into their budgets any sum to cover this new State Government demand. Therefore, my questions are:

1. Why has the commitment given by Minister Evans been broken?

2. When the budget for State Government emergency services funding this year is \$141 million (up from \$82 million last year), why is it necessary to clawback another \$4 million from councils?

3. To the extent that the councils will now have to redraft their budgets, does the Minister agree that they should make it clear to ratepayers that part of the sum owing this year is, in fact, yet another State Government tax?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: With the benefit of help from colleagues around me, I can say that the Attorney-General believes that what you have said is rubbish and that the Treasurer tells me that the Hon. Iain Evans already has indicated publicly he made no such commitment. In terms of the other matter—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Did you have a contribution, too?

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Hon. Mr Redford endorses the remarks made earlier by the Attorney-General. I will refer the rest of the questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, representing the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, a question about Hindmarsh Stadium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Following a freedom of information application, I have received a copy of the funding deed between the Treasurer, the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the Minister for State Government Services and the South Australian Soccer Federation. Under the funding deed, extensive conditions are detailed to be adhered to by the South Australian Soccer Federation. Clause 40 of the deed provides that the federation shall establish and maintain its operation in relation to the Hindmarsh Stadium as a separate and independent profit centre from the remainder of its other operations. Clause 40.3 provides that the federation throughout the 21 year term of the funding deed shall collect and maintain true, accurate and complete records in relation to the following matters:

1. the number of spectators and persons attending any match or event played or held at Hindmarsh Stadium;
2. the number of persons entering or using the grandstand area at any such match or event;
3. the number of paying spectators or patrons at any such match or event, including a division of such persons into adults and those paying a concessional entrance fee, such as pensioners, children and unemployed;
4. the number of paying spectators or patrons entering or using the grandstand at any such match or event;
5. the number of complimentary tickets issued by the federation to any such match or event, and the number of tickets actually used, including any such tickets or passes issued to any person pursuant to the constitution;
6. the number of complimentary tickets issued by the federation in accordance with the funding deed to enter or use the grandstand area at any such match or event, and the number of such tickets actually used, including any such tickets or passes issued to any person pursuant to the constitution.

I am aware that a report has been recently commissioned and received by the Minister regarding the levies charged for the use of the Hindmarsh Stadium. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister advise the Council whether he is satisfied that the report which has been commissioned by the Government indicates that the conditions, which I have outlined above, have been fully met by the South Australian Soccer Federation in preparing its yearly financial statements to be submitted to the Minister?

2. Will the Minister confirm whether since the signing of the funding deed on 14 October 1996 an audited copy of the separate financial statements on the Hindmarsh profit centre has been received by his office from the South Australian Soccer Federation prior to 31 January in each of the following years: 1997, 1998 and 1999?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about gaming machine statistics.

Leave granted.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: The New South Wales Department of Racing and Gaming now publishes a complete list of hotels and/or clubs of New South Wales by gaming

machine profits, which I understand includes details of the venue and actual gaming machine losses per venue on a quarterly basis. Given the importance of pinpointing both the location and extent of poker machine losses to gauge their social and economic impact, will the Treasurer consider releasing the same extent and particularity of details of South Australian gaming venues that the New South Wales Department of Racing and Gaming is now providing to the public?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will take advice on that and bring back an answer as soon as I can.

TRANSPORT, HILLS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about community transport in the Adelaide Hills.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Recently the Government's rural communities reference group had discussions with representatives of the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker Councils at Stirling. One of the issues raised was the need for improved passenger transport opportunities between the towns in that region. Having noted the successful introduction of community transport schemes in other regions based on significant voluntary input, I was interested to learn that negotiations had taken place between the two councils and the State Government in relation to the possibility of a similar scheme being established in the Adelaide Hills. Will the Minister indicate whether any progress has been made as a result of these negotiations?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I can advise that \$5 000 has been provided through the Passenger Transport Board to Adelaide Hills councils for a feasibility study to determine how a community transport network would operate. It is true that those councils are particularly interested in the success of community transport networks across regional areas of the State. I understand that they are actively working with community groups within the Adelaide Hills regions, with people who would like to use the service if it were available, and they are seeking to determine the terms of operation. I anticipate that the PTB will receive a copy of that feasibility study by September.

BUS INTERCHANGE SECURITY

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about public security at bus interchanges.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Over the past few years, with the changing arrangements in transport and the reduction of staff, I am advised that security at bus interchanges is of continuing concern to commuters and bus drivers alike. It has recently come to my attention that security is one of the biggest concerns to regular commuters, especially when people are going home in the evening or early on winter nights. I understand that some interchanges are fitted with security cameras; however, it has been suggested to me that the images taken by these cameras are of a lower percentage of screen image, which is okay for observation but not good enough for identification. I have also been advised that on many occasions the security cameras are out of action for long periods. One wonders whether we are putting in

el cheapo cameras which are not up to scratch. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Are all interchanges fitted with security cameras, and during what hours do they operate?
2. How much does it cost to install and maintain security cameras?
3. What percentage of image on the screen is taken by the security cameras?
4. Are the cameras effective in documenting any incidents at interchanges to the extent that the film can be used for identification and as evidence by the police?
5. Is it true that the Salisbury interchange cameras have been out of action at times for up to two months?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: There are a number of detailed questions for which I will obtain further information. I can advise the honourable member that, for the Passenger Transport Board, TransAdelaide and, for instance at the Salisbury interchange where Serco also operates, security is a high priority. It is true that security for passengers in terms of customer surveys is also a high priority, but so are frequency of services, affordability of services, cleanliness and the interconnection of services. A range of matters are important in terms of retaining and winning back passengers to public transport. Definitely, the use of surveillance and video cameras is important across the system. Recently we have installed video cameras on all 3000 Series rail cars. I believe that at all major interchanges and on the rail and O-Bahn systems cameras have been installed; but I will have to get the number, cost and maintenance advice that the honourable member has sought, and I will bring back a reply.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I have a supplementary question: could the Minister advise in her written answers whether the screen image percentage will be 10 per cent or 25 per cent, as the former will identify an incident and the latter can be used as evidence?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes.

MOUNT BARKER FREEWAY TUNNEL

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the safety of the Mount Barker freeway tunnel.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: There were several media reports last week of a fire in a transport tunnel on a key north-south alpine route in the Austrian Alps which left four people dead and 71 people injured. The blaze broke out after a car was shoved by a lorry into another truck. Both lorries caught fire, resulting in several explosions. One person was killed in the accident and three others were believed to have been trapped by flames in the tunnel. It has been reported that at least 71 people were injured and 21 cars and three lorries destroyed by the tunnel fire. The Austrians have a history of building some of the safest and longest tunnels in the world. Whilst not wanting to sound alarmist—and I emphasise that to the Minister—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: There is no need for you to be.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No. Whilst not wanting to sound alarmist—and I emphasise that—tragedies such as the Austrian tunnel fire may be of real concern for many people who will soon be using the Mount Barker Freeway tunnel, which is nearing completion. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Following the recent Austrian Alps tunnel disaster, what fire prevention and other safety measures are in place

for the Mount Barker Freeway tunnel and can the Minister assure motorists that all measures have been taken to ensure that a similar tragedy will not occur here?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I assure the member, as he wishes to be assured, that all measures have been taken in terms of safety generally, including fire protection. On a recent tour of the tunnel and roadworks generally, I was asked about the same matters following a fire in a tunnel in France some months ago. You could almost suggest that we have the most advanced fire protection measures not only between the tunnels in terms of the linkages—and there are more than required with the fire gates, the monitoring and the fire system itself—but also with back-up systems in terms of the generators and the optical fibre cabling system. I will get a detailed report for the honourable member. I understand that Transport SA did provide one to the media after an earlier concern about a fire in a tunnel in Europe, but I will get that updated for the honourable member and assure him that he has no need to be alarmist as the matters have been dealt with already to avoid such an incident.

RACIAL VILIFICATION

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a belief explanation before asking the Attorney-General and the Treasurer, the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, a question about racial vilification.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: The *Advertiser* recently reported that the Attorney and the Education Minister were intending to investigate a reported website claiming that Adelaide schools were being invaded by Asian gangs armed with knives and machetes. I understand that the claims were contained in the National Action website. I read in part from the newspaper report that the website claims:

There has been an increasing number of attacks upon white students in Adelaide schools by Asian gang members. These attacks come both from groups within schools and from outside and nearly always involve the use of weapons like knives, machetes and clubs. Several white students have been severely injured and it is only a matter of time before someone is killed in one of these attacks.

The website details how high school students can start up a self protection group to protect themselves against the invasion. The site refers to incidents at Underdale High School and Parafield Gardens High School and claims that Enfield High School is the subject of National Action's latest effort to stop Asian school invasion, after a gang of Asians bashed two students with wooden clubs. The report also goes on to say:

Police were unable to confirm the validity of any of the reports yesterday, but they were concerned by the site.

Given the seriousness with which many in our community view racial vilification, I ask both Ministers whether an investigation has indeed commenced and to undertake to advise the Parliament of the outcome.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will take this question for both Ministers and undertake to bring back a reply. My recollection is that this issue was raised with me by a journalist. I had not seen the website to which the allegations referred, and I indicated that if a complaint was made I would have someone look at the issue. However, I will take the question on notice for both Ministers and bring back a reply.

ALEXANDER AVENUE

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about speed zoning in Alexander Avenue, Evanston Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Recently, it was brought to my attention that in 1997 Alexander Avenue extending to Bentley Road intersection at Evanston Park had been rezoned from rural to residential. The speed limit is 80 km/h within 150 metres of Trinity College, which has about 2000 students. There are no all-weather footpaths to enable pedestrians to walk safely and there is no kerbing in this area.

I am advised that the safety factor has been compounded by the speed of the traffic and that this is the main concern of the petitioners, who petitioned not only the Minister for Transport but also the local member (Mr Buckby) and the council. I am advised that the council supports a reduction in the speed zone in this area. Following an investigation by Transport SA involving numerous traffic surveys, the only reason given for not decreasing the speed limit was the lack of development on both sides of Alexander Avenue and it was felt that this would create a precedent.

Investigations by my constituent show that a number of local roads with similar development have been given a 60 km/h speed limit. These are: Sunnyside Drive, Evanston Park; Clark Avenue, Evanston Gardens; Angle Vale Road, Evanston Gardens; Jack Cooper Drive, Hillier; Ryde Street, Gawler West; and Dawson Road, Evanston, which has no housing development with the railway line running along one side and paddocks on the other. None of these roads carry the large volume of traffic which daily goes to and from Trinity College.

I am advised that this matter was taken up in 1998 with Mr Buckby, who advised my constituents (the petitioners) that he would not support the matter but that he would speak to the Principal of Trinity College and suggest to him that students be advised to take extreme care when walking along Alexander Avenue. That is an amazing situation: warning the potential victims! My questions are: how many children need to be knocked down due to the combined effects of unmade footpaths, speeding motorists and lack of development along Alexander Avenue before the local member and the department undertake their duty of care to protect their constituents' wellbeing by complying with the request of nearby residents, parents and the Gawler Corporation to lower traffic speed in the area of Trinity College? After all, these people know the area better than the bureaucrats and the formula fiddlers in Transport SA and, obviously, they have more concern than the local member, Malcolm Buckby.

Will these children have to run the gauntlet until Gawler expands enough to provide development on both sides of Alexander Avenue so that the council can collect enough rate revenue to provide footpaths to protect them? Would it really be so bad to create a precedent which would provide safety and security for the children of Gawler and avoid the potential anguish of families who may lose a child in this area?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The honourable member's question contained a lot of comment, and there was also an inference—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:—that the local member (Hon. Malcolm Buckby) did not care, had not taken up the issue and was prepared to accept the loss of life of children. I totally refute that in terms of all my dealings with Mr Buckby on a whole range of issues relating to schools in this area and particularly regarding Trinity College.

The honourable member would be aware that I take up with the department all the matters that he raises. I want to know whether it is a local road or one that we are responsible for as regards its sealed condition and footpaths. I also want to sight the correspondence and representations from the council. It is true that Transport SA has delegated the responsibility to set speed limits on such roads. I will bring back a prompt reply for the honourable member and his constituents and also discuss the matter further with the local member, the Hon. Mr Buckby.

EMERGENCY TELEPHONE SERVICE

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precised statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services, a question about the triple zero emergency telephone service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: In the *Sunday Mail* of 23 May an article featured with the heading 'Police Review Triple Zero Service'. According to the article, an 18 year old woman, alone in the family house, feared for her life as masked men smashed their way in through a window. She only had time to telephone her mother before hiding in the bathroom and waiting for help to arrive. Her mother dialled triple zero and claimed that the first time it rang out and that the second time it took eight to 10 rings before the call was finally answered. The call was answered interstate, with the police taking 25 minutes to arrive. My questions are:

1. What reasons can the Minister give for a 25 minute response time in respect of the incident I have just described?
2. Is it standard procedure for triple zero emergency calls to be answered interstate and, if so, for what reason?
3. How does the Minister propose to address this issue, and how soon will it be before he does so?
4. In the light of the foregoing incident, how can the Government still claim that police numbers are adequate to ensure public safety considering the recent spate of home invasions?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

PERFORMING ARTS COLLECTION

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for the Arts about the Performing Arts Collection of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The Performing Arts Collection was established in 1979 as a home for 40 000 items of South Australian theatre memorabilia. The collection began in an office in Kent Town and moved to a hall on Beulah Road—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The time for questions has concluded.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to suspend Standing Orders to enable me to reply.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The matter is important to me. The new Chair of the Performing Arts Collection, Mr Greg Andrews, who is also a director of the Helpmann Academy, has taken up with me and also with Kate Brennan, the General Manager of the trust, the presentation of the collection. A consultancy will look at all the issues related to the future storage, maintenance and display of the collection. If that was not the question, I cannot believe what else could be more important than what I have just provided.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: The name of the collection.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

ELECTRICITY CORPORATIONS (RESTRUCTURING AND DISPOSAL) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 25 March. Page 1107.)

Clause 2.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: At the outset I move:

Leave out this clause and insert:

Commencement

2.(1) This Act (other than section 11A and Parts 2, 3 and 4 of Schedule 1B) will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

(2) Section 11A comes into operation on the day on which this Act is assented to by the Governor.

(3) Parts 2, 3 and 4 of Schedule 1B will come into operation in accordance with provisions contained in that Schedule.

Before addressing the intent of this amendment and the package of amendments of which this is the first, I outline to members a proposed process for considering this next stage of the long debate that we members in this Chamber have had over the issue of electricity assets here in South Australia.

The amendment that I have just moved is the first of a series of amendments which are part of a package for a staged, long-term lease of our electricity assets here in South Australia. There are a number of significant clauses, but the principal clause is new clause 11A. A package of amendments is on file and extends over a number of different clauses, and this amendment is the amendment to clause 2.

It is my recommendation to the Committee (and it is for a majority of members of the Committee to make a final determination on this) that we use the vote on this clause as a test vote on the issue of a staged, long-term lease of our electricity assets here in South Australia. That is a judgment for the majority of members in the Committee to take. It is not for me to dictate as the Leader of the Government in the Chamber: it is for me to recommend as I have done, and we will then see whether the majority of members is prepared to follow that process.

We have used this process on many other pieces of legislation over my 16 years in Parliament. It makes sense in terms of expediting the debate rather than drawing it out, and we can have the significant and substantive debate, with your support, Mr Acting Chairman, and that of the Chairman when he is in the Chair, to allow a free and wide ranging debate on the issue of a staged, long-term lease of our electricity assets.

With that, I now turn to the Government's position that it wishes now to put to the Legislative Council in the Committee stage of this debate. As all members will be aware but perhaps those few avid readers of the *Hansard* might not be, the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council mean that the

Bill has been delayed at the Committee stage in this place. That means that, whilst it occurred many moons ago, this Bill has passed through all stages of the House of Assembly; it has passed the second reading stage of the Legislative Council; it is now in the Committee stage, which is the penultimate stage of the debate in the Legislative Council; and, with whatever amendments are moved in the Committee stage, it then moves to the third reading stage, or final vote, in the Legislative Council.

As members will know, if amendments are passed, they will need to be further considered by the House of Assembly when the Bill is returned there with those amendments. I think that duly explains, for those unfamiliar with our process, what the Government is recommending to this Committee in terms of this debate.

On this occasion I will not, as I have done on three previous occasions, outline in great detail the Government's reasons for supporting the sale or long-term lease of our electricity assets. If I can summarise it relatively briefly, as members will know from the budget speech last week, the Government is still concerned over this debt burden that hangs over the heads of all South Australians—some \$7.5 billion of debt, or some \$2 million a day in interest that we continue to pay. The interest costs for next year, 1999-2000, are \$735 million and the interest costs for this year are \$728 million, so we are still looking at interest payments or costs of some \$2 million a day on our debt.

Again, as members would be aware (for those of us who are interested in debt; those who are not might use other adjectives to describe it), the seminal report of Access Economics has indicated that, with just under 8 per cent of the nation's population, we in South Australia currently have 19 per cent of the total State and Territory debt in Australia. In the year 2003 Access Economics estimates that we will have some 22 per cent to 23 per cent of the total State and Territory debt.

In New South Wales, John Della Bosca has just been appointed as Special Minister of State and is getting difficult tasks done. Those members of the Labor Party who know John Della Bosca—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Cameron knows Mr Della Bosca; his admiration for his campaigning skill is known, but I am sure he also admires his ability to do deals with unions and the Labor Right and others in New South Wales. There is no doubt that he has a task after a suitable period (I suspect after the Olympic Games) to do the deal on some of the electricity assets in New South Wales. The dogs are barking that it may well be generation assets first, but Access—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, if we look at the Access Economics figures we can see that, if New South Wales is able to sell enough of its electricity assets to get rid of its \$15 billion of debt (and its assets are worth about \$23 billion to \$25 billion, so it does not have to sell much more than about half of them to get rid of all its debt), then we in South Australia, with just under 8 per cent of the nation's population, could have 43 per cent of the total State and Territory debt in Australia.

It is the Government's view that, as a State and those of us who are interested in the future of the State, our young people and their ability to get a job and stay here in South Australia to get that job, something has to be done and

someone has to do the something in relation to the issue of debt here in South Australia.

Again, I do not intend to go over the detail of the budget from last week, but I can say as the State's Treasurer that, if I can use a colloquial expression, it is a God awful task to try to balance the demands for extra health and hospital services—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the Hon. Mr Crothers for that interjection—and other services in our State, with the opposition of many to increasing revenue issues that must be imposed to fund those new expenditures that everyone cries for, including shadow Ministers in the Opposition, who line up day by day, asking for more expenditure or criticising a particular cutback. We must look at the impact that the national electricity market has already had; we must look at the fact that some \$160 million has already been taken off the projected dividend flow from the assets into the budget in last week's budget projections; and we must look at the fact that, rather than \$300 million a year flowing into our budget from the electricity assets for the next three years, as some would have us believe, the estimate at this stage is only \$160 million a year.

Let me say in relation to electricity dividends that no-one can predict accurately what may or may not happen in relation to the profitability of the businesses and the dividend flows into the budget. The budget papers make it quite clear that those estimates are the best estimates that we can develop at this stage. But, one of the businesses, for example, as I highlighted in my speech, is indicating profitability for next year of somewhere between plus \$2 million and minus \$70 million. The range of potential profit and loss within that one company is extraordinarily large and is an indication of the difficulty of predicting whether or not the businesses can successfully manage the risk in the market and whether they can successfully manage and reduce the extent of any potential losses within those businesses. Now, on conservative budgeting policies, the Government has not budgeted a \$70 million loss for that business: it has budgeted a \$30 million loss for it.

In summary, this State is facing a terrible financial situation under the current parameters that confront this State. Something momentous has to be undertaken and implemented by this Parliament, with a majority of members in this Chamber, and indeed in another Chamber, being prepared to take decisions beyond the scope which they otherwise might have contemplated, outside their own thinking—maybe even outside their own party's thinking—decisions that are in the best interests of the State and, in particular, in the best interests of the young people of this State as they look at future job prospects in South Australia.

That is the background to the debate. I now want to describe, again, the detail of the proposed staged long-term lease structure that the Government intends to put to a vote some time later this week. Earlier this year, Mr Chairman—I think on 25 March, as you indicated—this Chamber expressed a view in relation to a sale, a straight-out lease and also a share float. On that occasion, the Government, with the Hon. Mr Cameron in support, was one vote short of successful passage of that clause.

This proposition is significantly different from the other lease propositions that have been publicly canvassed. Nevertheless, it is very similar to the proposition that we first discussed at the end of 1998. We described it then—and I do so now—as a staged long-term lease of our electricity assets

in South Australia. The proposition, put simply, is that this Parliament would be asked to vote, in the first instance, for a 25 year lease of our electricity assets.

Those members of the Labor Caucus who have been here for some time may well have been members of the Labor Caucus of the mid-1980s—if it was taken to Caucus; and there is some doubt about that—and would have wholeheartedly supported Premier Bannon and the Labor Government at the time in the 20 to 25 year leases of our electricity assets at Torrens Island and Port Augusta. The long-term sale-lease arrangement of the Port Augusta assets, which was set in place in 1986, is still in place. The Labor sale-leaseback arrangement expires some time in the year 2006 for part of the assets—the major generation part of the assets at Port Augusta, which is now known as Flinders Power under the new disaggregated electricity system that we have in South Australia.

The first aspect of the staged long-term lease is that the Parliament would be asked to support a lease of similar duration to the lease conducted by the Australian Labor Party and Labor Governments, and indeed supported—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, there is no criticism of Liberal Governments doing it. We support leases and sale. I am not sure why the shadow Minister for Finance interjects and tries to make the point that the Liberal Government in the past has done this. There is not a problem with the Liberal Government's supporting sale or lease. That is our policy; that is what we are saying. The point I am highlighting is the hypocrisy of some within the Labor Party who oppose Liberal Government leases but support Labor Government leases. That is the only difference: which Party happens to bring them down. Indeed, some members of this Chamber were members of the Caucus that supported a Government and a Premier who undertook a Labor Government lease of our electricity assets in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My understanding is that Mr Rann, I presume the Hon. Ms Pickles and others were here in 1986 and were members of that Caucus that supported it. The Hon. Mr Holloway in another life perhaps might even have been—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Even in a previous life the honourable member was supporting Mr Jacobi, was he?

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Holloway says that he has no idea. At the next election, if this provision were to have been voted on by this Parliament and been successful, there would be a 25 year lease, but the Parliament would also then, after the people had spoken in relation to whom they wanted to govern and represent them in both Houses of Parliament, be in a position to vote on a long-term extension of those assets: three further lots of 25 years (in some cases, I think, in the structure which the Government had, some were 24 years and some were 25 years), the total lease time, if so approved by the Parliament after the next election, possibly being somewhere between 97 and 100 years.

However, after the next election if the Parliament voted not to further extend those leases, then the 25 year lease would be all that would operate and at the end of the 25 years the electricity assets would return to the ownership of the State of South Australia and, indeed, the Minister of the day and the Government of the day—good luck to them; God

bless their cotton socks—would have to run those electricity assets after the expiration of the first 25 year lease.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member can put his position, but we are outlining our process. We are asking members, who will be able to express a view—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That position was never put to a vote.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There has not been a vote on the staged long-term lease proposal. The Government's proposition based on the commercial advice that it received late last year and early this year is that the strategic investors—that is, the investors who are interested in our electricity assets—would be prepared to bid about 80 per cent of the total value of the assets for the initial 25 year lease, and the remaining 20 per cent of their total bid would relate to the option of a further extension. One difference in the proposition that the Government puts forward this time is that the Government believes that all that money should be paid up front to the Government and to the taxpayers of South Australia; that is, the initial value for which the bidders are bidding, the first 25 year lease, and their bid—and this would be a competitive bid—for the remaining three lots of 25 years.

That is different from the proposition I outlined prior to Christmas when I indicated that the second part of the bid would be held. That is, they would still have to bid, but it would be held by the successful lessee which would have to put it into a trust fund account and then, after the next election, pay it over to the Government. That was never the Government's preferred course. The proposition we put to the Chamber on this occasion is that all the money would be paid over to the State of South Australia. If after the next election the Parliament was to vote not to extend the leases, obviously the Government would have had the opportunity to use that 20 per cent of the bid value for the next two to three years. However, should the Parliament say 'No' after the next election, the Government would need to be in a position to pay back to the successful 25 year bidder (but not to the unsuccessful 97 to 100 year bidder) that particular differential.

That is a clear cut process, and it is a clear cut option for members to contemplate. Based on the commercial advice that the Government has received, it will mean that the Government believes that it can capture virtually all the value of our electricity assets that we might have been able to accomplish through a trade sale. The Government again places on the record its preferred position, which obviously remains a trade sale of our electricity assets, but we accept that certainly at this stage there is not the support in this Chamber and in the Parliament for a trade sale, and therefore we are putting this proposition for a staged long-term lease.

As I said, we believe that that will capture virtually all the value and get rid of virtually all the risk. Again, we cannot say that it gets rid of all the risk as with a trade sale or that it gets all the value as with a trade sale, but it can capture virtually all that value and get rid of virtually all the risk that was otherwise confronting the State of South Australia from operating in the market.

The second component of the bid from the institution investors, in part, would be used by the State as a security bond for the maintenance of the assets. For example, if the Parliament was not to vote to support a further extension of the leases, we the State must be in a position to protect the

quality of those assets towards the end of the first 25 year lease.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Does maintenance include upgrading?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Maintenance includes upgrading. We must protect ourselves from a position where, if the Parliament said 'No' to the further extension, a lessee might at the 20 year mark of the first 25 year lease lose interest in our assets, proceed not to properly maintain them and to run them down. As part of this, it would be the Government's intention to maintain a very significant multimillion dollar security bond or deposit which would be forfeited by the lessees should they not maintain the assets in the condition that the State would require.

I hasten to say that associated with this Bill—and should this Bill be successful—one matter which will need to be debated during July and completed by the end of July is the important legislation in relation to the Independent Regulator. The Independent Regulator would have absolute and complete oversight of the standards of our distribution and transmission assets in particular to ensure that the quality of the service that is provided to South Australians is maintained; and, together with the security deposit notion that I have raised, it would also act to ensure that a lessee could not lose interest in our electricity assets towards the end of that first 25 year lease and to run them down to the detriment of South Australians.

The lease has a number of other aspects. At this stage I do not intend to go through all of them, but I will highlight two or three. It is the intention that the lessee will be required to take out and maintain appropriate insurance to protect the State and the distribution system; that the lessee will be required to appropriately indemnify the State against third party claims and losses in relation to the distribution system; that the lessee will be required to hold a licence to operate appropriate electricity generation, distribution or transmission businesses; that the lessee will also be forced to comply with all relevant legislation—and this will be administered by an Independent Regulator, not by the Government or the Parliament but an Independent Regulator in South Australia; and that the lessee will also be responsible for maintaining the distribution system to the standard required by the Independent State Regulator and the regulatory regime. There will also be protections and incentives to ensure that the lessees do not run down the condition of the assets towards the end of the lease.

As I said, that is just a handful of the protections and features of the lease which this proposal entails and which this Government is putting to the Chamber to support as part of the legislation. I indicate that all the key features of the Government's proposal have been outlined to members. Obviously, a number of other issues do not directly relate to the issue of a staged long-term lease but to the standards of the delivery of service. They relate to the rights of the individual workers within our businesses and to the impact of this momentous decision on the budget and on the debt structure of the State. They also relate to many other important issues but, given that we have had opportunities to canvass those issues on a number of previous occasions, I will not canvass a number of those again.

I know that when last we met some members were critical of the Government for continuing to put this proposition to the Parliament. I again have no hesitation in indicating that as we look at entering the new millennium the Premier, all members of Government and I as Treasurer have no embar-

assment at all in terms of continuing to raise what we see as a threshold decision for the future of our State and the future of our young people in South Australia.

Unless we are prepared to tackle this issue now—and if not now at some stage in the future—and come up with some alternative plan to tackle debt (and nobody in the debate of the past 15 months has put an alternative plan, other than the Democrats' vanishing cream suggestion from earlier this year), it is the Government's contention (and we hold it with a passion) that until we as a Parliament and a community can get rid of this debt this State will forever confront problems. This State's young people will forever confront problems in terms of finding jobs and employment in South Australian industry.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I have several questions to direct to the Treasurer. Perhaps I will preface my questions in case the wrong conclusion is drawn from them. Earlier this morning and at 2 p.m. I spoke to my Party colleagues at our normal Tuesday meeting, and I also gave a brief media conference at 2 p.m. The effect of what I said was this: that I had a view that I had some misgivings about my Party's position relative to the leasing of ETSA, and that I was not committed either way but would listen very carefully to any debate that might flow during the currency of this matter being dealt with. That is still my position.

It is true that if the Treasurer answers my questions in what I would deem to be a fulfilling and proper manner that would assist me greatly in coming to a particular conclusion. If he does not, I will make mention of that later on. But, either way, this must not be taken by the media present as being a finite position which I may or may not take when the vote is taken on this matter.

Having said that, I have three questions that I wish to direct to the Treasurer in respect of this matter. First, given that employment at ETSA has markedly declined from 5 290 in 1990 to 2 447 in 1998, and further given that the Treasurer has previously said that unemployment is one of the matters which will be addressed should this measure now before us pass through Parliament, is the Treasurer, both now and in the future, prepared to guarantee, first, for those present employees who want it, a suitable early retirement/redundancy package; and, secondly, that all other employees left who might forcefully be made redundant will be relocated in other State Government areas of employment at a rate of pay not less than that laid down in their current awards and/or agreements?

Also, will the Treasurer guarantee that all—and I stress 'all'—moneys received from the lease of ETSA and all associated instrumentalities be used solely and applied immediately on receipt of the same for reduction of the principal of this State's \$7.5 billion debt? I indicate, having given some thought to the matter, that I have may have a relatively minor amendment—and I mean 'relatively minor'—in relation to that second question.

I preface my next question by saying that some politicians believe that promises are made to be broken. I bear in mind Premier Olsen's promise prior to the last State election. If the Treasurer answers my first two questions in the affirmative, is he prepared to give them to me in writing, signed by himself as Leader of the Government in this Council, stating that he is acting in that capacity, and also signed by the Premier, who is also the current Leader of the Treasurer's Party by dint of his high office, as well as the Leader of the Government in another place, setting out in simple, clear and precise terms the answers to my first two questions?

I might add that, should the Treasurer not be prepared to do so, I will then consider that he is hiding something from this Council and that there is in this Bill something which prevents him from complying with my request. I might inform the Treasurer that I will then react accordingly, if that is not forthcoming and in writing and signed by himself and the Premier in another place.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: First, I refer to the Treasurer's comments where he suggested that this amendment to clause 2 be a test clause for this Bill. The Opposition is certainly happy to see that, and, of course, we will oppose clause 2 in that vein when we come to debate on it. There is much that one could go over in the ETSA debate, but I do not propose to go over the whole debate again.

In view of the speech we have just heard and the Treasurer's comments, it is clear that we will have a number of opportunities later this week and, indeed, later this and next month to debate the ETSA issue at some length. However, we should at least put some points again on the record.

First, I remind all members of the mandate question: the fact that this Government has no mandate to sell what is an asset that belongs to the people of South Australia. It has no mandate to do so and, indeed, there is an amendment to clause 2, which the Committee is now debating, that allows for a referendum. If the Government wishes to get the approval of the people of this State for the sale of their asset, there is a means by which it can do that, and that is through a referendum, which we will be debating later on this very clause.

The Treasurer raised a number of other matters, one of which was this lease question, when he talked about the lease that had been entered into by the former Labor Government in relation to Torrens Island. I pointed out by an interjection that, indeed, when Minister Ingerson was the Minister for Infrastructure in charge of the electricity assets, he entered into a similar lease with Edison Power in the United States. These leases, like the lease that was entered into by John Bannon with Japanese investors and like the lease that Mr Ingerson entered into with Edison Power, of course were leases to those companies, which then leased them back to ETSA to reduce the taxation liabilities of the companies in their home State.

Whatever one thinks about these leases and whether they should be allowed, I would have thought incidentally that the taxpayers in those companies who permit these leases and permit these countries to get tax advantages should perhaps think again. Nevertheless, under the taxation laws of those countries, they permit these sorts of leases. They have nothing at all to do with the sort of lease that we are debating on this Bill.

It is one thing to have these lease arrangements that are really just accounting transactions to provide a benefit to the lessee overseas and a commensurate benefit to people in this State. The Opposition did not condemn the lease that was entered into by Minister Ingerson, but we did ask questions about it, because the taxpayers of this State—so we are told—benefited by it. However, it had nothing to do with the change of control in the Electricity Trust. The State still controls the electricity assets in this State under that lease as it did under the previous Bannon lease.

However, if we were to pass the clause to which the Treasurer is referring, that would pass control of our electricity assets to another purchaser, almost certainly a foreign purchaser, for at least 25 years. So, let there be no more of

this nonsense that those sorts of leases are in any way related to the sort of lease that is before us on this Bill.

In relation to that matter it is also worth pointing out that this Chamber voted, I think on 25 March, on clause 11 of this Bill. Clause 11, as introduced by the Government, permits the Government of South Australia to lease electricity assets. Back in March when we had the vote this Council voted against that clause. It would mean, incidentally, that if there were to be some change of heart by this Parliament at some stage we would have to reintroduce that clause in this Chamber. However, that is another matter. The Opposition is quite happy to use clause 2 as a test clause on this issue.

It is also important in this debate that I reiterate that the proposal of this Government to have three 25 year leases is just a con job. If this Government were to lease its assets for 25 years, by the end of that 25 years those assets would be greatly depleted. Many of those assets—the transformers, and so on—would have reached the end of their useful life and others certainly would be going towards that state. I made the point in debating this issue back in November last year, when we first had a debate on the proposal by this Government to have three 25 year leases, that it could be even worse than a sale of ETSA.

The Opposition, through my Leader Mike Rann and shadow Treasurer Kevin Foley, made the point at the time that we would be strongly opposed to a lease and regard a lease as at least as bad as or worse than a sale of ETSA assets. The reason is quite simple. Even the Treasurer himself pointed out that if you were to have a lease you would get less money for it than if you had sold it. The effect is that if you have these leases you still lose control in the same way. It is the same as a sale, but you get less money for it. What is the sense in that? If we are to get rid of our assets and hand over control to a foreign electricity corporation, you might as well get more money for it than you would otherwise.

That was the point that the Opposition made quite strongly in the debate last November. I note that my colleague the Hon. Trevor Crothers, in supporting my comments at that time, made a similar point, as follows:

I understand that we have before us a 25 year lease with three 24 year periods ongoing, in other words, a 99 year lease. I wonder why we are getting a lease of such duration when some of the plant that I suppose is being leased is already well on the way to retirement or semiretirement and other newer elements will not have much more than a 25 year period of time to run and will still be able to operate in a functional sense. It seems to me there is something much deeper about this Bill than an innocent like myself can understand.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Very perceptive comment.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is a perceptive comment. That is the problem with a 25 year lease—many of the assets would be so depleted at the end of it that it is impossible to put the pieces back together again. That is the point the Opposition makes: you cannot rescrumble the egg. Once it is scrambled, that is it—it is gone. We need to regard a lease in exactly the same way as we would a sale. Nothing in it at all is related to the sorts of leases that were conducted under the Bannon Government or by Mr Ingerson in relation to Edison Power.

There are some other points I wish to make in response to the Treasurer's comments. No doubt we will have many more lengthy opportunities to debate these issues in future, so I will not go over it all now, but the Treasurer made great play of the need to reduce State debt. Why, then, has this Government proposed a \$1 billion social dividend? Why is it offering to spend \$1 billion from the proceeds of the sale if the debt

is so bad? Surely, if we are in such a precarious position as this Government claims, every last cent from the sale of one of the few remaining assets we have in this State would need to go towards reducing debt.

I notice that my colleague the Hon. Trevor Crothers raised that matter in one of his earlier questions, and I think we can understand why he would do so: because it would be a total disaster for this State if we were to sell one of the last remaining assets we have and therefore reduce our capacity to pay off our debt by reducing the income producing assets of the State and spending it in any way that was not sustainable. That would be a disaster.

I will also comment on the dividends to be paid by our electricity assets. The key economic question facing us in any consideration of the ETSA sale is whether the dividends we receive from the Electricity Trust, plus the other earnings retained by the Electricity Trust to finance its growth, are greater than the interest we would save if we were to pay off debt. That is the key question that has to be faced in any sale asset. I referred to that matter in my contribution on the Bill when it first came before us almost 18 months ago. That is the key question. The Treasurer is using the dividends that ETSA is paying currently and saying they are less than the interest bill, and so we have to sell it. A number of comments need to be made about that.

First, ETSA has to finance debt. It has a debt of around \$1 billion to fund from its earnings. That needs to be factored into any equation. It is recognised that at the start of the electricity market there is in some sectors of ETSA some temporary pressure on those dividends. I refer to the recent budget (page 8.9) where it talks about the future of ETSA Power and says:

ETSA Power is also expected to face significant competition from interstate retailers who at least initially may be intent on building market share at the expense of profitability.

In other words, not surprisingly, as we go into the new market, there is more competition and many people are trying to establish themselves in the electricity market; they will be undercutting to try to get a share of the market and that will put some short-term pressure on ETSA Power—the marketing arm. Not surprisingly, in that initial period those dividends will be somewhat less than they might otherwise be. Is any company that will buy our electricity assets expecting to come in and make a killing on day one? Of course it is not. It is looking down the track. Those companies want to get their hands on the monopoly electricity assets. They want to buy the poles and wires because they know they are a monopoly and will not be duplicated. They know that at some time down the track, when the sale process is bedded down and the regulator is comfortable in his office, there is the potential for huge profits to be made from those assets. They are looking down the track, while this Government is looking at tomorrow.

As an example of the dividends, the other point that needs to be made is that this Government has made a policy decision in this and future budgets to pay no dividends from the South Australian Generation Corporation, in other words, Optima, Flinders Power, Synergen and Terra Gas Trader, even though at least some parts of them we know will be profitable, because the budget tells us so. It is important to realise that this Government has made a conscious decision to withhold dividends. Indeed, it says so on page 8.12 of the budget, as follows:

For most of the review period Optima Energy projects losses, with opening cash balances quickly depleted. . . Optima Energy's

operations are likely to be heavily impacted by the entry of new generation plant (for example, National Power). . .

Of course, that is the Pelican Point power station which this Government has introduced. It says that we have introduced this and given them a deal on the gas. The Government will not tell us what the deal is; we have said that we will buy their power for 20 months and not tell them how much we will pay. However, we know from the budget that that will have a dramatic impact on the dividends that Optima Energy can pay, particularly from its Torrens Island plant. If you let in a new player and you give them a good deal and favoured treatment to compete against one of the existing Government owned generators, is it any wonder that that Government owned generator will be under pressure as far as its dividends are concerned? It goes on to say:

It may be necessary for the Government to make an equity injection in later years of the review period to fund certain requirements such as losses and restructuring costs.

Of course, we know what the restructuring costs are because ETSA has been telling us for years: the Torrens Island B Station is now getting very old. It is 25 to 30 years old, and it is inefficient by modern standards. It needs to be upgraded to a combined cycle plant so that it can compete with new generating plants, and it will need an injection of funds at some stage. If this generator had remained under Government ownership, as it was in the past, in the course of events it would have been upgraded together with all the other upgrading that takes place in our electricity system. However, the Government is trying to say that this is a new, horrible event that will throw the budget and dividends out of kilter. If any member wishes to look at the situation regarding electricity entities, I refer them to chapter 8 of the budget.

Just before the last election, when he was the Treasurer of this State, Stephen Baker transferred \$450 million of the State debt to ETSA. So, ETSA had to carry on its books an additional \$450 million of debt. At that time, Mr Baker said:

This Government also has been working with ETSA Corporation to ensure that the corporation competes on an equal footing with potential competitors. This has included the separation of regulation activities from commercial operations, the identification and funding of CSOs (community service obligations) and the introduction of a TER (tax equivalent regime).

Mr Baker goes on to say—and this is important:

As part of the separation process, ETSA Corporation's balance sheet was restructured based upon an independent analysis of its capacity to service debt. This resulted in a \$450 million transfer of debt to ETSA Corporation from the non-commercial sector.

So, we increased ETSA Corporation's debt by \$450 million. The reason we did that, so we were told at that time, was so that it could compete on an equal footing with potential competitors. What we find in this budget is that this Government is withholding dividends from the South Australian Generation Corporation. But what does it have to say about the position of these companies to compete on a level playing field with their competitors? Regarding Flinders Power, which, of course, is our Thomas Playford Station, and the Northern Power Station at Port Augusta, the Government says:

Flinders Power currently projects profits over the review period. The budget papers go on to state (page 8.11):

Flinders Power has no internal reserves to act as a buffer to address the type of losses it would incur with a major plant outage. It has no reserves, yet the Government took \$450 million out of capital so that ETSA would be on the same footing as commercial bodies.

This Government's treatment of our electricity assets is a disgrace. The fact that it would not provide any information regarding what it has done in respect of the contracts with the new Pelican Point Power Station is another example of that. I refer to Terra Gas Trader, which will be required to develop a reasonable capital base to underpin its future business (page 8.13). Here again there is inadequate capital. This Government is saying that it has to withhold the dividends it has given in the past because it has to build up its capital base, the very capital base that was stripped by Stephen Baker just before the 1997 election.

I will not comment on this matter in any more depth, because I think I have made the point that the way in which this Government has used its electricity assets and this debate in an attempt to achieve political ends is a disgrace. It is unworthy of any Government to handle its important assets in such a manner. The lesson we learn from this is that we should treat the Treasurer's comments about expected dividends with a grain of salt.

I will conclude my remarks at this stage. I just wanted to make the point that the Opposition will continue to oppose the sale or lease of ETSA for the reasons that have been stated on a number of occasions. This Government has no mandate for the sale or lease of ETSA, and the Opposition believes that the economic case does not stack up. I am sure that we will revisit this debate shortly and that no doubt we will take it up again at that time.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

FINANCIAL SECTOR REFORM (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 May. Page 1224.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for Disability Services): I rise to support the second reading of the Financial Sector Reform (South Australia) Bill, which is a product of the recommendations of the Wallis Report. The Wallis committee presided over by Mr Stan Wallis and containing a number of distinguished Australians is a landmark in the history of the Australian financial system. The committee was convened in 1996 but did not report until 1997. It was a thorough examination of our financial system. There have been similar reports in the past, including the Martin Report and the Campbell Report, which similarly addressed particular aspects of the Australian financial system. However, I think it is fair to say that the Wallis Report has provided the most extensive recommendations regarding financial institutions including banks, non-bank financial institutions and friendly societies.

One of the many recommendations of the Wallis Report was that banks, non-bank financial institutions and friendly societies be the subject of the same regulatory regime. Friendly societies were the subject of a separate regime enacted as recently as 1997, and the mechanisms for the regulation of those societies have, as far as I am aware, been satisfactorily conducted.

The Financial Institutions (Application of Laws) Act 1992 and I think also the Friendly Societies Act 1997 did have the effect of cancelling the registration and regulation of building societies, credit unions, special service providers and friendly societies under the Financial Institutions and Friendly Societies Codes. The Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA) was established in 1998, and the Aus-

tralian Securities and Investment Commission (formerly the Australian Securities Commission) is now established.

Part 2 of the Bill does confer on the Australian Securities and Investment Commission and the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority the power to regulate building societies, credit unions, special service providers and financial friendly societies for the purpose of the transition from regulation under the old financial institutions scheme to the new regime. When I say the 'old' financial institutions scheme, I think it is perhaps unfair to describe it as an old scheme, because it is a fairly new scheme that is being replaced only a short time after its establishment.

It is an interesting development in Australia on two scores, one of which is that we are moving to a national regulation and most of the players in the financial system are large players and many of them are national players. We note only this week in Adelaide the establishment of a small financial institution under the auspices of the Ballarat Bank—I think formerly building society—for the purposes of developing a community-type banking institution.

I believe that in the future we will possibly see develop in this country, as has developed in the United States, a very large number of small, localised and community financial institutions. If that occurs I would welcome it because everybody in this place would know that there is grave disquiet, especially in regional and rural Australia, about the continuing concentration of power of financial institutions with the inevitable closure of local branches and the centralisation of administration. I think that is an inevitable development, which will be ameliorated to some extent by the fact that electronic banking services will be increasingly available and will be increasingly used by members of the community. Notwithstanding that development, I believe that there will develop a network of localised financial institutions. If that occurs, it will be appropriately regulated under the scheme which is proposed nationally and which is presently before the Parliament. So, there is a paradox between the continuing centralisation of the regulation of financial institutions whilst at the same time there is a demand for localisation of institutions.

Another development that we ought reflect upon as we pass this legislation is the fact that it does represent yet another case where national legislation is taking over from what was originally, although not in the immediate past, a matter of State regulation. Friendly societies were a well-established part of the South Australian financial scheme, although not a large player in it. With this legislation, we will see yet again the cementing of a national regulatory regime which will inevitably have the consequence that this Parliament will lose its power over this area.

South Australia has been very successful in its credit union and building society movements. In this State there are presently 14 credit unions, one building society and four financial friendly societies. Indeed, the largest credit union in the country is based in this State. Therefore, it is appropriate that, given the vibrant nature of this sector, we are one of the first States to take on the implementation of this national legislation as recommended by the Wallis report.

I commend the Attorney for bringing forward the Bill. I have only a couple of questions to ask in Committee. One relates to clause 23, which provides that civil legal proceedings involving the South Australian Office of Financial Supervision which were commenced prior to the transfer date will be preserved. I ask the Attorney whether there are any

outstanding civil proceedings involving the Office of Financial Supervision.

Another question relates to clause 24, which empowers both the Australian Securities and Investment Commission and APRA to continue legal proceedings that might have been brought by the Office of Financial Supervision for breach of the Financial Institutions and Friendly Societies Codes. Are there any such proceedings and what is their nature?

Subject only to those issues, which should not detain the Committee because I am entirely content to receive a report on that from the Attorney in due course, I support the Bill.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CITY OF ADELAIDE (RUNDLE MALL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 May. Page 1206.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Opposition will be supporting the Government and the Democrats in their support of this Bill. My understanding is that this Bill dispenses with the body that is now administering the mall. The information that I have been given is that there is general agreement by the Government, local government and the stakeholders that the administrative committee is superfluous to requirements, that the administration of the mall and its precincts can be conducted by the combined relationships of the administrative body that is looking at the governance of the Adelaide City Council and the State Government and that the body no longer has a role to play or a function to fulfil.

Some people have a view that it could survive alongside the governance that has been set up, but I think further examination would show that it would be duplicating the roles of the body which is now set up to do the job and that there is no need for it. I take the points that the Democrats made in relation to consultation. If the new body, which is being set up with the Premier and other senior members of the Government, cannot get its communication right, then you would wonder how any major decisions can be made affecting Rundle Mall and its precincts, but I suspect as time goes on that we could expect or hope that those communication links could be improved.

I have not been in touch with the Lord Mayor or representatives of the council to gauge opinions, but I do take on board the comments made by other members in relation to those negotiations that have taken place, and I note that all stakeholders are supporting the progress of this Bill. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXPLOSIVES (BROAD CREEK) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 May. Page 1205.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I indicate that the Opposition will support this Bill. My colleague the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Annette Hurley) in the House of Assembly set out our position on this Bill at page 1424 of *Hansard* on 26 May. There is no need for me to go over the issue again. It is a very simple Bill: it contains only two clauses and relates to the Government explosives magazine at Broad Creek on Le Fevre Peninsula.

It is my understanding that this magazine has not been used since 1995 because there has been a change in the practices of the mining companies (the main users of explosives). They now store the explosives on site and there is little need for the Government to run a controlled distribution. This Bill removes the reserve status of the area that was covered by the old magazine.

My colleague in another place did seek assurances from the Minister that the environment of that area would be protected, and she read into *Hansard* the undertakings that the Minister had given in relation to that matter. Given those assurances from the Minister that this unique mangrove area will be protected as far as the environment is concerned, the Opposition is prepared to support the Bill.

My colleague in another place also made the point that there is some prospect of the Government magazine being turned into a museum which would certainly be a worthwhile step if funding could be arranged. The explosives industry has played a very important part in the development of this State, and the mining and quarrying industries of South Australia have made a great contribution to our development.

I also point out that my colleague in another place had consulted with the neighbour to this property, if I can call it that, Penrice Soda, which had no problem with the change. The Opposition had those additional assurances in relation to the Government magazine at Broad Creek and is happy to support the Bill.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: On behalf of the Democrats, I support the second reading of this Bill. I have been assured by the Minister that the intention of the use of the land, which is now to be rezoned so that the Explosives Act no longer applies to it, is such that the area which is currently covered by mangroves will eventually become a recreation park-reserve under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and that area within the zone currently covered by Penrice operations will continue to be so.

I suppose some people would be a little suspicious about things going on in the Port Adelaide area with the recent experience of Pelican Point, which came about without any public consultation, and when we were aware that Boral was going through proper planning procedures, yet the Government, right out of the blue, announced another power station without going through due planning procedures. We then also have the ship-breaking yard—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Normal planning procedures I would stress. Then, with the ship-breaking yard as well, I suppose some people would look with great caution at what else could be planned for this area. However, I can only put on the record that the Government has given assurances that, as I said, the mangroves will become part of a recreation park/reserve. I note that, when the MFP Bill first came before Parliament, the Democrats proposed that the land on Torrens Island and other areas which were part of the MFP should indeed become part of a national park. Therefore, I am pleased that many years later the Government, after voting

against those amendments, has now adopted Democrat policy and, as such, we cannot help but support it.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I thank members for their indications of support for the Bill. There has been an exchange of correspondence between the responsible Minister and both the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place and the Hon. Mr Elliott, and I think that satisfies inquiries in relation to the usage of the land when the Bill has been enacted. I did have the benefit of a conversation with the Hon. Terry Cameron, who is given the opportunity to speak on all Bills if he so wishes but who, on this occasion, has indicated that he supports it and therefore it is not necessary for him to speak on it.

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

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (CONTINUATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): 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.

Section 4 of the *Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Act 1993* adopts the Commonwealth *Mutual Recognition Act 1992* for a period ending on 30 June 1999. Section 6 of the Act provides for its expiry at the end of the period for which the Commonwealth Act is adopted, that is, 30 June 1999.

These Acts were enacted as part of a national scheme of mutual recognition and are complemented by an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Commonwealth, States and Territories. Under the terms of the Agreement a review of the mutual recognition scheme was conducted early in 1998, five years after the commencement of the Commonwealth Act.

The COAG Committee on Regulatory Reform undertook the review. In addition to advertisements in the national press inviting submissions, members of the Committee on Regulatory Reform undertook consultation within their jurisdictions. This review was completed late in 1998, and a report made to COAG.

The purpose of the 'Expiry of Act' clause was to ensure that a review of the effectiveness of the mutual recognition scheme take place within 5 years of its commencement. The Act's original expiry date was 1 March 1998, but this was extended to 30 June 1999 pending the completion of the review, and to allow sufficient time for South Australia to consider the review's outcome and take any necessary legislative action arising from its recommendations.

The objective of mutual recognition is to promote the freedom of movement of goods and service providers across Australia, by reducing the regulatory barriers to the flow of goods and skilled service providers across State borders. The review found overall, mutual recognition was working well to advance this objective.

The review report recommended, *inter alia*, that jurisdictions endorse the continued operation of the mutual recognition scheme in Australia, and that further reviews of the scheme occur every five years – the next to take place in 2003 in conjunction with the first review of the Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Scheme. South Australia accepts these recommendations.

This Bill removes the 'Expiry of Act' clause from the legislation to enable the continuing operation of the Act consistent with the review's recommendation.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 4—Adoption of Commonwealth Act

Clause 3: Repeal of s. 6

Clauses 2 and 3 remove the provisions in the principal Act dealing with the expiry of the Act, resulting in the Act continuing in force until repealed.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LISTENING DEVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its disagreement to the House of Assembly's amendments.

This is part of the process towards setting up a deadlock conference. By virtue of the numbers in the Council when last we debated this issue, I would expect the Committee to insist on its disagreement. In those circumstances I would expect that the conference will consider this matter later this week.

Motion negatived.

A message was sent to the House of Assembly requesting a conference at which the Legislative Council would be represented by the Hons I. Gilfillan, K.T. Griffin, Carolyn Pickles, A.J. Redford and Carmel Zollo.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.2 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 2 June at 2.15 p.m.