

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 7 June 2007

**The PRESIDENT (Hon. R.K. Sneath)** took the chair at 2.18 p.m. and read prayers.

McDONALD, Mr S.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Police):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** I have this morning been advised by South Australia Police that officers from Operation Cypress have today arrested Stuart McDonald and charged him with seven counts of act to endanger life. The charge carries a maximum prison term of life for each count. Operation Cypress is the SAPOL task force established to manage the investigation into the alleged criminal conduct of McDonald, who is alleged to have recklessly and intentionally infected up to 10 other people with HIV.

On 4 April 2007, the Adelaide Magistrate's Court granted a warrant to SAPOL and the Crown Solicitor's Office on behalf of health authorities for the detention of McDonald at the Glenside Hospital pursuant to section 32 of the Public and Environmental Health Act. On 20 April 2007, SAPOL established the Cypress task force parallel with the detention order, which confined McDonald to Glenside. Between 20 April and 6 June 2007, police conducted a preliminary inquiry into McDonald's alleged criminal conduct, as well as a complex identification process.

I am advised by SAPOL that, of the persons identified with the same HIV strain as McDonald, seven have provided police with statements and are victims in the prosecution. One has not been located by police, although his identity is known, one refuses to provide a statement to police or health authorities, and one has provided a statement to police but there is insufficient evidence to lay a charge against McDonald. I understand that McDonald will shortly appear in the Adelaide Magistrate's Court on these criminal charges. I am advised that police will oppose bail.

WALSH, Mr S.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement in relation to the report of Mr Walsh QC made today by the Hon. John Hill.

## QUESTION TIME

## POLICE DOCUMENTS

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Police a question about the secret files bungle.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Yesterday, I asked a question and, with your leave, Mr President, two supplementary questions about the number of files that were stolen or lost, the investigations that were compromised and whether any other jurisdictions or agencies were involved. The minister was either unable to answer or did not know the answer, and did not provide an answer. It is interesting that

today, on page 3 of *The Advertiser*, I read all the answers to the questions I asked. The article states:

The information was contained in more than 20 confidential files—

a question I asked yesterday—

*The Advertiser* understands the files detailed more than 30 investigations being conducted by the SA Police Organised Crime Branch. . .

It continues:

A senior police source told *The Advertiser* yesterday the theft was 'the biggest disaster to ever face SAPOL. SAPOL is the laughing stock of police forces nationally. . .

It also states that the Australian Crime Commission, NSW Police and Victoria Police had also had their investigations compromised. The editorial in today's *Advertiser* states:

There appears to be little doubt that the stolen material covers a range of critical police investigations and has fallen into the hands of a bikie gang.

The personal details, including addresses and telephone numbers, of dozens of police and some police informants are apparently included in the files.

My question is: why is it that, when we ask questions in parliament, we do not get an answer, yet we read the answers in *The Advertiser* the next day?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Police):** One thing you could do is perhaps talk to the Leader of the Opposition's press secretary, but I will not go into that at this time.

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** What's that got to do with it?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Ask him and find out. The editorial in today's *Advertiser* contains a number of statements, some of which are untrue; one in particular is that addresses of police were provided. My advice, certainly, is that that is not the case. I believe that, tomorrow, the Leader of the Opposition in another place will take up the invitation of the government to have a full briefing on this matter with the Acting Commissioner of Police. The fact that police files have been stolen from a vehicle and handed to criminal elements is, of course, something that is bitterly—

*The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Well, it's embarrassing for the police and it's embarrassing for me.

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** It's an inconvenience.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** In relation to the police, yes, and I repeat that—the addresses of police officers were not put in there. *The Advertiser* refers to a senior police officer. Presumably it is referring to a senior constable who whilst having a chat to someone may have said this. The senior police who have advised me have not said that. I can say categorically that the senior police officers involved in this matter have not made those statements, and I suggest they have come from another source.

I had a lengthy meeting with the Acting Police Commissioner on Monday. Both he and I made ourselves available to the media at great length at a press conference outside my office on Monday morning. We answered all the questions that were asked and I have answered the questions that have been asked here. What I do know is that, at about 7.30 this morning, the Leader of the Opposition in another place went on ABC radio and made certain comments. Apparently, after that, he must have read *The Advertiser* editorial and, of course, picked up the suggestion about having an independent inquiry, because he then called a press conference for later in the morning asking for this independent inquiry—because it was suggested in *The Advertiser*. Wouldn't it be nice if the Leader of the Opposition actually had an original thought;

and wouldn't it be even nicer if he came up with one constructive idea for what should be done here?

The point I made to the media is that there is one lesson to be learnt from this, that is, you do not need an inquiry to find out that police files should not be left in places where they can be taken. You do not need to hire a judge to tell you that. There is an internal investigation of this matter going on within the police force, but you do not need an investigation to know that these documents should not have been left where they were. That is the lesson that will come out of this, and it is exactly the lesson we learnt, of course, when a former Liberal minister had her cabinet documents stolen from a car near the Feathers Hotel.

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** No. They were documents relating to the Hindmarsh stadium that were required under a FOI request that happened to go missing, if my memory serves me correctly. Back in those days there were FOI laws and since that day the FOI laws have been changed and there are now dozens of requests. So, just because *The Advertiser* says—

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Well, it's in *The Advertiser*. The Leader of the Opposition woke up after his 7.30 a.m. interview and must have read *The Advertiser* and thought, 'Gee, that's a good idea.' These ideas are not the Leader of the Opposition's, they are the ideas of the Editor of *The Advertiser*, and that is the great tragedy. The Leader of the Opposition was on television two days ago, and do you know what, Mr President? The Leader of the Opposition, the member for Waite (Mr Hamilton-Smith), said on television a couple of days ago that what we do not need now is further reviews; we need action. That is what the Leader of the Opposition was saying—we need action, we do not need reviews. Two days later he reads in *The Advertiser* that we should have a review and suddenly these people want a review. What a joke they are!

The information in *The Advertiser* says that senior police have provided information but if, in fact, senior police have done so and if I really believed that was true and that was the source, maybe there ought to be an investigation into why senior police are making details public. Maybe that is the investigation that we need to have if that sort of information which can only be of assistance to criminals is provided.

Let me conclude with one final point, because I think it shows the hollowness of the views of the opposition and particularly those of the leader in another place in relation to this matter. You would think that bikies were the only source of organised crime. There are plenty of other groups involved in organised crime with whom the police need to be involved. We know what happened under the previous government, with all the bikie activities which happened just prior to the election and after which this government established Operation Avatar as an ongoing operation and increased its resources.

On 24 April 1999, only weeks after setting up a clubhouse in Adelaide, the Bandidos launched a recruiting drive. They placed a classified advertisement in *The Advertiser* recruiting members. That is what happened under the previous government. They actually had classified advertisements in *The Advertiser* recruiting members. On 3 May 1999, a fire (for which a rival gang was responsible) raged through the Bandidos new headquarters at Osborne. On 16 July 1999, two bomb blasts rocked Adelaide's inner western suburbs. Two bombs were planted outside a building being renovated to

become the Rebels motorcycle gang's clubrooms. The bombing was linked to a clash between bikie gangs.

On 2 August 1999, a series of violent crimes believed to be clashes between rival bikie gangs were to be investigated by police. The investigations would include a gunfire exchange between the occupants of two cars; a shooting at Elizabeth Grove when two cars were hit with gunfire; a brawl at the Eureka Tavern at Salisbury in July 1999; an arson attack on the Bandidos motorcycle club's Osborne clubrooms on 1 May 1999; and the placing of a bomb under a car in the driveway of a Woodville South home on 1 April.

On 8 October 1999, five members of the Rebels motorcycle club were ambushed as they left their clubrooms at Wright Street Adelaide; three Rebels motorcycle club members died. On 4 January 2001, 130 Gypsy Joker gang members in the South-East town of Beachport bashed three Star Group officers: injuries sustained by the police included a broken jaw. That was the situation immediately prior to this government coming to office.

*The Hon. G.E. Gago interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Yes, it was—out of a car. This government has acted. This government has taken action to address this problem. We do not want to go back to those days. The fact that a police officer has left files in a place where they could be stolen is highly regrettable. As I said, one would expect that, whatever happens, that particular officer is probably suffering a lot more for this thing than the previous Liberal cabinet minister who was also irresponsible with documents. Okay; it should not have happened—the lesson is clear: confidential documents should not be left in places where they can be taken—but a whole lot of wild speculation does not help. Tomorrow the Leader of the Opposition will have the opportunity to be briefed by the Assistant Commissioner and I think that, when he has that briefing, he will understand what action (and why) the police have taken in relation to this matter.

**The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:** I have a supplementary question. Will the minister advise whether any of the police informants whose details were disclosed have been the subject of any threats or intimidation and whether any of them have decided to decline to assist the police with their investigations?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** It would be totally irresponsible to provide information about those people. I will reiterate what I said yesterday: the police will contact anyone involved. That does not mean that informants were necessarily identified. In relation to any evidence that might contribute towards identification, the police have taken the appropriate action to ensure that there is no risk to those persons and that there is a minimal compromise of any ongoing police investigation. The police can do no more than that.

### SOLID WASTE LEVY

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** My questions to the Minister for Environment and Conservation about the solid waste levy are as follows:

1. What is the total quantum of funds that has been collected so far by the levy?
2. How much has been expended; and what has it been expended on?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I did not quite hear the question because of the noise in the chamber. I take it that the questions are about

the waste levy. I do not have those exact figures, but I am happy to take those questions on notice and bring back a detailed response. In terms of the levy, currently the waste levy is \$10 million a year, with half going to the EPA and half to Zero Waste. Prior to Zero Waste existing (which was back in early 2000), the waste levy went in total to the EPA. Since being set up as a department, half of the fee has been sent to Zero Waste; the other half going to the EPA. I do not know how long that has been in place. I gather that the member is asking back to the inception of the waste levy but, as I said, I do not have those details with me. I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I have a supplementary question. Is the minister aware as to whether any of those funds have been expended and, if so, does she have a figure for that amount?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Is the honourable member asking whether any of the waste levy funds have been expended?

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** Yes.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I gave quite a detailed response yesterday, but I am happy to do it all again. A good part, or all of the Zero Waste budget, is supplied through the Zero Waste levy. I believe it does not receive funds from anywhere else but, if it does, it would not be of any significance. In terms of Zero Waste, other than funds that are placed in the Waste to Resources fund which sit there for however long to be spent on future projects, those funds are used to fund the administration and the programs run by Zero Waste.

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** How much?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I just said that currently the Waste levy is \$10 million.

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** How much is being spent?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I have already said to the member (I think she must be hard of hearing today) that I do not have the details of the accrual of the levy since the time of its inception. I said up-front, as soon as I got to my feet, that I do not have that level of detail with me today but that I am happy to bring back a response. Basically, that is what it is spent on. In terms of the EPA, it is a similar thing. The waste levy contributes to the administration and program of activities of the department. That is what it is spent on.

The EPA also receives funding from penalties and suchlike; it generates revenue from the penalties that it receives when breaches of the act occur. It has income from there but, basically, it also includes income received from Treasury to pay for the administration and program of activities of those two departments. It is not rocket science.

### MOBILONG PRISON

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question relating to Mobilong Prison.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** In December 2006, a prisoner was transferred from Mobilong when authorities learnt of a planned escape. In April 2007, a juvenile was arrested for trying to smuggle contraband into Mobilong Prison. In May 2007, an escape was foiled when a prisoner tried to leave Mobilong in the back of a vehicle. My questions are:

1. Given recent security issues, will the minister advise whether any prisoners currently placed at Mobilong are classified above medium security?

2. Will the minister advise whether, over the past two years, any policy or procedure prohibiting prisoners wearing civilian attire at Mobilong has been changed or enforcement practices varied?

3. Will the minister assure the council that the statements made by the Department of Correctional Services about the attempted escape of a prisoner on 8 May were accurate in all material respects?

**The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (Minister for Correctional Services):** I assume the honourable member is referring to recent media reports in the *Murray Valley Standard* newspaper.

**The Hon. B.V. Finnigan:** Not *The Advertiser*?

**The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO:** No, it's not *The Advertiser*. The newspaper article quotes a source it refers to as a 'Mobilong prison officer' who 'wished to remain anonymous', who accuses the department of 'lying to the public about what goes on behind the walls of the prison'. The allegations are primarily related to prison security. The article follows on from an article published early in May in that same newspaper about an attempted escape from Mobilong Prison on 7 May, where a prisoner accessed a hard hat and vest from a contract worker inside the prison and attempted to conceal himself in the back of a truck.

In the article dated 22 May, it is alleged by the Mobilong prisoner officer that all sorts of things were going on, such as items 'being smuggled in' and going 'over the walls' and prisoners being able to wear casual clothes. I think the honourable member has already referred to quite a few of those things. From memory, I thought the department had made comments that were published in a subsequent article. There is no evidence that the amount of weapons or drugs being introduced into Mobilong, or any other prison for that matter, is increasing. On the contrary, all the evidence available to the department indicates that the amount of weapons and drugs being found is declining. I am advised that my officers are unaware of any situation where a weapon has been brought into Mobilong Prison over the fence.

With respect to prisoners being allowed to wear casual clothes, it is not unusual for medium security prisoners to be allowed to wear casual clothes. In our prisons, prisoners have to earn the right to be treated in a particular way. In South Australia, and Mobilong in particular, approval to wear casual clothing is part of an incentive-based regime that requires prisoners to reach a certain standard of behaviour before they are allowed to wear clothing of this type. At Mobilong, there are several units where prisoners have not achieved the levels necessary and they are still required to wear prison clothing. The regime process is part of a graduated approach that sees prisoners given greater levels of responsibility and freedom to make choices as part of the process of preparing them for their return to the community.

The department did not lie about the recent escape attempt. The prisoner was detected at the gates by an officer whose role was to detect anything or anyone leaving the prison illegally. The prisoner had not been detected by previous checks or surveillance measures. To her credit, the officer was observant and noticed the prisoner trying to hide in a vehicle.

In regard to the statement about lockdown, which was also referred to in the newspaper, the prison was aware that a prisoner had not reported and was in the process of ascertaining the identity of the prisoner at the time the prisoner was located. The prison had identified the unit to which the prisoner belonged and was in the process of locking down

that unit when he was found. What we are saying is that the processes do work.

No prisoners classified as high security are being held at Mobilong Prison. There are some murderers and rapists being kept at the prison but not because of the overcrowding in Yatala Labour Prison. All modern prison systems have a process that allows high security prisoners who have achieved medium security status to be transferred to a medium security facility as a matter of course. They are placed there in accordance with their sentence management. As I have said, Mobilong is a medium security prison, and this has been happening at Mobilong, as well as in other medium security prisons in the state, for many years.

The Correctional Services Act allows the Chief Executive of the department to sometimes release prisoners who are in the last 30 days of their prison sentence. This is an administrative process which is allowed for under the Correctional Services Act which has been in place for many years. In relation to what people are wearing in prisons, clearly we have civilians who have access to the prison system, and they are an important part of any correctional service process. Our prisons are visited by volunteers, inspectors, tribunals and educators, to name a few. All those people have regular access to our prisons, and they must have satisfied an essential police check before they are allowed to enter the prison or work with prisoners.

The other thing that the article said was that visitors could be described as being at risk of physical abuse whilst working in a prison. There would be even less chance of any abuse in medium and low security prisons. I think, in all, I have responded to the very many questions that the honourable member has asked and, indeed, all the assertions by the anonymous correctional services officer at Mobilong.

### SINOSTEEL JOINT VENTURE

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development a question on the Sinosteel joint venture.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I understand that the Sinosteel Corporation and PepinNini Minerals have completed all the formalities to finalise their joint venture. Will the minister provide some information to the council regarding this arrangement?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development):** For those who may not know the Sinosteel Corporation, it is China's biggest steel maker. I am very pleased to advise the council that the Sinosteel Corporation has now officially entered a major joint venture with PepinNini Minerals Limited to develop the Crocker Well and Mount Victoria uranium deposits, as well as other commodities in South Australia's Curnamona Province. Yesterday, a completion ceremony was held in Adelaide, attended by representatives from both companies as well as South Australian government officials.

The announcement that such a steel making giant will establish an office in Adelaide is very welcome. Sinosteel's Adelaide office will be the company's second in Australia and will be the base for the joint venture with PepinNini. Sinosteel already has a presence in Perth. This decision by Sinosteel to open an office in Adelaide is a further sign that important international mining sector companies are recognising the state's minerals boom. Sinosteel is one of the world's great mineral sector companies, and the fact it has chosen

Adelaide in which to establish an office is a huge vote of confidence in South Australia's minerals boom.

Anything that increases that level of confidence is bound to encourage more investment in our state. As part of its joint venture alliance with PepinNini, Sinosteel is set to spend \$11 million on exploring the Curnamona Province during the next two years for uranium and other commodities.

### GAME SHOWS AND COMPETITIONS

**The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Environment and Conservation, representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs, questions in relation to late night trivia game shows and SMS competitions.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:** My office has received a number of complaints in relation to these competitions, which require viewers to SMS the correct answers to a series of questions in order to be eligible to win a prize. I am advised that entrants have to answer at least 10 questions to be eligible for a prize, something that is not made apparent in the advertising. These competitions start off by asking a very basic question, such as, 'Who is the Prime Minister of Australia? Is it John Howard or Bob Hawke?' and if you answer that question correctly then you go on.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** Did you get it right?

**The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:** The Hon. Mr Stephens should know that I did not enter the competition. In order to be deemed a winner for the second round and to be eligible to win a prize, the entrant must also be the fastest for that month in responding to the questions. There are also invitations for entrants who did not win to keep playing. I had a recent complaint from one entrant who, in one of the further rounds, was asked the question as to who was the federal leader of the opposition, whether it was Kevin Rudd or Kim Beazley, and the correct answer, according to the competition promoters, was Kim Beazley. So, that just indicates the nature of some of these competitions.

According to the complaints I have received, once you have entered the competition it costs \$2 for each SMS sent and a further \$2 for each SMS received. In total, it costs a minimum of \$40 to be eligible for a prize, and that is with the company that trades as Text for Cash. Information received from the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner indicates that only competitions and trade promotion lotteries in which the winners of the lottery are determined by an element of chance have to be conducted in accordance with the rules set in the lottery and gaming regulations. Because these competitions are considered games of skill rather than games of chance they are not covered by lottery and gaming legislation. My questions are:

1. Has the minister been made aware of these competitions and, if so, is she aware of complaints made either to the Office of Consumer Affairs or to the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner?

2. Does the minister concede that there is a gap in current legislation with respect to these competitions? For instance, is there any policing to ensure that these competitions are being conducted with probity and also that consumers are being appropriately informed?

3. Does the minister consider that these competitions ought to be the subject of regulation?

4. Does the minister propose to establish any consumer protection measures in order to protect the public from these competitions?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I thank the honourable member for his important questions and will be happy to refer those questions to the Minister for Consumer Affairs in another place and bring back a response.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

**The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER:** I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Environment and Conservation a question about natural resources management boards.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER:** In his second reading speech on 18 February 2004 then minister Hill said:

We promised to develop new arrangements that would support skills-based regional boards to coordinate regional programs for natural resources management. . . We also promised that the new arrangements would incorporate the development and implementation of revegetation and biodiversity plans, and works to manage salinity as components of both the State and regional NRM plans.

He further said:

Existing State Government funding for natural resources management purposes will continue, subject to standard Government budget processes. . . Regional boards established in areas that will not have the capacity to fully fund themselves via natural resources management levies will be assisted through the Environment and Conservation Portfolio, as is presently the case with some existing boards.

He further said:

Levies will not be increased as a direct result of this reform. . .

At the time, the Liberal Party expressed grave concerns that the government would renege on its promises and, in fact, in April 2004 the then shadow minister Iain Evans said:

The real concern of this levy is that the minister is in the Messenger Press over the last few months saying the levy may not increase very much between now and March 2006 but after . . . There's no guarantee so we all know in the political field, what that is code for is that straight after the next election if this government are re-elected these particular levies are likely to increase significantly above the CPI.

Indeed, his words have proven to be prophetic, because the government contribution to NRM boards has not even increased with CPI. One example is the Northern and Yorke region, which has had to increase its levy by over \$1 million in one year, which in the case of at least one council is an increase of over 300 per cent in one year, and that is just to make ends meet. On the other hand, the Eyre Peninsula NRM board, due to political pressure, has been told that it must reduce its projected levy by over \$1 million; hence, its project plans have been delayed or cut to a level where they are ineffective or worse.

The state government put in place the structural and administrative requirements of these boards, yet its contribution does not even cover administrative salary costs, let alone assist with any project implementation. Even the LGA and *The Advertiser* of 31 May expressed their frustration with the NRM process and called for an urgent review of NRM arrangements. My questions are:

1. Has the government indeed broken its promise to the people of South Australia?
2. Will the minister instigate an urgent review of the NRM Act and its administration?

3. Will she commit to appropriate government funding of NRM boards and regions within this state?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** This government and the former minister for the environment (Hon. John Hill) showed enormous vision and good governance in the way they established the NRM boards by consolidating 70-odd—a large number—of small catchment pest and weed control and soil boards. The former minister consolidated those boards into eight NRM boards under a single piece of legislation, and he set up the regional boards along catchment boundaries to better manage our natural resources. He showed enormous vision in establishing these boards, as did the Rann Labor government.

There was government funding for these boards, but they were also given the capacity under that legislation (as were the water boards previously) to charge for levies, as do the NRM boards. It is mischief on the part of the Hon. Caroline Schaefer to suggest that the Hon. John Hill gave any commitment for a standstill (other than beyond CPI) on the NRM levy rates beyond the first two years of the scheme. It is absolute mischief. She might think that selecting certain paragraphs and reading them out of the broader context might be smart, but it is in fact mischievous.

The Hon. John Hill was very clear that a moratorium would be established on that levy rate for at least two years, after which the boards would have their plans in place, would be well-established and consolidated and have the capacity in line with their planning to recommend levies at what their local communities were prepared to pay after consultation. In terms of government funding, in 2007-08 we provided almost \$4.6 million and other considerable amounts of money to the boards for transitional arrangements, particularly the Northern Yorke region, which was given additional one-off funding of over \$1 million to help them get to their feet and establish themselves. So, significant funding has been provided by this government over the past three years.

The government committed to continue to provide funding for the boards, and a review involving the presiding members (including the NRM Council presiding member) is currently underway to look at current funding allocations and ways of addressing issues around equity, particularly those boards that have been identified as having problems. Given that the populations they serve are quite small, their capacity to generate levies is restricted. They are looking at the issue of equity and at how funding might provide a better balance between boards that have access to levy funding and those that do not.

That review is already underway. As I said, the Rann Labor government and the former minister for the environment showed incredible foresight and leadership in setting up these boards and this consolidated and streamlined way of managing our natural resources. There is an increasing focus on natural resource management. We all know that our awareness, knowledge and information about the importance of managing our resources have increased, and this issue has lifted in people's minds as they have become more aware of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. It is to be expected that, as our interest in and knowledge and understanding of these issues increases, so, too, do the expectations of the general public in terms of the management of these resources.

There are ever increasing pressures on these boards to manage issues such as weed and pest control, water catchment management and the fencing of remnant vegetation, particularly in a period of drought. People's awareness and

knowledge have increased, as have their expectations, so it is not surprising that the boards are listening and responding to the concerns of their communities.

**The Hon. SANDRA KANCK:** I have a supplementary question. Is it correct that the approximately \$4.6 million, which the minister says the government has provided for NRM boards in the past financial year, remains the identical amount for this financial year—in other words, with no CPI adjustment? Does this not mean an effective reduction in government support in this current financial year for NRM boards across the state?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I am not too sure whether the Hon. Sandra Kanck is asking me whether it will be adjusted for CPI in the next budget. Obviously, she knows—

*The Hon. Sandra Kanck interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Whether it was adjusted to CPI from the 2006-07 budget? I cannot answer that question, but I can inform the honourable member that significantly larger sums of money were paid out by the government. As I mentioned, an extra \$1 million was given to the Northern Yorke NRM Board to assist in its establishment costs. I have been advised that other large amounts of money were given to a number of other boards to assist them in their transition and establishment costs. So, those extra funds would far exceed any CPI adjustment.

#### FIREFIGHTERS CHARITY FOUNDATION

**The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Emergency Services a question about the support and assistance Metropolitan Fire Service officers provide to burns victims in South Australia.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN:** Burns victims, especially young people and children—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN:** I am very concerned about people who suffer horrific burns, and I am sorry that the opposition does not think that it is an important topic. Burns victims, especially young people and children, suffer terribly from their injuries. Will the minister advise the council of how our Metropolitan Fire Service firefighters assist burns victims and play a significant role in community education?

**The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (Minister for Emergency Services):** I thank the honourable member for his important question—

**The Hon. G.E. Gago:** And his interest.

**The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO:** That's right—and his interest, in particular. I am aware that he has a family connection with firefighters. On Saturday 26 May, I had the pleasure of attending the Australian Professional Firefighters Foundation Annual Charity Ball. The foundation, of which I am a proud patron this year, is an organisation unique to Australia, and it began here in South Australia. It belongs solely to the member firefighters and their families. As I have advised the chamber previously, the main purpose of the foundation is fundraising for charity, offering both financial and other assistance to fire victims, especially children and those in immediate need. It also aims to become actively involved in its local communities, assisting in the provision of fire prevention information to the community and improv-

ing the internal network and welfare of the firefighters themselves.

The Australian Professional Firefighters Charity Foundation membership is made up of professional firefighters from all services and currently comprises approximately 700 members who donate \$2 or more per pay. Funds are also raised through other events. Funds for the foundation, such as over \$31 000 raised by the annual charity ball, will be used to support fire-affected victims. I make particular mention of one of the sponsors of the successful fundraiser, Mr Warren Hoare from Lion Apparel. It is a credit to the foundation that, whilst membership is not compulsory, a very high percentage of firefighters (80 per cent) are members of the foundation, and they should be commended for their important contribution to the community.

One of the better known, very impressive undertakings of the foundation is Camp Smokey, which is a four day camp, held annually, for children between the ages of seven and 16 years who are past and present patients of the paediatric unit of the Women's and Children's Hospital. I have previously informed members of this very successful camp, which commenced in 1990 with funds raised through Women's and Children's Hospital nursing staff holding raffles. Since 1999, when the first charity ball was held, the foundation has donated funds from this event to ensure that Camp Smokey continues to be held every year.

One of the noteworthy examples of funds donated to various organisations includes establishing a skin culture facility for South Australia and the Northern Territory. The foundation assists the community and families in need, and donations or gifts are presented on a regular basis for people who require that help. The foundation is also responsible for raising the profile and morale of firefighters in South Australia. It aims to continue to be actively involved with local communities, assist in the provision of fire prevention information to the community, and improve the internal network and welfare of professional firefighters and their families.

I congratulate the foundation for its efforts, in particular Mr Greg Crossman, the President of the foundation, and indeed all the members of the Australian Professional Firefighters Charity Foundation and wish them well in their community endeavours. I also make special mention of senior firefighter Mr Kevin 'Billy' Boyle for his commitment to the foundation. I was pleased late last year to present Mr Boyle with a South Australian Emergency Services Medal for his work with the foundation. I do not know whether members are aware that he was also featured in a publication called *Just Doing My Job* on the work of cops, fireys and ambos.

#### BICYCLE SAFETY

**The Hon. SANDRA KANCK:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Road Safety a question about bicycle safety.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. SANDRA KANCK:** Adelaide as a plains city is ideally suited to be a cycle city, and the threat of climate change and the spiralling cost of petrol means that South Australia must develop alternative transport modes. However, a spate of deaths involving cyclists in Adelaide shows that cycling is a risky business. I have recently learned, because cyclists have drawn it to my attention, of a very practical and inexpensive Danish policy that increases cyclists' safety and

therefore encourages more people to take up this very healthy and sustainable option.

Denmark has a policy of continuing cycle lanes through intersections. It is incredibly simple. These lanes are indicated by a solid blue line, which apparently is the most visible to cyclists and is a very simple and inexpensive measure that causes no disruption to motorists. A study conducted in Denmark on these cross-intersection lane extensions has concluded that they result in a 38 per cent reduction in bicycle crashes and a 71 per cent reduction in fatalities and injuries. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has work on cyclists' safety included investigations about introducing or trialing cross-intersection lane extensions?

2. If the department has not carried out such investigations, will the minister request that the department initiate an investigation of cross-intersection lane extensions?

**The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (Minister for Road Safety):** I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in cycling. I think that I have placed on record on more than one occasion the commitment of this government in relation to funding for cycling. Cycling has very many benefits, in particular recreational, and it also assists with improving our environment. As I said, since coming to government we have made a tremendous commitment and we are continuing to do so in terms of funding for cycling, not only on arterial roads but also on shared trail bike roads as well.

First of all, we do have a task force for pedestrian cycling that sits underneath the Road Safety Advisory Council. I will refer the honourable member's suggestion to the advisory council and that particular task force which sits underneath the council for some exploratory work to see whether it is something that we can adopt. I will endeavour to bring back a response for the honourable member. It may be something which we are already looking at and which has not yet been brought to my attention, but it certainly sounds as if it could be of interest to us.

#### NATIVE VEGETATION COUNCIL

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Environment and Conservation a question about the Native Vegetation Council. Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** On 6 December last year, I asked questions of the minister regarding a number of local government bodies which had been experiencing difficulties in their dealings with the Native Vegetation Council. The difficulties in resolving delays that I referred to often related to the process and timeliness of applications regarding the need to remove trees adjacent to roadways. Indeed, I highlighted a situation where one rural council had matters which it took to the Native Vegetation Council in September 2003 still unresolved. The minister gave me an undertaking that she would investigate this specific case if I provided more details and bring back a response. I provided the minister with the details of the council involved in that case, but six months later I have had no response. When will the minister provide an answer in relation to this specific case which has been unresolved since September 2003?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I have passed that information on to the department and, as yet, have not received any advice in

relation to it. I will raise the matter with it again and seek an expeditious response.

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** I have a supplementary question. Will the minister undertake to bring the answer back in a timely fashion?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I provide all the information to the council in a timely manner. All requests are dealt with in a timely way; it is just that some issues are more complex. Perhaps the issue is more complex than the member has indicated. Perhaps it is information that is difficult to find—I do not know—but my departments and I always react and respond in a timely way—always.

*The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

#### EYRE PENINSULA NATIONAL PARKS

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Environment and Conservation a question about park management on central Eyre Peninsula.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** This government is leading in the protection of our state's precious natural resources through the establishment of wilderness protection areas. The setting aside of these areas for conservation purposes under both the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992, however, is only the first step towards conserving our state's unique biodiversity for future generations. The effective management of our state's reserve system and wilderness areas is paramount to ensuring that we achieve the best environmental, social, economic and commercial benefits from our parks and reserves for all South Australians. Will the minister inform the chamber what progress is being made to ensure the effective management of our national parks and wilderness areas on Eyre Peninsula?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing interest in these very important policy areas. I am pleased to say that this government is committed to the effective management of our state's parks and wilderness areas and continues to demonstrate that commitment through the addition of land to our reserve system, increased protection for our parks and, importantly, the adoption of management plans for our parks and wilderness areas.

I am pleased to advise the chamber that I recently adopted the management plan for the mallee parks of central Eyre Peninsula, a plan which covers nine of the area's conservation parks and wilderness protection areas. A management plan is the most important source of clear management direction for a reserve. It is prepared to anticipate management directions over a 10-year period. As a strategic document, a management plan must identify the vision for the reserve and the objectives and strategies necessary to meet that vision. The management plan for the mallee parks of central Eyre Peninsula covers 155 204 hectares of the central Eyre Peninsula region. The adoption of the management plan follows the recent additions by this government to Barwell and Bascombe Well Conservation Parks and the proclamation on 22 March 2007 of two new parks: the Peachna and Shannon Conservation Parks.

Since coming to office in 2002, this government is proud to have adopted 65 plans of management for our parks and wilderness areas, wilderness areas for which the Labor government is responsible. As I mentioned the other day, under the Liberal government not one square centimetre of wilderness was protected—not one square centimetre. There are 26 plans that have been adopted for parks on Eyre Peninsula. The Department for Environment and Heritage target for the 2006-07 year was to have 180 reserves with management plans and I am thrilled and delighted to report that, thanks to the huge amount of very hard work of people within the agency, who go beyond the call and do the most extraordinary amount of work in relation to these plans—each and every one of them is to be congratulated for their considerable efforts and commitment—we now have (as at 1 June) 177 reserves with management plans. I understand that I will shortly receive three more management plans to cover 10 reserves. With those plans we will exceed our target, and I am delighted about that.

The mallee parks of central Eyre Peninsula conserve some of the largest remnants of intact mallee vegetation on Eyre Peninsula and contribute significantly to the objectives of the East Meets West initiative of the South Australian government's NatureLinks program. Significantly, two state and regionally threatened mallee vegetation communities are afforded greater protection through the adoption of this management plan. The diverse mallee vegetation community is protected within these reserves. They stretch over scenically diverse landscapes, such as the ancient ranges, including dunes and undulating plains. Importantly, they provide significant habitat to numerous species of national and state conservation significance (both plants and animals) including the metallic sun orchid and the malleefowl.

A most pleasing component of the management planning process for this plan was the involvement of the Lock Community Reference Group, which was formed to provide advice and comments to the Department for Environment and Heritage on the key issues facing the reserves covered by the plan. The importance of the group in contributing valuable knowledge to the planning processes cannot be overstated and its input is gratefully acknowledged.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** In a predominantly agricultural landscape, the management plan for the mallee parks of central Eyre Peninsula—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I cannot hear myself think because of the interjections.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** They are making too much noise.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The minister has the floor.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** In a predominantly agricultural landscape, the management plan for the mallee parks of the central Eyre Peninsula region provides for the protection and conservation of significant biodiversity and wilderness values of these reserves, while allowing minimal impact visitor use in the parks already developed for tourism and recreation to continue. The adoption of the management plan supports regional strategic directions for biodiversity conservation in the Eyre Peninsula region, encouraging the local community's involvement in regional conservation initiatives and programs, such as East Meets West, and integrated natural resource management programs.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** If members do not stop interjecting, I will just have to keep—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The minister has the floor.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Thank you, Mr President. Again, I congratulate the members of the department who have worked so diligently to achieve management plans for those parks.

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS:** Sir, I have a supplementary question. Can the minister tell us which are the closest towns and communities that surround that park, just so that we know where it is?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The minister will ignore that question.

## RADIATION PROTECTION AND CONTROL ACT

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Stephens will come to order, or he will not see the rest of the day in the council.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Environment and Conservation a question about the administration of the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** I understand, from the minister's directory distributed through Services SA, that the minister is responsible for administering the Radiation Protection and Control Act, which regulates the registration of premises where radioactive substances are stored. It was announced yesterday that the government will be constructing a new so-called green hospital, which will be named the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, to replace the ageing Royal Adelaide Hospital, and a government spokesperson was reported as saying that the hospital will be Australia's most advanced and greenest hospital facility. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will this green hospital house a facility for the containment of radioactive waste?
2. Will radioactive waste currently being stored at the Royal Adelaide Hospital be transported to the new green hospital for storage and, if so, how?
3. How many other locations in Adelaide are used and approved to store radioactive waste?
4. What procedures have been put in place to protect our radioactive waste from theft by people with sinister intentions?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** My advice is that most of our hospital facilities store low-grade radioactive materials. In fact, in 2003, the EPA undertook an audit of radioactive materials in South Australia, which revealed that radioactive waste was stored in about 80 locations throughout the state. I understand that it comes from radioactive isotopes and dyes used for various diagnostic and other treatment procedures. In response to the recommendations of the audit report, a feasibility study was undertaken with respect to the suitability of the Olympic Dam and Radium Hill regions as interim repository sites for the storage of the state's radioactive waste. The study found that sites exist at both Olympic Dam and Radium Hill that appear suitable to be used as a reposi-



tory for the storage of radioactive waste. However, at present, the Olympic Dam region has a number of advantages over Radium Hill.

The officers, in consultation with BHP Billiton and the government, have pursued the option of excising a part of the company's pastoral lease interests in the region to construct an interim store and repository, subject to confirmation that the location obviously was acceptable in relation to the requirements detailed in the report and that this would ensure adequate storage.

I cannot answer the specifics of the question, but certainly any facility built would be required to meet the Radiation Protection and Control Act in terms of the storage of any of its radioactive materials. I am absolutely confident that the Hon. John Hill will ensure that, if there is not a suitable repository location organised by then, any of his hospitals will have storage facilities that will meet current safety and health standards.

## BUDGET PAPERS

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Police):** I lay on the table the following papers:

Budget Overview 2007-08; Budget Paper 1  
Budget Speech 2007-08; Budget Paper 2  
Budget Statement 2007-08; Budget Paper 3  
Portfolio Statements 2007-08; Budget Paper 4, volumes 1, 2 and 3  
Capital Investment Statement 2007-08; Budget Paper 5  
Regional Statement 2007-08; Budget Paper 6.

## CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION BILL

The House of Assembly agreed to amendments Nos 1 and 2, 4 to 11 and 13 to 16 made by the Legislative Council without any amendment; disagreed to amendments Nos 12 and 17; and disagreed to amendment No. 3 and made the following alternative amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 5, page 5, after line 13—  
Delete 'Two' and substitute:

Three

Clause 5, page 5, after line 13—  
Insert:

(aa) an interim target to the SA target, that is to reduce by 31 December 2020 greenhouse gas emissions within the State to an amount that is equal to or less than 1990 levels;

Clause 5, page 5, after line 19—  
Insert:

(2a) The targets under subsection (2)—  
(a) are to be achieved in a manner that is consistent with the principles reflected in this Act; and  
(b) are set recognising that their achievement will be influenced by national and international developments that are outside the control of the State Government.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Police):** I move:

That the message be taken into consideration forthwith.

**The Hon. SANDRA KANCK:** I rise to indicate my opposition to dealing with this matter at the moment. As members know, today is budget day. There is no media

coverage of this council, which I think suits the opposition very nicely as we know that it is about to cave in on all of the amendments that we put in this place two months ago. This is such an important matter that we ought not to be dealing with this in what is effectively an undercover way when there is going to be no media focus on it whatsoever. I will be opposing consideration of this message at this time.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I, too, have some concerns about treating this matter with this degree of urgency. I will not pretend that I did not know that some aspects of this bill were coming back to us today, although I had a conversation with the minister. What I can say is that we were unaware until 2.15 that this was the number one priority for the day and that it would take precedence over other government business, and we did not know until about five minutes ago the nature of all of the upper house amendments that have been disagreed to by the lower house.

I do not believe that there is any great harm in delaying consideration of this bill either until the next sitting week or until we commence our discussions later this afternoon so that we have had a chance to revisit the amendments that we insisted on after very lengthy debate in this place on the last occasion. I am somewhat prepared to debate the main issue of interim targets this afternoon—and I think we will spend some little time talking about that this afternoon. However, the other amendments, whilst they might appear to be minor, are serious parts of the bill, and I would like more time to consider them.

In relation to the point made by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, I can accept, as the government has stated, that the media are welcome in their multitudes to come into the Legislative Council on budget day to record the important proceedings of this chamber. However, members who have been here longer than I have will know that, if you want to kill a story about an embarrassing position you have taken on an issue, the best day to do it is budget day, given that we do not sit Christmas Day or Good Friday.

You can guarantee that no-one will be paying any attention to any embarrassing backdowns, or any moves that go against international science and international thinking on how we should be dealing with the most important problem facing the planet (more important than terrorism, we have been told). Yet it is so urgent that we must do it at the one time of the year when we can guarantee that no-one in the outside world will be paying any attention to it. For those reasons, I believe we should deal with this either a little later this afternoon when we have had a chance to digest the material just put in front of us, or, preferably, on the next sitting day.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition):** I rise on behalf of the opposition to indicate that we are happy to deal with this matter at any stage, but I indicate that the opposition will insist on amendments Nos 12 and 17 but will not insist on amendment No. 3.

The council divided on the motion:

AYES (16)

Dawkins, J. S. L.	Evans, A. L.
Finnigan, B. V.	Gago, G. E.
Gazzola, J. M.	Hood, D. G. E.
Holloway, P. (teller)	Hunter, I.
Lawson, R. D.	Lensink, J. M. A.
Ridgway, D. W.	Schaefer, C. V.
Stephens, T. J.	Wade, S. G.

AYES (Cont.)

Wortley, R. Zollo, C.

NOES (3)

Kanck, S. M. (teller) Parnell, M.  
Xenophon, N.

PAIR

Bressington, A. M. Lucas, R. I.

Majority of 13 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

In committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Just before we proceed, I must say that I am extremely disappointed that anybody would consider holding up the business of the council because the press was otherwise engaged. Business must go on.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment No. 3 and agrees to the alternative amendments made by the House of Assembly.

*The Hon. B.V. Finnigan interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I would not go down that path if I were you, Mr Finnigan. I indicate that the opposition will also not be insisting on its amendment. However, we also will not be supporting the government's amendment for another interim target. I am not sure whether that presents a procedural challenge to the Clerk. I will not delay the debate for any great period of time other than to say that it has become apparent over the past few weeks that, if we are to establish any interim targets, there needs to be some sound economic modelling to make sure that that does not adversely impact upon businesses, South Australian families and the productivity of this state.

In particular, we also believe that an interim target of any nature should be linked to an emissions carbon trading system which, given that I am confident of the result of the next election, will be developed under the next Howard government. It seems logical to lock those things together. After we have had the economic modelling that I am led to believe will be available some time early next year, in 2008, we can then set some interim targets.

While we do not support having an interim target at present, once we have that actual economic modelling and economic data it will give us an opportunity to set targets which are achievable and which do not have an adverse impact on very important South Australian businesses and the South Australian economy. It is interesting to look at the lovely document tackling climate change released by the government just recently; it is not glossy, so I guess it probably is on recycled paper.

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** In vegetable ink.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** In vegetable ink, as my colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink interjects. It is interesting to note in this document that, in setting targets under the topic of 'Leadership—Government Action Plan to 2012' on page 52, there is no mention of the interim target that the government was inserting yesterday, which is that, by 31 December 2020, South Australia is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the state to an amount that is equal to or less than 1990 levels. We all know that is a con. In actual fact, that is an increase in greenhouse gas levels. From where we are today to 31 December 2020 will be an increase, because the 1990 levels were higher than they are today.

It is also interesting to cast our minds back to the original debate, where there was some disagreement and misunderstanding with the minister and her adviser as to exactly what

was the base rate we were dealing with: was it 29.3 megatons or 32.8? We were never actually given an accurate figure of what baseline we would be starting from. I think it is disappointing that still, to this day, an accurate figure has not been given to the opposition or the community of what is our starting point. We actually need to get that starting point first. We need the economic modelling and the economic data to be able to set those interim targets so that we get the best of both worlds, if you like. With those few words I indicate that we think it is in the best interests of this state and our economy to sit tight on insisting on interim targets at this point in time and to revisit the issue once we have the appropriate economic modelling and data.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I think that was probably one of the most ungracious backflips I have ever seen; nevertheless, we will take it. It is accepted. I will start with some general comments. Parliament has taken a keen interest in this bill, and a number of amendments have been made in both houses. The government considers that many of these amendments are unnecessary, particularly those that add to the already significant reporting obligation on the government. However, the government is committed to approaching this issue constructively and in a spirit of bipartisanship. In a genuine effort to secure its passage through the parliament, the government yesterday agreed to 14 of the 17 amendments made in this place and, therefore, I look forward to the opposition parties taking a similarly constructive position today.

The amendment before us relates to an interim target in connection with the SA target under subclause (1) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the state by at least 20 per cent by 31 December 2020 to an amount that is equal to or less than 80 per cent of 1990 levels. During the debate on this bill in the other place, the opposition put forward an amendment for an interim emissions reduction target of 20 per cent. The government agreed to look at the interim target between the houses. The proposed emissions target of a 20 per cent reduction to 1990 levels by 2020 has been considered by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. Their advice is that such a target cannot be achieved and that it would damage the state's economy.

The increase in economic activity in the state, including the forecast mining activity and the current lack of implementation of climate change policy initiatives at the national level (such as an emissions trading scheme), puts this target out of South Australia's reach. I am advised that adopting such a target is neither feasible nor responsible. The state government supports the interim target of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and will commit to ongoing policy development in efforts to reach this target as a stepping stone to the target of a 60 per cent reduction by 2050.

The target of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 was passed in the House of Assembly yesterday and would be the only legislated interim target in Australia that would match the target set in California. This is a stretched target and the toughest set by any jurisdiction in Australia. South Australia's progress towards the target and its achievability will be subjected to the highest standards of scrutiny and transparency, with this bill providing for three separate regular reporting procedures, as well as a review every four years. Clause 20 requires an annual report from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on policy and initiatives, which includes consultation with the Premier's Climate Change Council. Clause 13 obliges the council itself to report

independently against the government's progress annually. In addition, the minister is required to prepare a report every two years on the operation of the act. The government has agreed to have that report assessed by the CSIRO (or a like body). The government will not be releasing the modelling it has done to date. We are satisfied that our 2020 target is tough but achievable, and that there are more than enough reporting obligations in place in parliament for South Australians generally to decide for themselves how we are going against it as we progress.

On 28 March, the Hon. David Ridgway told this chamber that the opposition's interim target was 'probably the most significant amendment I will move tonight'—in his life, I would add—'and I hope it will be supported'. This target was part of the Liberal Party's policy prior to the last election. On 28 March 2007 the Hon. David Ridgway also said:

I think the key to this is an interim target that will focus the community's attention on achieving that interim target. The long-term aspirational goal of a reduction of 60 per cent (and some members spoke of 80 per cent and 90 per cent) by 2050 really means nothing unless we have a strong and bold interim target.

He is flip-flopping all over the place. On Thursday 12 April 2007, in one of his first interviews as Leader of the Opposition (Mr Martin Hamilton-Smith) said:

We supported deeper cuts in the bill that has been before parliament, but they are of course voluntary cuts. They are not binding on business. We will consider any proposal for mandatory cuts that will have an effect on business because that is a much more serious proposition, so we will stand by our decision but, if they become mandatory cuts, we will be reviewing it.

Now he and the opposition not only renege from that position but also introduce the spectre of mandatory provisions for business by proposing to bring forward the review provisions of clause 21. The opposition is looking to accelerate by 18 months the obligation for the government to consider additional legislative measures, including performance standards and other mandatory requirements.

The reality for the opposition is that it has been blatantly caught out trying to be too smart by half. Not only is the South Australian Liberal Party out of kilter with its own party and Prime Minister but it has also tried to force on South Australia a target that is completely irresponsible and unachievable. We have seen, as I said, one of the most ungracious back-flips that I have ever experienced in parliament.

I am advised that South Australia is on track to reach the Kyoto target adopted by South Australia's Strategic Plan. This is 108 per cent above the 1990 levels by 2012—an 8 per cent increase on the 1990 levels; therefore, it is clear that our emissions will increase before they reduce. I am also advised that South Australia's economic activity, including mining, is not projected to peak until about 2015. Driving our emissions down from this peak in 2015 to 80 per cent of 1990 levels in just five years carries a level of risk to the economy and jobs, which is simply unacceptable to the community. The government therefore supports the amendments made yesterday in the House of Assembly.

In relation to one of the comments by the Hon. David Ridgway during the committee stage of this bill (28 March 2007), I offered a briefing to the opposition and other parties. I said that officers would be only too happy, when they requested the details of the modelling for this particular interim target, to provide them to the opposition and the other parties. I said the following:

I understand that it is the usual practice of the government to provide briefings requested from the opposition or other parties, and I believe that we could provide such a briefing.

Later on I stated:

We remain very happy to provide an officers' briefing.

I just want it to go on record that the Hon. David Ridgway and his colleagues, to my knowledge, have not taken up the offer made at the end of March. There was ample opportunity if he was really genuine about wanting access to those details. If he was really genuine, he would have accessed the offer of a briefing.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Contributions during this debate will be on the amendments and the clauses only.

**The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:** I indicate that I believe the Legislative Council should stick with the 20 per cent level; that is, we ought to aim for a 20 per cent cut in greenhouse gases by 31 December 2020. The reason that I supported the delay in the debate was on the basis of the Hon. Mr Parnell's concerns that he wanted a bit more time. To suggest in any way that I am media-driven in relation to this debate would be quite wrong. I will defer to the greater expertise of my colleagues, the Hon. Sandra Kanck and the Hon. Mr Parnell, in relation to these issues. I may seek to contribute further, but I want to put on record that I believe we should stick to our guns on this, that it is an aspirational target.

I am disappointed with the Liberal Party. I can understand what happened and why, but the fact is that I think that, at one stage, the opposition understood (and perhaps still understands) that it is an aspirational target. It is not something that sets us in stone in terms of what has to happen. Because we have an aspirational target and given the gravity of this issue and the gravity of the concerns about global warming and the potential for environmental and economic catastrophe we should at least stick to where we are and aim for a 20 per cent reduction.

**The Hon. SANDRA KANCK:** I oppose the motion. I want the bill as amended by the Legislative Council in regard to the targets to remain as is. I want members to reflect on the information we have heard just in recent times. Since the bill passed this place there has been information that suggests that we could have a sea level rise of up to eight metres. What we have before us is a voluntary bill—it is not mandatory. We are saying, 'Oh, yeah, the sea level might rise by eight metres, but if people want to comply with this, yes, they can if they want to.' With his amendment, the Hon. David Ridgway at least gave some guidance as to what we should be attempting to attain, to say that by the year 2020 we should not be emitting more greenhouse gas but rather less. The Hon. David Ridgway said at the time that it was significant, and the Hon. Gail Gago has quoted him in that regard.

I agree that it was significant, and that makes the back-down of the opposition all the more significant. Unfortunately, I think the Hon. David Ridgway got it right but was rolled by his leader, who clearly has no understanding of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. I have a question of the Hon. Mr Ridgway in terms of the contribution he made a short time ago: if there is a need for baseline studies now, why were they not needed two months ago when he moved his amendments?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Two months ago we were looking at a different set of circumstances and it has become very clear to the opposition that we need the economic modelling done, and if we are to set targets at some point in

future we also need to know, if we are sticking firmly to targets and having a united national approach to achieving those targets, what our baseline position is.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I am prepared to debate amendment No. 3 that has come back from the House of Assembly. I am less prepared for the other two, but I will proceed on No. 3. Late last night I looked at the uncorrected *Hansard* proof of the debate on this clause in the lower house. Some of the contributions by the Premier surprised me. He said in relation to interim targets:

What happened, of course, is that if we had a target here of no emissions at all in South Australia, or only 1 per cent emissions, the Greens would say that that is not acceptable. There is no way anyone would satisfy the Greens.

In relation to interim targets, I find that a most remarkable statement, which the Premier must know is not true. I challenge him or any other member of this place to point me to the place where I have said, or to something I have done, that suggests that Greens policy is no emissions at all. We are a popular whipping boy, with people saying that the Greens would have us living back in the caves and eating grass seeds, and the Premier has milked that for all it is worth. I put on the record while discussing interim targets that it is not Greens policy to have no emissions of greenhouse gases and certainly not our position that they should be reduced by 99 per cent, leaving us with only 1 per cent. The Premier goes on to say:

They would rather have the state closed down, the electricity power stations turned off, no industries and no business, because they do not care about workers.

Again, I challenge the Premier and any member of this chamber to point me to where I have said in this place that we need to turn off electricity power stations in order to meet interim targets, or that our policy is to have no industries or business at all in this state. I take particular offence in the Premier's remarks about interim targets where he says that we do not care about workers. I can tell members that the Premier would have trouble looking some of those cleaners in the eye who he refused to protect from the federal government's WorkChoices legislation.

I challenge him to say where he was on the Radio Rentals' picket line. I was there, but the Premier was not there. I take offence, in the context of interim greenhouse gas targets, at the suggestion that the Greens do not care about workers. The Premier then went on to say:

And so what happened is that there was a Faustian pact between the Liberal Party and the Greens. The Liberal Party did not support what we were doing and the Greens resented what we were doing, so there was a Faustian pact designed to kill the bill. What did they come up with? Oh, the Liberals would support the Greens' amendment, even though it was totally irresponsible and unachievable—but it seems like the Prime Minister and Business SA have had a word.

In relation to interim targets, it is clear that any examination of the record would find that this council was presented with a range of potential interim targets. The Greens put forward a 30 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, the Hon. Sandra Kanck on behalf of the Democrats put forward a 25 per cent interim reduction by the year 2020, the Liberal Party put forward a 20 per cent reduction and the Labor Party effectively put forward no reduction at all and more likely an increase in emissions. The Premier is wrong to say, first, that the Liberals supported the Greens' amendment. In fact, it was the other way around.

It was a compromise that the Greens were prepared to enter into in the spirit of moving this legislation forward. I put forward 30 per cent, and not enough members supported

that. The Hon. Sandra Kanck put forward 25 per cent, and not enough members supported that. So, I supported a 20 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. To suggest also that there was some bargain is in some ways slightly less offensive, because I do enjoy my conversations with my friends in the Liberal Party as I enjoy my conversations with members of Family First and the No Pokies members (the Hon. Ann Bressington and the Hon. Nick Xenophon), as well as my colleague from the Democrats, the Hon. Sandra Kanck.

To suggest that there was some Faustian bargain, some deal that was struck in relation to interim targets, is completely wrong and irrelevant. Effectively, when the Premier talks about Faustian bargains over interim targets it does invite the question: who here is supping with the devil? I might leave that question in limbo. I do not expect the minister to answer that question. However, I do endorse what the Hon. Sandra Kanck said in relation to the Liberals' position. I am personally disappointed that they have not stuck to their guns on this.

I think they have offered the government a get-out-of-gaol-free card. It was looking very embarrassing on this question of interim targets because, at that stage, the Liberals were presenting a much stronger environmental stance than the Labor Party. I wanted to put on the record my concerns about some of the untruths the Premier was spreading last night in his contribution on this question of interim targets. I do have a number of questions of the minister, because it has been some little time since we discussed this matter. As the Premier pointed out last night:

The government agreed to look at an interim target between the houses. The proposed emissions target of a 20 per cent reduction of 1990 levels by 2020 has been considered by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. Their advice was that such a target being proposed—forcefully and dynamically by the Leader of the Opposition—cannot be achieved and would damage the state's economy.

My first questions of the minister are: can she tell us more about the two pieces of advice she received from those two government agencies, and can she explain to us why that advice has not formed part of other government pronouncements in relation to greenhouse gas reductions and whether or not she will table those pieces of advice in this parliament so that we, too, can see the information on which the government has decided that this 20 per cent target is unachievable and, as the Premier says, irresponsible?

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** I would like to put some perspective on this debate. For the record, I state that Family First are not climate change doubters. We believe that there is something legitimate happening with respect to climate change, and we believe that greenhouse gases are one of the primary reasons for that climate change. So, there is no need to question our commitment to this issue. In one year, South Australia produces approximately the greenhouse gases produced by the United States in less than a 24-hour period and by China in approximately one 24-hour period. What we are talking about here is an amount equal to a 20 per cent reduction; that is, 20 per cent less greenhouse gas production by South Australia. That would be equivalent to the greenhouse gases produced in China in a period of less than five hours and of even less than that (approximately four hours) in the United States. That is how much we are arguing about in this debate. It is not insignificant, and I do not want to trivialise it, but I want put it into some sort of perspective. Let us get an understanding of the real issue we are talking about, whether it be 20 per cent, 30 per cent or whatever it is.

The key for Family First is that we want this bill to pass because climate change is a real phenomenon. We are seeing our planet experiencing these changes. What do we need to do? We need to legislate in order to control this phenomenon and reduce the incidence of greenhouse gases reaching and destroying our planet over a period of time. With those words, I indicate that, whilst we can argue, and it is a worthy debate—again, I am certainly not trivialising the situation, and I respect the views that have been put forward—I think that, in the grand scheme of things, whilst we have been debating this bill between the two houses over the past three months, we have a situation where greenhouse gases have continued to increase during that time.

If we delay even further—for another three months—that six-month period in South Australia represents a significant input to the greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. So, let us bite the bullet and agree here that something must get through this chamber to make this law so that the monitoring process can begin. For that reason, whilst I accept the logic of the Liberal Party's position and think that it makes very good sense, Family First will support the government's amendment because we want to see some action, and we want to see it now.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** First, I want to address the position the opposition has now put before us; that is, to knock off from this bill any interim target at all, after it had proposed a 20 per cent target, which we know was completely irresponsible, and I have already talked about that. The government remains committed to an interim target.

The opposition is clearly flip-flopping all over the place; one minute it wants a 20 per cent target (which is proven to be irresponsible and unachievable), and members opposite are even going against their own Liberal federal colleagues' position. The Hon. David Ridgway stands up and states that the long-term, aspirational goal of a reduction of 60 per cent, etc., by 2050 'really means nothing unless we have a strong and bold interim target'. That is what the honourable member is on record as saying. If he does not watch out we will be calling him the Hon. David Whichway! That is in terms of proposing to withdraw an interim target, and it is completely the antithesis of what he stood up in this chamber and boldly proposed was, basically, essential to the success of addressing climate change in the longer term. Now he does not want to do anything at all.

We have provided information, and I have already gone through the rigorous and extremely high level of scrutiny that we will be providing in relation to this bill, one from an independent source and the other subject to independent assessment. The general public will be able to monitor this in an ongoing way and make its own judgments on how well the interim target is operating and on the rigour of our method. I also remind members that clause 14 requires that the minister use international best practice.

I addressed most of the Hon. Mark Parnell's comments and questions in my opening statements. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the advice I referred to was provided through cabinet and, therefore, the government will not be releasing the modelling that has been done to date—and I have already stated that quite clearly. The government is satisfied that its 2020 target is tough but achievable and that there are more than enough reporting obligations in place for parliament and South Australians to decide for themselves how it is going in terms of progress towards this target.

I have outlined the rigorous reporting that will be required. I also remind the Hon. Mark Parnell that a couple of months ago the government offered the opportunity for briefings to go through any of the details that it was able to make public. Not one of the members here availed themselves of that, so I believe this is another stalling tactic. I agree with the Hon. Dennis Hood: we need to move on; we need to make our decisions. We will be calling for a division, and I think it would be quite incredible to see the opposition lining up to oppose any interim target at all.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I take some exception to the minister's comment that we have not availed ourselves of opportunities to discuss this bill. Indeed we have, with representatives of the government, and I have attended workshops on the topic that were addressed by the minister's own advisers. So that is not the case. I am disappointed with reports from the agencies that allegedly support the government's position that the interim targets the Liberal Party called for, and the tougher targets that the Democrats and Greens called for, are unacceptable.

If the aim of the game is to get bipartisan or tripartisan (or quadrupartisan, if there is such a word) support, I do not think the best way to do it is to say, 'We have secret cabinet documents that tell us that your position is no good. We are not going to show those documents to you. You just have to trust us that we know what we are talking about and you don't.' I do not accept that as a basis on which to advance debate in this parliament, and I am disappointed.

I have a few other questions of the minister. The minister would be aware that the University of Adelaide has recently appointed a Chair of Climate Change, Professor Barry Brook, who says that the rate of climate change is accelerating (I think we all accept that) and that, with that, there is an accelerating risk of species extinction. He states categorically that without urgent action we are heading towards dangerous climate change. I am interested to know whether the minister, as the minister handling climate change in here but also in her capacity as Minister for Environment and Conservation, has considered the impact on species and the possibility of species extinction in South Australia that might flow from some of the different interim targets that we have been discussing here. It seems to me that that is an important piece of information that the government should avail itself of. So, my question to the minister is: is the effect of these different interim targets on species in South Australia something that the government has taken into account?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Yes, I am aware of the Adelaide University's new chair position. I understand it is a position that the government funds. In relation to the bill before us, it has been given considerable weight. It has looked at an all-of-government response, given that climate change affects across government. Due weight and consideration has been given to all aspects, and this is considered a responsible way to progress.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I am interested in some of the science that is behind the government's alternative interim target. In particular, I am interested in the basis for this target and the longer term 2050 target in connection with the acceptable rise in average global temperatures that the government deems to be acceptable and the rise that we are trying to limit under this bill.

So, my question to the minister is whether it is the government's intention, through this bill and through the interim target in particular, to keep carbon dioxide concentrations at the point where any global warming remains below

what is usually regarded as dangerous climate change. That point which is widely accepted by authorities—including the International Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations and the European Union, amongst others—is the figure of 2° Celsius this century. My question to the minister is: is it the basis of the government's policy, in general (but its interim target, in particular), to keep us below that 2° Celsius tipping point?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I have been advised that the 60 per cent by 2050 target is based on an intention to avoid the dangerous level of climate change, and the interim target that the government is supporting is a stepping stone to achieving that and is consistent with that ultimate goal.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Following on from the minister's answer, I ask whether she accepts the conclusion of the international panel on climate change in its fourth report that, if we are to avoid dangerous climate change and if we are to keep the global warming range to 2° Celsius, our emissions need to peak and start declining by the year 2015. That is directly relevant to the target that we are talking about, which is a 2020 target. Does the minister accept that international panel on climate change conclusion?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I have already put on the record that South Australia's economic activity, including mining, is not projected to peak until 2015, and that driving our emissions down from this peak in 2015 to 80 per cent of the 1990 levels in just five years carries a level of risk to the economy and jobs. I have talked about that and stated that the ultimate target is the 60 per cent by 2050 target. We are committed to that. I have been advised that that target is based on a premise that is about avoiding dangerous climate change. The interim target is a stepping stone to achieving that and is consistent with that.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I did understand what the minister said earlier; that is, in terms of the desired economic growth of South Australia some projects such as mining will mean that our emissions (if those projects go ahead) do not peak until after that period. I would ask the minister, in terms of this IPCC report, does she believe that there will be any additional hardship to the South Australian economy because we are achieving the peaking at a later period than the international panel on climate change says that we should, which means that we will be some years behind and therefore our ultimate target of reaching a 60 per cent reduction by the year 2050 would appear to be more difficult? Would the minister explain how she sees the reduction program in this state working if we do not agree with the international panel on climate change which recommended peaking in the year 2015?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I have already substantially answered this question. The hardship for South Australians will be if we do not legislate and do something about our commitment towards reaching our 60 per cent target by 2050. We are doing that by passing this legislation that is before us today, with a firm commitment to an interim target. We need to address that, rather than filibuster.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I would also like the minister to respond to the way the interim target (which we are discussing now) fits within our global responsibilities as a state player in relation to climate change. I ask the minister whether she believes that we have any particular and additional responsibilities on the global stage arising from the fact that we are a developed nation, that we are a wealthy nation, and that we are, in fact, one of the world's largest per capita emitters of greenhouse gases, and whether the minister

agrees with me that that means we have a greater responsibility than other nations and, in particular, we have a greater responsibility than poorer countries and developing nations to make those cuts. I ask the minister to respond as to where we stand in the global environment in relation to interim targets.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** In terms of our global responsibilities we need to lead by example. This legislation will ensure that South Australia is leading nationally. It will be the toughest target in the nation and in step with California, so it is in line with best practice. In terms of our global responsibilities, that does entail not trying to avoid moving on this issue or avoiding our legislative responsibilities. We have before us legislation that will put South Australia on the map in terms of climate change. We have a government which has a clear commitment to an interim target.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** In terms of some of the local expertise on climate change that we have in this state and, in particular, Professor Barry Brook, I note that his view was that there needs to be an 80 per cent reduction by the year 2050 in first world nations—in other words, in countries like Australia—rather than the 60 per cent reduction that we have agreed to. We are talking about interim targets but, if we accept what Professor Barry Brook has to say, I would ask the minister what advice she might have sought from, for example, international development agencies or NGOs, or organisations familiar with the different capabilities of poorer countries, of developing countries.

If she has had discussions with such organisations, how have those discussions influenced or otherwise the government's decision on this particular interim target? If the proper target for first world nations is 80 per cent, the interim target would therefore need to be much higher if we are to take into account the equity between nations when we are setting our interim target and dealing with our greenhouse gas emissions. I ask the minister to respond to that.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Again, I remind the honourable member that this legislation will lead the nation. It will be the toughest target and toughest legislation in the nation. It is important, in doing this, that we take people with us, that we bring the community with us, that we have industry being prepared to support us, otherwise we end up with an unrealistic and unachievable goal and target. I believe that this legislation has been responsible on both fronts. It has provided leadership and direction and vision as well as working with the community and taking the community and industry with us. We have to have them on board, otherwise it is just pie in the sky stuff.

What are the Greens suggesting? I will ask them a question: are they going to support the government's interim target or not? Are they going to abandon their green values and credentials, given that they have a first in the nation opportunity, a real leadership opportunity, to pass this legislation today? It is achievable, it is responsible and we will take the general public and industry with us. I ask the Hon. Mr Parnell: are the Greens going to support our interim target or not?

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** The minister posed an interesting question, and one that goes to the heart of parliamentary democracy. This matter has been brought on at very short notice. Most of us have had only a few hours—just before bedtime, perhaps—to read last night's *Hansard*. As I said, we have only just received the detail of the amendments and it seems that, the longer I talk, the more amendments are put before us to consider.

I have an old-fashioned notion of parliamentary democracy. I am asking the minister some questions that will determine my position in relation to this legislation. Call me naive but, when matters are brought on in a hurry, it limits the ability of a party such as the Greens, which prides itself on grassroots democracy, to go back to the party and consult widely and to talk to members of academia and other government and non-government organisations. So, I am keen to hear the minister's answers.

If the minister does not want to answer my questions, that is her business. However, my responsibility, as a representative not only of the Greens but of all citizens of South Australia in this parliament, is to take seriously this most important piece of legislation. This is probably the most important bill that we will ever deal with in this place. The Premier has said that climate change is a more important issue than terrorism. We spend a lot of time in this place debating things that are not important. This is important. So, to a certain extent, my position is in the hands of the minister, and I am looking to her, in the spirit of parliamentary democracy, to convince me that the government has done enough work and that it has a sound position that is worthy of support.

However, I do want to explore issues that the minister has raised during the debate. With respect to the question of interim targets, the minister mentioned that the peak in South Australia will be later than the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said it should be because of the mining boom, for example, when the construction phase—and, therefore, the energy use—of those big operations comes into play. I ask the minister to expand on that a little more and, in particular, I ask her a specific question about whether, in setting this interim target, the minister has taken into account the likely greenhouse gas implications of the expansion of the Roxby Downs uranium mine.

I understand that, until the environmental impact statement is released, we are somewhat constrained in our knowledge of exactly what will be the greenhouse implications of that project. However, research that my office has undertaken indicates that the expanded mine, for example, will use as much electricity as every household in Adelaide combined. That is a huge increase in electricity demand. Whilst that electricity comes from the general grid, and whilst that grid is primarily powered by the burning of fossil fuels, it is the burning of coal, it is also partly the burning of gas (we have a higher proportion of gas) and a small proportion of renewable energies. So, that is the electricity use from the Olympic Dam mine expansion.

However, we also need to think of the hole that is to be dug when that mine is transformed from an underground mine to an open-cut mine, because that is most important in relation to interim targets. My understanding is that this mine is likely to be about a kilometre deep, which can be very hard to imagine. However, one descriptive way of doing it is to consider the Sydney Centrepoint Tower and to put three of those towers on top of each other: that is how deep the hole will be. I understand that it is going to be some four kilometres across; perhaps the minister may be able to illuminate us further. However, my understanding is that it will take some four years to dig the hole to get to the ore body. Depending on when that four years starts, given the approval process that is in train, it brings us within this period to 2020—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the honourable member that his comments must be relevant to the amendment being considered.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Thank you, Mr Chairman; I appreciate your guidance. The connection with the interim target is that, if the digging of this hole occurs in this period up to 2020, it must, I would suggest, be a consideration to be taken into account when the government is trying to work out what an appropriate 2020 target should be. The digging of this hole, as I understand it, will involve a number of trucks (possibly hundreds) operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and greenhouse gases are emitted for the whole of the time those vehicles are operating. I will not elaborate much more about the mine because I want to focus on interim targets, which is what we are here for. As well as the electricity use, the digging of the hole and many other aspects of the expansion use energy, which generates greenhouse emissions being fuelled from the grid. Will the minister advise how she has taken that project into account in setting the interim target that is included in this bill?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Within constraints, the government has taken all foreseeable economic development into consideration. As I have already put on record, we have balanced those with a climate change target which will lead the nation and which will take the community with us, and industry is providing leadership, as well as something that is responsible and achievable. South Australia leads the nation in wind-generated energy and solar-generated energy, and we have an opportunity here today to lead the nation in terms of climate change. I invite the member to seize this opportunity and to move ahead and support the bill before us.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Unlike the minister, I am focusing on the amendment. I will be supporting the bill, but the final shape of that bill will depend on the decision we make today in relation to these three amendments. The minister should rest assured, as should you, Mr Chairman, that I am focusing very strongly on amendment No. 3 that is before us and the interim target.

When we last discussed interim targets in this place, there was a great deal of discussion about the 1990 figure. That figure is important for interim targets because that is the base against which we are going to judge our performance. The minister's response at that time was largely twofold. In a nutshell, she did not know what the 1990 figure was, but she pointed us to the clause in the bill that said, as I recall it, that one of the objectives of the Climate Change Council is to devise the methodology for arriving at the 1990 figure. We have had some weeks and the government has had some considerable time to ruminate on the question of what the 1990 figure is.

The suggestion made last time was that perhaps we should not be considering any interim targets, or even final targets, until we have a more clear understanding of what that 1990 figure is. So, my question to the minister is: what additional work has the government undertaken to progress us towards a final understanding of what that 1990 figure is for greenhouse gas emissions for South Australia?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I will refer the member to our Tackling Climate Change: South Australia's Greenhouse Strategy, 2007-2020. I refer him particularly to appendix 1, which provides the background and the modelling, and to page 3 of the strategy document, which provides the answer to his question in relation to the 1990 figures.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Do we still need in this bill a clause that refers to the creation of a methodology for

determining that figure if the figure is already known? My further question to the minister is: if we now know what that 1990 figure is, why does the government not come to us with an amendment so that we can put that into the bill as the definitive figure for 1990? Then we can focus our attention—as I know the minister and certainly the Greens are keen to do—on ways of meeting that target. We will know what the 1990 figure is and we will know what the interim target actually means. So, if we have done the work, minister, why can we not put that figure directly into the bill?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Appendix 1 shows that the South Australian government is currently adopting a methodology that is in line with international best practice. Methodologies, as we know, develop and change with time as information and science improve. The legislation requires that the minister adopt international best practice. So, we have all the necessary requirements in place to ensure the adequacy of the standards that we are using.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Just to be a little bit different, I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition a question, because he has stated to this committee that the opposition has somewhat changed its position. The leader of his party in another place has said publicly, 'We'll support the targets as long as they are not mandatory.' So, I am curious to hear from the Hon. David Ridgway, on behalf of the opposition, what has changed, because we still do not have mandatory targets—in particular, interim targets—in this bill.

Mr Hamilton-Smith is on the record as saying that there is no point in having targets unless they are tough. That is something that the Hon. David Ridgway as leader said in response to the Schneider report that was released recently. Of particular interest for the Greens in relation to trying to understand the Liberal Party's approach to this issue is some of the new information that the party says has influenced its decision. I understand, as the honourable member has referred to already, that the Prime Minister's carbon trading task force report is one such document, and I would ask him whether he could explain to the committee what particular revelation was in that report that has resulted in such a change of heart on the part of the opposition.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** We have talked about a number of reports and data for establishing an interim target, and we heard earlier about the information on which the government based its bill in relation to interim targets and the economic risk that flows to South Australia. We have not seen those documents, and so we have to take their word for it, as the Hon. Mark Parnell said earlier. We know there is some detailed work being done at a national level on some economic modelling that will gauge the impact of whatever target we might happen to set in the future.

It is not so much based on new information that is at hand now, but on information that we are on the cusp of, if you like, receiving in the next six or eight months that the opposition has said, 'Well, let's not set an interim target at this point; let's wait for that vital information.' We can then approach this all together, nationally as a commonwealth, rather than individual states (this state, in particular) grandstanding on a target that we know is actually an increase from where we are today.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I would like to reflect now on the information that the government has had available to it on the specific question of interim targets and on what some of the key thinkers in this state who have addressed the issue of interim targets have had to say about it. My starting point would be South Australia's own adopted Dr Tim Flannery.

As honourable members would know, he was the chair of the Premier's Round Table on Sustainability. One important document which goes directly to the question of interim targets is the report 'Three, Four, Five', which stands for: three challenges, four principles and five actions for a sustainable future. This report on implementing the State Strategic Plan was produced in 2004 for the government of South Australia, and it contains a section on energy and climate change. In its report, in respect of the question of greenhouse gas emissions and interim targets in particular, the round table (with Tim Flannery as its chair) stated the following:

The emerging carbon-constrained global economy will challenge us all yet create great opportunities for innovation.

So, it is not just a question of economic pain; there is also the question of opportunities. We might, hopefully, come back to that theme as this debate progresses. The report goes on:

There is increasing acceptance that humankind must halve global carbon emissions by 2050 to avoid catastrophic climate change costs this century.

In terms of the long-term targets in this bill that is a recommendation that we have matched. In fact, we have exceeded it. The report continues:

While the energy and emissions targets in the State Strategic Plan provide a good start, they are not enough if we aim to be world renowned for being clean, green and sustainable in that carbon constrained world. A strategic plan for the coming decade needs to look beyond the Kyoto emissions target. Given the deep cuts in greenhouse emissions needed by 2050, a leading state should aim for a 20 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2020.

This a body of which the Premier is proud. He has set it up and it has reported to the government. Its advice is that 'a leading state should aim for a 20 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020'. The report continues:

And to be world renowned we need to lead in achieving more economic output and a better quality of life, while using less energy and dramatically cutting emissions. That means leading Australia in business initiatives and community practices to reduce energy demand through widely applied low emission technologies, efficiency and behavioural change programs.

Those programs are a vital part of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, but they are not the matter before us. The question before us now is the question of interim targets. In the report of the Premier's round table on sustainability, under the heading 'Abatement', the report recommends:

Set a binding cap on state greenhouse emissions and specific targets for future reductions. The State Strategic Plan when updated should set targets for a 20 per cent emissions reduction by 2020.

In other words, our leading thinker at that time on the question of climate change through the Premier's own round table has said that we need to update our strategic plan to incorporate this 20 per cent reduction by the year 2020. That begs a number of questions, one of which is: if it is good enough to put it in the State Strategic Plan, is it not good enough to put it into this legislation? That is the matter directly before us—the question of interim targets by the year 2020. I would appreciate the minister's response to that because, if it is good enough for the strategic plan, it should be good enough for this bill.

The report continues that for the state to be a top quartile—that is, a lowest emissions performer—in terms of emissions per unit of state GDP compared to other developed economies we need to make the 20 per cent reduction by the year 2015. Directly on the question of interim targets, we have got the Premier's round table saying that we not only



need the figure to be 20 per cent (which was the position until recently championed by the Liberal Party in this place) but also bring forward that target to the year 2015. I ask the minister whether she can address the question of whether or not the recommendation will be taken into account in relation to both the bill and the State Strategic Plan—although, clearly, it is the bill before us now.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** The honourable member is filibustering. I have already explained our interim target and the rationale behind it. I have outlined the safeguards that have been put in place. I have outlined the fact that it is based on best practice. He is filibustering and attempting to delay the passage of this amendment and this bill.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I warn the Hon. Mr Parnell that it is not the bill we are discussing but, rather, the amendment.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. I believe I have gone to great lengths to confine my comments to the matter before us—which is the matter of interim targets. I take some exception to the minister referring to this particular debate as a filibuster. The issues that I am raising now are those that I would have raised had it been a live issue when we first debated the bill. At that time, we clearly had the support of the council for the 20 per cent figure by 2020, so there was no great need for me at that stage to put on the record and to point out not just the Premier's own round table on sustainability report, but a number of other authorities that this government has cited when putting its position to the people on climate change.

But we are now in a different environment. The question of the interim target is now very much a live question, and we are now having the debate that we would have had a number of months ago. I am more than happy to take directions when I stray from the topic before us. I am very determined to play by the rules of this place, and I am focusing on the matter before us—the interim target. One person who—

**The Hon. J. GAZZOLA:** I rise on a point of order. Given that comment, Mr Chairman, perhaps you could draw the honourable member's attention to standing order 186 which states:

The President may call attention to the conduct of a member who persists in continued irrelevance, prolixity or tedious repetition, and may direct such member to discontinue speaking and to be seated.

That is the rule. I am not calling you to rule on it, but we have been going around on this interim target stuff for quite some time now.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Hon. Mr Parnell.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Thank you, Mr Chair. I thank the honourable member opposite for not only drawing your attention to the standing orders but, as a new person in this place who is perhaps less familiar with the rules, in also drawing my attention to it. I will do my utmost not to backtrack or repeat myself. I thank the honourable member for his assistance in progressing the debate. One person whom the Premier has constantly quoted as a supporter of this government's approach on the question of climate change is David Suzuki, renowned international ecologist and commentator on greenhouse gas emissions. David Suzuki has published widely on this topic. He has visited South Australia, and when here he has spoken on the need for deep reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; in fact, one of his papers is entitled 'The case for deep reductions'. This is a publication of the David Suzuki Foundation. There is a small section in—

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I rise on a point of order dealing with relevance and repetition. The honourable member makes

exactly the same point using another example. It is repetitious. I have already put on record that I have answered these matters before. We are simply going around and around in circles. He is making the same point using another example; it is repetitious.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the honourable member that he will have to get to the relevance of his point about the amendment or cease that line of argument.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Whilst it may be that a number of these commentators—and they are not people whom I have necessarily dragged up; they are people whom the Premier has dragged up—come to a similar conclusion, they often reached the conclusion via a different route. I think that this is most important, because the matter before us goes to the heart of what this state is aiming to do over the next 13 years as we lead up to the year 2020.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I rise on a point of order. It is the same point; he makes the same point using another example. I have already answered those matters. It is repetitious.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the honourable member that this is not a second reading speech, and that it must be relevant to the amendment. If there is some point quoting people whom you have named, get to the point.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I will move to a different point that David Suzuki makes on the question of interim targets. He talks about the need to distinguish the atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions from the actual emissions themselves. The matter before us is emissions, but it is directly linked to the question of concentrations. As David Suzuki said, 'Global emissions are rising, but simply halting the rise by stabilising emissions will not be sufficient to stabilise concentrations.' The matter before us is the stabilisation of emissions, because that is what the government's amendment talks about—our going back to the level of emissions in this state that occurred in 1990.

The minister has not been able to explain to my satisfaction—and perhaps not to anyone else's satisfaction—what the level is. The minister has not addressed the question of the consequence of stabilising those emissions and what it means for concentrations. David Suzuki refers to the international panel on climate change and to a different aspect of their work, where he says:

They clearly show that stabilising of concentrations at any level requires emissions to be reduced eventually to a small fraction of the current level. Detailed trajectories of annual emissions over time, calculated to stabilise atmospheric concentrations at particular levels, suggest that to stabilise the atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration at 400 parts per million of carbon dioxide equivalent, global greenhouse gas emissions must be limited to no more than about 15 per cent above 1990 levels by 2020 and fall to at least 30 to 50 per cent below 1990 levels by 2050.

That was earlier work he had done, but the point it makes is that concentrations need to be dealt with as well as actual emissions. A point I want to move on to, because it is a vital point in the question of interim targets—

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** On a point of order, sir, I refer to relevance. The interim target before us addresses the issue of emissions and not emission concentrations, and it is not relevant.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the honourable member of standing order 367 and warn him under that standing order. He has been warned before, but this is a final warning. If he continues not to adhere to the amendment, I will sit him down and he will not be heard again.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I would not presume to dissent from your ruling, sir, but I trust that the minister will listen

carefully to what I am saying because it goes directly to the point. The point the Premier and minister herself has made is that the main reason for not accepting the Legislative Council's interim target of a 20 per cent reduction by 2020 and instead to insert a weaker target is the effect that it will have on the South Australian economy. It is that aspect that I would like to address now. Other members and the minister will be familiar with the work of Nicholas Stern, the world's leading economist on climate change. He has challenged Australia, including South Australia, to slash its greenhouse gas emissions by up to 30 per cent by 2020 and 90 per cent by 2050. But the reason is economic.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** On a point of order, sir, I refer to relevance. The honourable member attempts to make similar points that I have already answered to the best of my ability and he is simply repeating himself or making irrelevant points.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the honourable member, as I have done previously, that it is not a second reading speech. The debate has gone through the council and there was an opportunity then for the honourable member to quote expert advice and papers. I do not think that this is the place to do that unless it is totally an argument that relates to the amendment before us. That is my final warning.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. As always, I take your guidance very seriously. However, I am disappointed that the minister is not even allowing me to finish sentences or the points I am making before deciding that they are irrelevant or repetitive. As I was trying to say before the point of order was raised, it is the economic implications of the interim target (which is the question before us) that have been stated by the minister, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition in another place and by the—

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I have already answered these questions. I have already gone to great length to explain the methodology and rationale behind this position. I have already explained the various matters the government has addressed in terms of providing a balance in relation to the setting of this target. I have already answered these questions. They are repetitious.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I agree with the minister. The honourable member seems to be going around in circles and adding things to the debate that do not relate to the amendment. I ask the honourable member to get on with speaking either to or against the amendment, or to ask the minister a question that she has not already answered. I intend to put the motion if the honourable member continues going around in circles.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I am going to great lengths not to go around in circles. The point I want to move to—which the minister seems reluctant to allow me to—is the economic cost of the interim target. The document that has been referred to before was the Prime Minister's recent report. That is the new information that was not available to us when we debated this matter last time. It is information that has come to us since debate concluded here. It is information that has been referred to by the Hon. David Ridgway and by his leader in another place, that is, the Prime Minister's report on emissions trading.

I do not intend at all to go into the area of emissions trading, because the matter before us is one of interim targets. However, it is the effect this report has had on the opposition in relation to interim targets that, I think, deserves exploring. The one point I would make, in particular to the Hon. David Ridgway, is that the Prime Minister's report had at its basis

a terms of reference that included some very significant limitations which I believe should encourage the honourable member to change his mind on this point, because that is the purpose of parliamentary debate.

The terms of reference of that report basically said that the competitive advantage that Australia holds over other nations is that we possess large reserves of fossil fuels, the burning of which is the main cause of anthropocentric greenhouse gas emissions, and we have uranium as well. That body was asked:

In assessing Australia's further contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions these advantages must be preserved.

At the heart of the report that seems to have so frightened the Liberal Party to abandon its position on the interim target is a term of reference which says that not everything is on the table because we need to maintain our competitive advantage. I do not know whether the Hon. David Ridgway has dug much deeper than the report he has cited on the question of interim targets. Had he delved a little deeper he would have found, for example, the submissions that had been made to that report by, I think from memory, more than 200 individuals and government organisations. One of those reports, in particular—

**The Hon. J. GAZZOLA:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, does the honourable member have a question for the Leader of the Opposition or the minister rather than just walking us through a report?

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** With your forbearance, I will ask the question of the Leader of the Opposition on this issue, because it goes directly to the report he cites as the main reason that, in between the houses, his party has changed its position on interim targets. I urge the honourable member opposite to allow me to ask the question of the Hon. David Ridgway. The question is whether, in examining the report and its constituent elements, he came across the submission made by the group, Make Poverty History. For the benefit of honourable members, that group is a coalition of more than 70 non-government development agencies, faith groups and community-based organisations. They have addressed this question of interim targets, which is what we are talking about.

I certainly do not intend to read out the 64 members of that organisation, but I draw the honourable member's attention to some of the faith organisations, in particular, and I urge our colleagues in Family First to take this on board as well. The group comprises the Anglicans, the Catholic Mission, the Australian Lutheran World Service, Baptist World Aid—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** This is not relevant, Mr Chairman, and I raise a point of order.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I agree. I do not think that it is relevant. I ask the honourable member to get to his question.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** The question for the honourable member is this. The position those groups have adopted is that they suggest that we need to adopt a national framework for reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 60 per cent by 2050 (that is the long-term target), with an implementation timetable that will provide no less than a 20 per cent reduction by the year 2020. My question is whether he has had discussions with any of these groups, whether he has read this report and whether my having drawn it to his attention now might convince him that the target this chamber originally endorsed (the 20 per cent target) is one that is worth support—

ing. Make Poverty History is about making poverty history, and it focuses on the social justice implications, which is an issue we have not yet dealt with in this debate, but it is an important one about the effect of interim targets on social justice. That is my question of the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I have not looked at the submission to the report made by that group, but it comes back to the point I made earlier in relation to not insisting on our amendment regarding a 20 per cent reduction by 2020. I do not want to be accused by the government of repetition in my answer, but early next year we will have the economic modelling available. I think that most of the points the honourable member raises are very important. Without wishing to pick a fight with the government and with your ruling, Mr Chairman, I think that he has been sticking to the point of the interim targets. However, it comes back to the economic modelling.

I do not think that, in the long term, the opposition will shy away from interim targets, but it is a fact that we do not have the details and the data with us today; we will have that early next year. It seems sensible to make those decisions in the framework that this group has talked about—a national framework for a long-term target, as well as a short or medium-term target. It will be a national solution. We know that South Australia's economy is not the biggest one in the nation, and we need to approach this issue on a national basis and do what is right for the future of Australia. However, I have not read that particular submission.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I would like to make a brief comment on the economic impact of the target. I draw the honourable member's attention to comments made by Peter Vaughan of Business SA on creating poverty, and he has been quite clear about this. At the time the amendments were approved in the upper house, he said that they would cost jobs and lead to business closure.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Is this relevant to the amendment? I do not think that this is relevant to the amendment.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** It was to his question about the impact—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am going to clamp down on everybody and ask them to make their comments relevant to the amendment.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I was looking forward to the minister's answer, because it goes to one of the most important aspects of the question of interim targets and whether we should accept the government's proposition—that is, its economic impact. For the minister's benefit, I note that the Insurance Council of Australia (which is no stranger to risk—the business of the insurance industry is to manage risk) has weighed into this—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! What the insurance industry is doing in managing risk is not relevant to the amendment. If members will not stick to the debate on the amendment I will close down the debate and put the amendment.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. The Insurance Council has weighed into the debate on the amendment in its contribution to the Prime Minister's task force. This is new information that was not available when we debated this last time.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I rise on a point of order: repetition. The honourable member has already addressed the Prime Minister's report.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That's right.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** With respect, Mr Chairman, I have not addressed the Insurance Council's analysis of the

impact of interim targets on the gross domestic product of Australia.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. My point of order is relevance and repetition. The honourable member is making the same points by drawing on different examples. It is clear that he will draw on every single comment that has ever been made by anyone about this issue. The honourable member is not raising any new points. It is repetitious and I ask you to rule on that point of order.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Could I comment on that point of order, Mr Chairman?

**The CHAIRMAN:** No, I have not yet ruled on it. I agree that this debate is going around in circles; it is more like a second reading speech or a debate of the whole bill in committee. These things should have been put up and presented in the Hon. Mr Parnell's original arguments. It seems that the honourable member has not done that and intends to do it here. I will not allow that. The honourable member has been warned a number of times. I rule that the honourable member shall not be heard again during the discussion of this question before the chair.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I cannot speak to your ruling, Mr Chairman?

**The CHAIRMAN:** No.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** So I have been gagged.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Am I able to call for a division on that question?

*The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I will not say sorry. The point I was making is that this is new information, it was not available for the second reading explanation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Standing order 367 states:

The member named shall not be heard again during the discussion of the question before the chair.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I move:

That the Chairman's ruling be dissented from.

**The PRESIDENT:** I have the honourable member's motion in writing. I have to report that the Hon. Mr Parnell has objected to the ruling of the Chairman under standing order 367. As President, I uphold the decision of the Chairman.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Mr President, I understand that further discussion of this bill may be deferred to another day, in which case I withdraw my dissent.

In committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The motion is in two parts. I will put the first question: that the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be insisted upon.

The committee divided on the question:

AYES (2)

Parnell, M. (teller) Xenophon, N.

NOES (15)

Dawkins, J. S. L.	Evans, A. L.
Gago, G. E. (teller)	Gazzola, J. M.
Holloway, P.	Hood, D.
Hunter, I.	Lawson, R. D.
Lensink, J. M. A.	Lucas, R. I.
Ridgway, D. W.	Stephens, T. J.
Wade, S. G.	Wortley, R.
Zollo, C.	

PAIR(S)

Kanck, S. M. Schaefer, C. V.

## PAIR(S) (cont.)

Bressington, A. Finnigan, B. V.

Majority of 13 for the noes.

Question thus negatived.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The next question is: that the House of Assembly's alternative amendments be agreed to.

The committee divided on the question:

## AYES (7)

Evans, A. L.	Gago, G. E. (teller)
Gazzola, J. M.	Hood, D.
Holloway, P.	Wortley, R.
Zollo, C.	

## NOES (10)

Dawkins, J. S. L.	Lawson, R. D.
Lensink, J. M. A.	Lucas, R. I.
Parnell, M.	Ridgway, D. W. (teller)
Schaefer, C. V.	Stephens, T. J.
Wade, S. G.	Xenophon, N.

## PAIR(S)

Hunter, I.	Kanck, S. M.
Finnigan, B. V.	Bressington, A.

Majority of 3 for the noes.

Question thus negatived.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I move:

Page 1, after line 10—Delete paragraph (ia)

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** This amendment is consequential.

Amendment carried.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (REAL ESTATE  
INDUSTRY REFORM) BILL**

The House of Assembly agreed to amendments Nos 2 to 8 and 10 to 15 made by the Legislative Council without any amendment and disagreed to amendments Nos 1 and 9. The House of Assembly returns the bill herewith and desires its reconsideration.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 5.38 p.m. the council adjourned until Tuesday 19 June at 2.15 p.m.