

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 24 October 1996

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That the thirtieth report of the committee on the Southern Expressway, stage 1, be noted.

In December 1995, the Public Works Committee reported to Parliament regarding the Southern Expressway project. In that report, the committee gave its support in principle to the first stage of the project and recommended the commencement of works to remove unstable soils from the O'Halloran Hill section of the road corridor. Since that time, these works have been completed, and the next part of the project, stage 1, is ready to commence. However, until now, the committee was unable to approve works on stage 1 beyond the removal of these reactive clays, as there were outstanding Aboriginal heritage issues that had to be resolved. Those issues relating to the identification of the Sturt Triangle as a possible site containing Aboriginal artefacts had to be addressed.

Following extensive negotiations, the committee can now report that authorisation has been received from the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs which allows the Department of Transport to disturb the site and commence developing this section of the road corridor. The excavation of the site will be monitored by representatives of the Kurna Aboriginal group to ensure that any artefact discovered can be dealt with in an appropriate manner. Furthermore, it is the Department of Transport's intention to involve the Aboriginal community in the project via participation in landscaping and other projects related to landscaping, and the provision of Aboriginal arts and signs.

The committee considers that all outstanding issues for this project have been dealt with and, as stated in its previous report to Parliament, believes that the Southern Expressway will enhance the transport needs of the southern region. Consequently, the Public Works Committee fully supports this proposal and, pursuant to section 12c of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** I would briefly like to address the thirtieth report of the Public Works Committee. I commend all committee members for the attention they have given to the Southern Expressway project—a roadworks project of significant value to the outer southern suburbs and a commitment given to the southern community by this Government. However, I want to correct one fact because it is causing some confusion, that is, the title of the report, 'The Southern Expressway, Stage 1'. Stage 1 of the project was implemented some four or five years ago, with funds allocated by the then Federal Government. In 1992, South Road was identified as the national arterial road, with the Department of Transport committing resources to commence the first stage of the then third arterial road. Perhaps with the name change came the understanding that this stage would be known as stage 1. However, through DRT and RTA documents, it is now

known as phase 2 of the project and has been advertised that way throughout the community.

Also people may be aware that part of the project of stage 1 was the widening of Marion and Sturt Roads and the South Road proper, and general roadworks in the Marion triangle area. Unfortunately, at this stage, even though the initial intention was good, it was not until 1993 that a firm decision was made to ensure that the roadway would proceed to the outer south to ensure that all members of the southern community would reap the benefits of the road which, following the 1993 election, became a priority of our Government which, as I said earlier, put on the agenda a firm proposal to bring the road to the south.

We also implemented changing the alignment in the Darlington area to avoid existing houses being demolished, and we conducted extensive consultation in the same area. We looked at the designing and development of landscape buffers and linear parks, and we addressed the issues of employment and transport in the southern area. The scope of our policy was broad, and in looking at our transport networks we also took into consideration together with the Southern Expressway the Marion Interchange; Panalatinga Road; Commercial Road, Seaford; and the traffic signals at Old Noarlunga.

In March 1995, the third arterial project (phase 2) and the Morphett Vale bypass were repackaged and then launched as the Southern Expressway. The repackaged version of the Southern Expressway included a number of new initiatives to ensure that all interested people would be kept informed on the progress of the road. Initiatives used included: the information signs along the road, a video showing a computer simulation of the new road, a localised radio signal known as Roadside 88 FM, the 1800 information line and, of course, the *Expressway* newspaper. It is important to note that the last three items that I have mentioned have been used as an integral part of community consultation, consultation which I believe is the most extensive that has ever been undertaken in South Australia in respect of any single road project.

At this point, I would like to highlight to the House the extensive consultation that has taken place, and I also want to put on record my appreciation of the work undertaken by Mr David Gray of Maunsell Pty Ltd who, since May 1995, has worked as Project Manager responsible for community consultation. His consultation included: introductory visits to Willunga, Noarlunga, Happy Valley, Marion, Brighton, Glenelg and Mitcham councils; meeting with the Bedford Park Residents' Association; continuing discussions on Aboriginal heritage matters between Department of Transport personnel and representatives of the Kurna community; continual discussions with all southern members of Parliament, and again the free call line and the information bulletin were part of his portfolio area as well. He also undertook a two day value management workshop involving various community stakeholders, and that included: the Southern Region of Councils, Marion council, Bike South, the transport industry, the RAA, the SA Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and a number of Government departments.

Again, another half day workshop on bicycle and pedestrian issues was organised. Attendees included the Noarlunga and Marion councils, Bike South, The State Bicycle Committee, the Bicycle Institute, the Federation of SA Walking Clubs, and the Adelaide Mountain Bike Club. Detailed discussions on the environmental assessment and concept development included extensive consultation with: local

government and various Government departments and resident groups in Bedford Park, Trott Park, Sheidow Park and O'Halloran Hill; various greening groups such as Trees for Life, Greening Australia and Trees for Transit; the Kaurna Aboriginal Group; again, bicycle and pedestrian groups; and sporting and recreation groups along the corridor also had the opportunity to have input.

I participated in several community meetings and workshops within my electorate. I appreciated, as the local member and more so as a southern resident, the opportunity to discuss issues relating to regional access, bicycle and pedestrian paths and the integration of the open space associated with the Expressway with the wider open space areas and, something which was of most concern, we were able to discuss freely our concerns relating to noise, visual amenity, air and water quality.

I will admit that the first few meetings in my electorate were a little hostile. People did not really believe that they had the right to have a say—it had not happened in the past, so why would it happen now, what was so different? It was not long before the community could see that they were an important part of the development of the new road. They had an integral role in ensuring that the new road had little impact on their quality of life and that design work and landscaping was suitable to their area. The residents of Trott Park and O'Halloran Hill have contributed significantly to the development of the road project in their area. Both the member for Mitchell and myself have spent time walking along the roadway with residents looking at the proposed alignment, assessing the visual and noise impact and ascertaining the most suitable positioning of this section of roadway. Along with David Gray, I have doorknocked and letterboxed the area to make sure that the residents were well aware of the community meetings and ensuring that they had every opportunity to participate.

The next phase of the Expressway is still some time away but I am already experiencing a great interest in what I would call phase 3 of the project. As most members of this House are aware, businesses are showing a greater interest in the Lonsdale area with some people moving into the area and others considering a move. If I hear of a move into my area, I make a point of visiting the potential investor, first, to ensure that they know they are welcome and, secondly, I always ask why they have selected my electorate. I can guarantee that comments such as, 'Well, the new road, along with the other great attributes', is normally the answer. I have also conducted extensive research within my own business community into the economic impact of the expressway. To date, 43 per cent of businesses have seen a benefit for their own local business. Others are still looking at it and are quite excited about the prospect of this new road. The residents in this same area are also keen to know more, and I am looking forward to the further consultation that will take place in the community as we progress to this stage of the road. I commend the report to the House and I await with interest the progress of our new road.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It is with pleasure that I support the thirtieth report of the Public Works Committee on the Southern Expressway with respect to stage 1. It is great to see the tender now out for stage 1 to Panalatinga Road. It will be an immediate job creator for our region and, of course, once it is completed we all know what will happen with future job opportunities in the area. In fact, as the member for Reynell just said, jobs are already occurring in

the Lonsdale area. That is very important to my electorate because, whilst the member for Custance and others may not realise it, people obtain jobs at Lonsdale and areas such as that, even though they may live in my electorate. I guess the same situation occurs around Port Pirie in the electorate of the member for Custance.

As the member for Reynell pointed out, job expansion is already occurring at Lonsdale, and I hope to see that situation flow over into the Hackham industrial precinct of my electorate. It is great to see that MacMahon Construction was the successful tenderer. It was interesting to hear on radio this morning that a member of the Civil Contractors Federation tried to indicate that MacMahon Construction was not a South Australian company. I am very surprised about that because MacMahon Construction is definitely a South Australian company.

MacMahon Construction has capitalised on the opportunity of having its parent company located in South Australia. The company has expanded its operations into the Eastern States as well as into overseas ventures. Of course, prior to MacMahon Construction winning the tender, Lorenzin Construction had a \$1 million contract to complete some road works before the winter. Lorenzin Construction is also a South Australian company, with its headquarters at Darlington. To claim that the construction companies for the Southern Expressway are not South Australian is somewhat of a furphy.

With respect to the environment, I am pleased to see the way this road is taking shape, and I congratulate the Minister and the department on their broad vision and discipline in making sure that, from day one, the environment is a major factor with respect to this road development. Most South Australians should take the opportunity to see what can be done to enhance an environment via a green corridor and a wildlife corridor. The whole amenity of a road can be enhanced, believe it or not, by establishing walking and bike trails behind the areas of vegetation, and that is certainly the way that this road will be constructed.

I reinforce the fact that public transport will have a major focus on this road and, whilst it is a reversible road at the moment, in time, as the population and other demands increase, its lane capability will be increased. I cannot see any reason why, in the mid to long-term future, a form of O-Bahn cannot be developed along the Southern Expressway. It will be great for my constituents of Mawson because, by December 1997, as a result of this report and the Government's initiatives, stage 1 will be completed and will connect with the recently completed Panalatinga Road—a \$28 million project. The constituents of Mawson will then have a fantastic opportunity for good and quick access to Adelaide. It is all about promises being kept. At election after election the previous Labor Government announced that it would do something about an arterial road network to the south, but of course nothing ever happened. I am pleased to say that we have kept that promise, which will be beneficial to the Fleurieu Peninsula.

It is also interesting to note that with respect to the Southern Expressway and other capital works projects for roadworks in South Australia, and including some of the other capital works for civil construction, somewhere between \$125 million and \$183 million worth of capital works for civil construction will be let out in a six month period. That is an enormous amount of money. Under previous Governments, if a contract was let out for \$10 million it was considered to be a big contract. This

amount of capital works has not been tendered out in South Australia for at least five years, and it could well be a record for South Australia that \$183 million worth of capital works projects are currently being tendered out. Things are happening, and it is time that we spoke up strongly about the fact that those things are happening. I congratulate my colleague the member for Morphett for bringing down this report, and I very much look forward to the major construction works proceeding at full speed over the next 12 months.

Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BURRA TO MORGAN ROAD**

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That the thirty-first report of the committee on the Burra to Morgan Road upgrade, stage 2, be noted.

In 1995 the Public Works Committee reported to Parliament that it approved the commencement of stage 1 of the Burra to Morgan Road upgrade. As such, Parliamentary Paper No.188 entitled 'Burra to Morgan Road Upgrade' provides a comprehensive analysis of the evidence presented to the committee and the associated committee findings. However, at the time of the initial inquiry, there were some outstanding environmental issues that had to be resolved prior to commencement of stage 2 of the works. Following a comprehensive heritage survey, five scatters of worked stone sites have been located, four of which are directly affected by the road alignment. Unfortunately, all these sites have been damaged by clearing, ploughing and wind erosion to such an extent that any salvage measures would be ineffective.

The Department of Transport has obtained permission from the State Heritage Committee and approval from the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (in accordance with section 23 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act) to destroy any of the sites affected by the roadworks. In addition, the pygmy blue-tongue lizard, which was previously thought to be extinct, has been discovered in the Burra Hills area. This is the only species of lizard on the National Endangered Species list. A study undertaken by Mr Tim Milne from the Flinders University in South Australia identified pygmy blue-tongue lizards in several areas along the road corridor. It is therefore recommended that immediately prior to construction all lizards be removed and be relocated in artificial burrows. It is important that this relocation work is completed in spring, summer or early autumn to ensure that all lizards are found and successfully translocated.

In addition to the relocation program, it is recommended that heavy machinery associated with the alteration of the road should operate from the current road reserve and not from the south of the road in the native grasslands. It is of interest that the Government has reacted to the pygmy blue-tongue lizard in such a way. I was in Canberra recently and gave a speech on the work of the Public Works Committee. Considerable interest was created amongst Public Works Committees around Australia that a major roadwork was modified to ensure that an almost extinct species was saved.

Furthermore, on the outskirts of Burra is an area known locally as Snake Gully, which has been identified by the State Heritage Branch as a significant part of the Burra heritage area. At the eastern end of Snake Gully are two houses that have been identified as a heritage landmark in the area. It is the wish of the State Heritage Branch, the Department of Transport and the District Council of Burra Burra to retain

the road alignment between these two houses, as it will provide a heritage entrance to the district.

The committee believes that the Burra to Morgan road in its present unsealed state is hindering the economic development of the Mid North of South Australia and diverting heavy traffic to tourist routes not designed for such traffic, thus creating the obvious potential hazard. The committee believes that both tourist and freight traffic are travelling by longer alternative routes to avoid the Burra to Morgan stretch of road, thus reducing the economic benefits that could accrue to the area. Furthermore, the unsealed surface is a traffic hazard, with wet weather often causing difficulties or, in severe cases, the road actually having to be closed. This situation also occurs during summer, when roads become corrugated and potholed. Such road closures reduce the reliability of the route and further deter traffic from the area.

The committee is satisfied that all outstanding environmental issues have been adequately addressed and considers that the commencement of stage 2 will not cause any adverse effects on flora, fauna or heritage in the area. In particular, I commend the department once again on its handling of the pygmy blue-tongue lizard issue. Pursuant to section 12(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to the Parliament that it recommends that the proposed works proceed.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I have read the report of the Public Works Committee and congratulate the committee on its thirty-first report. This subject can never be brought up in this Parliament without my having something to say. I know that some members are getting a little sick of this, but the record speaks for itself. Some members have even accused me of being a single issue politician, but never could that be said. I am pleased that we are making great progress. The portion of the road running between Morgan and Burra is approximately 80 kilometres long and has three main functions: it is a national freight and tourism corridor; it is a link to regional areas, connecting the Mid North and the Riverland, which is represented by my colleague the member for Chaffey; and it is also a local access road for properties in the area.

The benefits of the road upgrade will be immense, particularly for local people. First, it will improve transport efficiency and decrease road user costs for those currently utilising the road via an increased level of service and improved safety for traffic, particularly that going the long way around through Eudunda. It will assist economic development by an increase in the volume of traffic utilising the route, and I note that that is happening already. Traffic volume on this portion of road is relatively low, with an average of approximately 150 vehicles per day, including a commercial component of 45 vehicles a day. It is envisaged that a sealed surface on this road will make it more attractive to tourists and freight carriers, resulting in an increase in traffic volume. As I said, it is already happening.

I do not think the locals realise how much more the road will be used. I have heard critics ask why we should bituminise the road when it is not used very much. It is obvious why it is not well used: it is a long, isolated and extremely rough road, and its record has been very bad. Direct public benefits will derive from reduced transit times for traffic currently opting to take the longer route, particularly the route via Eudunda and Clare; reduced vehicle operating costs; less wear and tear on vehicles; and reduced accident costs, because the road will be a straighter and more direct route.

I have seen some horrific accidents on that road. I am pleased that this upgrade will quell a lot of the angst, upset and injury and save many lives. Indeed, the potential for increasing State and regional economic development via this inter-regional tourism movement is very important and cannot be underestimated.

I read with interest the comments in the report in relation to the environmental impact of these road works. I am very pleased that the matter has been addressed. I listened with great interest to the reports and comments about the pygmy blue-tongue lizard. Quite often, these animals have been run over on the road. I am pleased that the committee has addressed all the environmental problems. Likewise, I was pleased to read about the heritage concerns, particularly in the Snake Gully area, and to note that the road will run between those two heritage buildings, which will be an engineering feat. This will provide a true heritage entrance into Burra, one of South Australia's most historic towns.

The funds for this project, both capital and recurrent, are to be provided from the State's source receipts collected through the Highways Fund. I am pleased to note that, because for so many years Governments in this State, particularly the previous Government, milked the motorist at the bowser, and the money was lost to general revenue. This project, with an estimated total capital cost of \$17.62 million, is one of the largest single road projects the State has seen for many years. I give credit to the previous Government. Every time I drive on the dual highway between Adelaide and Port Wakefield, I think of the Bannon Government. Notwithstanding all the things it did not do, I give it credit for that, because it is a marvellous road. At least we can say that something was done in all those years that South Australia had a Labor Administration. I give the Labor Party credit: you have to be fair about it. It is a lovely highway—

**Mr Oswald:** A national highway.

**Mr VENNING:** It is a national highway. Certainly, State and Federal Labor Governments helped construct it. Thank goodness we have something. I am very pleased that the Government has given this \$17 million project such a high priority, particularly in these financially straitened times. The first stage, approximately 20 kilometres extending from the sealed section west of Morgan, has been completed. So, the road westward from Morgan to The Gums, a property owned by the Strachans, is now sealed. The second stage—at a cost of approximately \$12.87 million—from Burra to The Gums will be harder to complete because a lot of bridge works need to be negotiated. I hope that it will be completed within the next 18 months to two years.

The recurrent costs in the first year are virtually zero, to an amount in excess of \$2 500 per kilometre towards the end of its nominal design life. Generally, roads are resurfaced every 12 to 15 years. At present, the Burra to Morgan Road in an unsealed state is hindering the economic development of the Mid North of South Australia and diverting heavy vehicle traffic onto tourist routes which are not designed for such traffic, thus creating potential hazards. Tourist and freight traffic are travelling via longer alternative routes to avoid the Burra to Morgan stretch of road, thus reducing economic benefits for the area. The unsealed surface of the road is also a traffic hazard, with wet weather causing difficulties or, in severe cases, road closure. Problems are also occurring during summer when the roads become corrugated and pot-holed. Such road closures reduce the reliability of the route, stop local traffic and further deter freight and tourist traffic from the area.

As I said, this project has been a priority for me. I note that you, Sir, will take over from me at the next election. The work will be done, and I am pleased with the cooperation I have had from you, Sir. It has been a high priority for me since I entered this place six years ago—

**Mr Oswald:** Have we had you for six years?

**Mr VENNING:** You have had me for six years; I am sorry about that. I have been here for six years, and this is one issue that has probably taken most of my time.

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Certainly, the honourable member has enjoyed my time here. We knew each other before we entered this place as we both lived in the City of Port Pirie. I remember sitting in the honourable member's lounge room one night when he missed becoming a Federal member by only a handful of votes. In hindsight, I am glad that he lost, because we are now here together. When I became the local member, this road was within my electorate. There has been one redistribution and half the road is still in my area. At the next election, I will lose it all. Hopefully, with the next election it will all be done. I am sure that the bit remaining will be in very capable hands when you are there to finish it off, Sir, and I hope you will understand if I rock up to the official opening after all this.

I am very pleased that it is almost completed. The locals are also extremely pleased. I spoke to Ruth Strachan last weekend at the Burra Show, and she is over the moon. They live at The Gums and they are now able to drive on a sealed road from their front drive out to Morgan, and they never thought they would see the day. When I made these promises six years ago they thought I was just another politician with plenty of hot air. I also pay tribute to Mr Harry Quinn from Burra, whom you would know, Sir. He was the person who invited me to take on the challenge in the first place. I saw Harry the other day and he is very pleased that the project is half done.

I pay tribute to the Public Works Committee on the work it has done. In all projects we have to be very careful what we do, particularly in relation to environmental problems, but the committee has addressed the problem very well. The final and greatest tribute I save for the Minister, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. Not only did she bring this project to fruition by going to Cabinet and obtaining a large amount of money but also she personally rode her cycle on half the road in its roughest condition to see first hand for herself how very bad it was. I am very pleased with her support and thank the Government for backing it up. I commend the committee on its report.

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

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I rise this morning also to formally endorse this thirty-first report of the Public Works Committee with respect to the continued progress of the upgrading of the Morgan to Burra road. Members will be aware that I have spoken at length in this place on this project. Right from when I was first elected I have done my best to support the benefits to my electorate. More particularly, I recognise the effort, contribution and I would say the great passion of my colleague the member for Custance in his endeavours over the six years that he has been in this place to achieve the sealing of the Morgan to Burra road. Because I have spoken at length previously I will not go into specific detail, but I will reiterate some of the very strong benefits that the sealing and upgrading of this road will provide nationally

and to the State (as of course we recognise), but more particularly in terms of the regional value to my electorate, which is at the eastern end of the road.

The completion of the sealing of the road will mean that the Riverland—the electorate of Chaffey—will become very much the hub of a transport corridor across this nation. Whether it be from Melbourne to Perth, Melbourne to Darwin or Sydney across to Perth, it will mean that the Riverland, and the Morgan Burra area in particular, will participate in the value of the extra transport that will be enjoyed by the transport companies, many of which operate and are housed in South Australia. Some of the major transport companies are in my electorate and will also benefit from the increased safety factor, the reduced travelling times and the cost efficiency in transporting heavy produce, which cost needs to be reduced across this nation.

Additionally and more particularly, that hub and transport corridor will be of benefit to the State and to my region with respect to tourist endeavours and tourist numbers, which are growing in this State. I note that the most recent figures show that tourism in South Australia over the past 12 months has increased by about 41 per cent, compared with a national increase of about 7 per cent. The completion of this road will undoubtedly reinforce and assist these increasing tourist figures here in South Australia because of the cross route that will be provided by the upgrading of this road. I am conscious that the road is just over 80 kilometres in length, and the first stage, which has been completed, now takes it to about 40 kilometres of bitumen.

I can assure members that that is particularly appreciated by those who now use this route. It includes those who have always used it as the local road or regional road but, more particularly, those who now choose to use it because of its fundamental benefit to the national and international transport network. More particularly, as has always been mentioned, the figures compiled on the road's usage are low. As the member for Custance and I would both reiterate, it is no secret that, quite obviously, many heavy transports and other drivers have regularly used the road on the basis that it is a shorter route and, in many cases, I suggest, used it unbeknown to their company owners. Therefore, there is no doubt that statistics that have been provided over the years have not truly reflected the amount of use and its importance. Now this usage is starting to come home in terms of the statistics that reflect its use at this time.

In conclusion, I take special note of the committee's report with respect to environmental issues. I note there were some Aboriginal heritage issues involved, particularly because some worked stone sites of Aboriginal significance were found. I commend the committee and the Department of Transport for their cooperation in terms of working with those respective interest groups and recognising the practical reality. Four of these five sites had been damaged beyond formal protection and, even though there may have been some remains, a practical and appropriate solution was found whereby the unrealistic protection of these sites would not hinder the development of this project.

Similarly, in relation to native fauna, I acknowledge the fact that the pygmy blue-tongue lizard has been recognised. It is appropriate that the Department of Transport will ensure the appropriate protection. The report states that an environmentalist will be used to ensure that, if any of these pygmy blue-tongue lizards are found, they will be moved, on the basis that they feel confident that they will be protected, their environment will be enhanced by moving them and they will

not be put under threat, which they could well be from their current existence in the construction area of the Morgan to Burra road upgrade. I commend all those involved with that issue. In relation to heritage, I also note that the road will go between those two houses of significance in the Burra area. I commend the Department of Transport for being able to make the appropriate changes to allow these heritage sites to remain.

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**Mr ANDREW:** As the member for Morphett has indicated, the lizard indeed will be saved. I commend the committee, the Department of Transport and the Minister for getting this current upgrade into its second stage—\$17 million has been well spent. It has been appreciated. It is bringing the benefits home to this State. As the member for Custance indicated, the Minister for Transport, the member for Custance and I rode our bikes along that road in its poorer condition and, by doing so, gave our commitment and proved our intent to ensure that priority would be given to the completion of this road as soon as possible. I commend the report on the upgrade of this road to the House.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: VIRGINIA PIPELINE**

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That the thirty-second report of the committee on the Virginia pipeline project be noted.

The MFP Australia proposed to construct a pipeline system at a cost of some \$27 million for the Bolivar Waste Water Treatment Plant. This pipeline will allow treated water to be available to the horticultural industry in the northern Adelaide plains for irrigation purposes with the aim of re-using some 75 per cent of the Bolivar output for irrigation purposes by the year 2001. Substantial reuse of the discharge from the Bolivar Waste Water Treatment Plant was first investigated in the early 1970s but, due to the perceived high cost of such a scheme, marine disposal was decided upon as the alternative. However, MFP Australia reassessed the project in 1993 and determined that there was an opportunity to treat and reuse the discharge from the Bolivar plant and thereby create a world-class environment with economic development project potential.

The construction of the Virginia pipeline project will reduce the impact on the marine environment caused by the present sewage discharge from the Bolivar waste treatment plant. This discharge has had a damaging effect on the seagrasses living on the ocean floor; consequently, only a small percentage of the seagrasses survive to this day. The Virginia pipeline will reduce the volume of effluent pumped into the ocean, thus creating an environment where previously damaged plant life can now begin to regenerate. In addition, growers in the Virginia region rely heavily on the northern Adelaide groundwater basin for their irrigation and water supply. For this resource to be sustained in the long term an alternative water supply is required. The Virginia pipeline project will provide this alternative supply while conserving South Australia's water resources and creating a world-class model of economic environmentally sustainable water management.

The Virginia pipeline project is also consistent with current Government policy of phasing out all sewage effluent discharge to the marine environment and provides an exciting opportunity to take the lead in developing world-class

approaches to water resource management. The project has been configured on a build/own/operate/transfer scheme (the BOOT scheme) with a special purpose company being established to own and operate the scheme for 15 to 20 years, whereupon it is intended to transfer the whole operation to the Virginia Irrigation Association (the VIA). As such, the project is being negotiated on a basis that it be self-funded except for the injection of \$10 million, which came originally from the Building Better Cities funds, and the revenue to support the project will be derived from the sale of water to the growers in the Virginia region.

Furthermore, the committee is supportive of the Virginia pipeline project on the basis that it will provide substantial economic growth for South Australia. The additional water supply will allow growers to crop new products that have a growth market—sustainable compared to advantage—and export potential. These opportunities are valued at about \$20 million annually. Overall, the Public Works Committee strongly supports the proposal to construct the pipeline system from the Bolivar waste water treatment plant and, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, reports to the Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public works proceed.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I wish to speak briefly on this matter and add my support to this project. The idea of a pipeline transporting water from Bolivar to the Virginia region is not a new one. In fact, I was speaking with the member for Peake and he reminisced about a particular person in the northern area, whose name he could not remember, but who had tirelessly campaigned for this project about 25 to 30 years ago. It is a great thing that this pipeline is now about to become a reality, that the project has been picked up through the MFP and through the Building Better Cities funding which was made available by the previous Federal Labor Government and which is now coming through to help in the funding of this project. The total cost is \$27 million, of which \$10 million is from Federal funds—Building Better Cities money—and \$17 million from the private sector.

The project is significant because it meets two very important aims. First, it reuses water from the Bolivar waste treatment plant so that water does not have to be discharged into the gulf; and, secondly, it provides much needed water for the growers in the Virginia region. As we all know, that part of northern Adelaide is alive and well and the growing of vegetables and flowers and the export of those goods is a very important new industry for the north and for South Australia. This pipeline, bringing water on a guaranteed basis to those growers, is very significant.

During the time that negotiations were going on with growers, I was contacted by one or two of them who were concerned about the price they would have to pay for the water. I understand that those details have not been worked out and that the committee will look at further details about the contractual arrangements when they are finalised. I hope that will be done fairly so that the growers can look forward to a fair deal in terms of the water that they require. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the Virginia expo last weekend, but I believe that it was very successful. This pipeline is an integral part of the plans for the Virginia region. I welcome it and I look forward to seeing its completion.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** As a member of the committee, I share the views contained in the report. I support the proposi-

tion that we should press ahead with the establishment of the Virginia pipeline project. That became a commitment of mine even before I entered this place, and I illustrated the benefits that would come from improved water supply from sources outside the basin in the speech that I made in this place about 15 years ago. There are hundreds of billions of dollars to be earned from exports that can be produced by using the resource available from Bolivar as water, that is, in the process of producing fresh vegetables and fruits, whether they be fruits for fresh consumption or fruits for value adding, as is the case in wine and olive oil, and fresh vegetables likewise.

To my mind, it is an entirely sensible thing for this State to look at everything it presently regards as waste and examine whether or not it is a resource rather than a waste. If we do that, thousands of tonnes of fertiliser will come from what has previously been placed in landfill, which can be used by producers to enhance organic matter levels on the soil to which it is supplied, as well as improved plant nutrient levels in the soil to which it is applied, and a good many other things as well, such as is being done at NAWMA, but that is a slight digression.

It simply illustrates the benefit of looking at the water from places such as Bolivar that is left after it has been through treatment to breakdown the sewage, as a resource and not a waste, and I mention that again because I believe that it is possible for us to treat the solids in different ways from the way we do it at present. In my judgment, it is not necessary simply to rely on bacteria to break down those solids and expend the energy which they contain, as we do at present, without getting any benefit from it. There are other ways of dealing with that and, once sludge is present following the bacterial breakdown of the solids, that sludge should not be treated simply as waste. It is a valuable resource. It makes excellent addition to bricks, for instance, and can also be used in other processes, both as an industrial catalyst to facilitate those processes, as well as other things.

I want to make one other point relating to our commitment as a society to do these sensible things, and the fairness or lack of it that is inherent in the way that we make our decisions. Here the public purse is providing \$10 million; otherwise the project is self-funding.

I have no difficulty whatever in accepting that the \$10 million is peanuts, in that it will be recovered, anyway, in consequence of the value received from using the water as a resource to grow export products. The Government will recover that \$10 million in the form of taxes, and so on, over the ensuing years once the project is in place not only from the people who produce and sell the goods but from those who add value to them, make profit and pay taxes along the way. The other benefit to the Government and society at large is that using it as a resource rather than as a waste gives us a contribution to our balance of payments problems.

I now want to turn to the other matter of substance. The sum of \$10 million of public money is going into this, and in the process we can treat what we have regarded as waste water in a sensible fashion. Better Cities was the source of the money. Another program in rural and regional areas was called Main Street. We can treat this water but we cannot even find a measly few hundred thousand dollars to provide the people in Swan Reach with a reliable water supply. We say it is simply not possible. We can subsidise with \$10 million the provision of this scheme, yet people in Swan Reach will neither have filtered water—as will the rest of South Australia come 1999—nor will they have an adequate

supply with any pressure at the upper level, and they are told, 'Stiff' (I could add a second word to that); they are just told, 'That's too bad. You have to cop that.'

That would not be too bad, either, if they did not have to pay about 90¢ a kilolitre like everyone else does—and they do, because their properties are metered and it is a public supply. They are being ripped off mercilessly without concern or care for their welfare, and it distresses me that we can build a plant to filter the water supply to the Barossa Valley at public expense, to Yorke Peninsula and everywhere else. We put this plant at Swan Reach and call it the Swan Reach water filtration plant and yet deny local residents any of that water. We could put a pipeline under the river back into Swan Reach to supply people very simply for a few hundred thousand dollars, but we are too mean and stingy to do that.

I say on another front why I believe we ought to review this policy. In this instance we are providing waste water as a joint venture, and we know that we will recover that cost through the taxation mechanism. We are not charging the Virginia growers 97¢ a kilolitre—nothing like it—because it is not a potable supply—but, if we can go into these build, own, operate and transfer arrangements, as is the case here, why cannot we do it for other country towns, in the Mallee, for instance, where the water comes from underground? Why can they not own and operate their own water supply to their towns? Why does it have to be owned by SA Water? Why do they have to pay 94¢ a kilolitre for that water to be reticulated to their factories, homes, shops, and so on, in the towns of Lameroo, Pinnaroo and Geranium when the cost to the public purse of doing that is only about 18¢ to 20¢?

Indeed, along the Murray River at Murray Bridge, even after that water is filtered, we know that the cost involved will be only about 40¢: a 50¢ cross-subsidy will be going into general revenue for the supply of water in other places at 94¢ a kilolitre. That is as crook as hell. It is iniquitous and it ought to be addressed. Notwithstanding my concerns in these comparable domains of public works, and so on—outside this one but, as I said, comparable—I applaud what we are doing at Virginia and just wish that we could apply similar principles in other locations, if in no other way than in the name of social justice and equity.

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I want to place on the record my support for and endorsement of this project. Last Friday I had the pleasure of being at Virginia, where the Federal Parliamentary Secretary to the Federal Minister for Primary Industries (Senator Brownhill) opened the community centre. I must say that I was impressed, and it was heartening to see the community spirit and support for what has been established at Virginia in terms of the growth potential there. When I came into this place, I had many areas of interest, but I reflect here on a couple that are relevant in this case—water resource issues and exports for the growth of this State. This project undoubtedly reinforces the importance to the State of both those issues. With respect to water supply, not only will it provide environmental advantages by protecting the underground aquifer in the Virginia area but also it will enhance the water supply potential and be an advantage to the Virginia growers. On the other side of the coin, there is the degradation of the current outflow of Bolivar sewage and the impact that is having on the marine environment, particularly on the aquaculture potential which is not being fully exploited in the gulf region.

I endorse the Public Works Committee's support for this project. I particularly congratulate the Minister for Infrastructure for his support and achievement in getting this initial funding of \$10 million through the Better Cities program. I also congratulate SA Water and its officers on the way they have taken this opportunity to use the BOOT scheme as a practical and appropriate financing mechanism to get a capital infrastructure project up and running. I understand that, in general, the Virginia growers totally support the project in principle, and on the basis of their contribution I look forward to seeing their final agreement to the details. I note that the present area of horticulture production there is about 3 000 hectares. When this project comes to fruition with stage 2, the potential for irrigated horticulture in that area will increase to about 9 000 hectares.

Exports and gross value product out of that area amount to about \$60 million: when that can be levered and perhaps increased three or fourfold, bearing in mind that the value added factor is significant for this intensive horticultural production and that the vast majority of that must and will go into exports, that will be a valuable enhancement to our exports out of this State. Not only will it be of direct value to growers, local producers and businesses suppliers in that area but also it will have a multiplier effect on air trade, air traffic and other transport infrastructure. More importantly, it will continue to show to our Asian neighbours that we can be efficient, productive and lead the world in terms of the production and value adding processing we will apply to our horticultural process. I commend this project to the House.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I rise briefly to commend the work of the Public Works Committee on this matter. I also direct the House's attention to a couple of matters which have not previously been canvassed in the debate but which I thought might have been canvassed by the member for Elizabeth. In 1989, our Party went to the election with a strong environmental policy in a form (perhaps slightly dissimilar) of which this was part. That was on the promise that, on coming to Government, we would do all we could to see that water was not discharged into the gulf and that effluent water, as opposed to solids, was turned back onto the land and utilised in wood lotting and for the purposes we now see coming to fruition. It has been a longstanding commitment on this side of the House, a commitment which I have to say to members opposite was one that was increasingly shared by their own Party when they were in Government. I note that whilst it was not part of the Opposition's 1989 election promises, Minister Lenehan and a number of other Ministers were interested in going in the same direction. So, I am pleased that this project has bipartisan support.

The member for Chaffey commented briefly on the benefits that this project will have for the aquifer in the Bolivar area. Sir, you will remember that we had a very passionate debate in the corridors of this place and the Chamber about a proposed development in the Wilpena area. It was going to be the end of the world because, even though the aquifer in the Wilpena area, as I remember it, is fractured and self-contained, there were those in this Chamber who asserted that we were going to drain all the water, that the saline water would come in, and that we would destroy forever the water supply of the northern Flinders Ranges. I remember, Sir, that you described it, I will say in this Chamber politely as rubbish, but I recall that your words were slightly stronger than that.

I raise this point in this context only to point out that all the conjecture about that section of the Flinders and what could happen to the aquifer is speculation and child's play compared with the very real and provable damage that is occurring to the aquifer in the area of Bolivar. So this pipeline is not only a good idea, it is essential. I do not have the figures at my fingertips, but I think that the cone is depressing about six feet a year. It is an appreciable and alarming amount, and it is greatly worrying to those who are dependant on it and to the whole of South Australia, because it is much nearer to the coast, and there is therefore a much greater possibility that if we depress the cone too much the water will become saline because of groundwater flows.

The other point that I would like to add is that all of South Australia will benefit from this pipeline, and not in the most obvious ways. One of the least obvious benefits relates to the fact that our discharge water contains heavy metals, not in huge or dangerous amounts, but there are measurable amounts of heavy metals in the effluent. That effluent is being discharged into the gulf, and there is no certainty about the cumulative effects of heavy metals over centuries. If we use it for our own uses, especially for intensive horticulture, we will carefully have to address the problem of heavy metals and make sure that the level of heavy metals in any discharge is limited to the point where they are of no concern at all to the environment.

So, this program, because it will force us to look more carefully at heavy metal levels in the discharge and to deal with them in a way that ensures that our health and the environment is not put at risk, will be a positive step forward for the environment. I see this as a very positive move. The Minister, the Party and the Parliament are to be commended for it because, as I say, whilst it was a strong plank of ours in coming to the election in 1989, I believe there was a commitment by members opposite, certainly by former Ministers, gradually to move down this path. It is an excellent program, one which I hope will have no impediment put in its way and one which I hope will come to a rather speedier conclusion than many of the other projects that we have discussed in here *ad nauseam*. Some of them still seem to be dreams for the future. Let us hope that this project becomes a reality more quickly. I commend the motion to the House.

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** I want to make a few brief comments. A number of members have elucidated on the reasons why this project is good for South Australia and good for the region, particularly my electorate, which includes both the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Plant and the Virginia growers of that region. The pipeline will do much to reduce the problems of effluent discharge into the Gulf. It is a requirement of the Environment Protection Agency that the nutrient content of that outflow be reduced, and so this is something that the Government must do. Using that nutrient-rich water in the Virginia area and in surrounding areas for agricultural purposes is an efficient and good use of that water. It also addresses other problems in the Two Wells and Virginia region that are reaching crisis point, namely, degradation of underground aquifers and increased salinity levels. The water quality has been downgraded to such an extent that growers are experiencing many problems.

Using the treated effluent from Bolivar in the vegetable and horticultural growing areas will help reduce the load on those underground aquifers. Proposals are in place to recharge the aquifers; hopefully that will address the difference in demand usage between the summer and winter

months, but that is something that will be decided in the future. Of course, the economic growth to the State and the future prosperity to the region in enabling growers to increase their production will be a big boon to the region and to the State. As this project progresses I will monitor closely the cost of the water provided by the pipeline to the growers. Obviously the growers will want to use the water only if it can be provided at a reasonable cost. The growers want to be assured that they will not be caught in a situation where they are paying uneconomic charges for that water.

**Mr Brokenshire:** What price should it be?

**Ms WHITE:** A lot less than 10¢ to 13¢. Of the \$27 million that is being spent and will be spent on this pipeline, quite a significant portion (\$10.8 million) was provided by the previous Federal Labor Government, and the remaining \$17 million will be provided via Eurotech, as well as contributions from the growers. In essence, I support the project. As I indicated earlier, I will be keeping a close check on the way that this project progresses, particularly the effects it will have on the number of growers and their properties in the Virginia and related regions. I will also be monitoring the price that the growers will have to pay for this water.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I support this report of the Public Works Committee. As members may be aware, for many years the electorate of Goyder included the area of Virginia. I had the privilege of representing Virginia until the last election (a period of 11 years), and I know that, during that whole period, the issue of extending reclaimed water into the Virginia area and possibly the Two Wells area was a point of discussion. I am pleased that the Public Works Committee has now identified this \$27 million project. Without question, it will be a marvellous asset and boost for the area. In earlier years I made many visits to the channel that takes the waste water out to sea, and I know that irrigators for quite some years have been using that reclaimed water. By and large, it has been excellent, but there have been problems occasionally, particularly at times when the number of people employed to look after the water decreased, for example, over the Christmas break. I know that several property owners had all their produce ruined by excessive saline water on at least two occasions, and I recall taking deputations to the then Minister.

I still believe that the Government should have reimbursed those growers for their losses. Although it was on a trial basis and their contracts stipulated that they would have to take those problems in their stride, it was totally unfair to those growers. Nevertheless, the positive news is that those problems have been overcome. We are able to deal with them adequately and efficiently. The extension of the pipeline will provide to the growers water that has been running as waste water into the sea for many years, and it will be to the benefit of this State.

I place on record the work of Mr Ron Baker, who was active in wanting to see the water extended from the Bolivar region. On many occasions he spoke with me about it. He urged me to continue to push for it and, if members look back through earlier *Hansard* records, they will see that I brought up this issue on many occasions. I certainly was not the first to do so because, in about 1968, the need for a pipeline into Virginia was identified as being absolutely essential. It has taken the better part of 30 years to achieve it. I am pleased that this Government is undertaking this project.

The easy course of action would have been to say that it was too expensive and that there were too many possible problems. People are becoming aware that this Government



is determined to see South Australia go from strength to strength. I am delighted for the Virginia region and the many people who will benefit. I know the work that they did in seeking to get the water there; I know the work they did to make a living and their pride in the Virginia area as the green basket of South Australia. It will become very much the green basket of South Australia in future years.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It is not every day that I rise to support a project that is occurring in the north. However, I am happy to support this project in the northern suburbs. It has been a long time coming but it is now coming to fruition. It is important not only for the northern suburbs but also for all South Australians. One should never underestimate the importance of value added agriculture to this State. Fully value added agriculture will underpin South Australia's economic reform and recovery. Members have only to look at what is happening in Malaysia at present. A decade ago, 75 per cent of all the Malaysian GDP came from either agriculture or mining. Today, 25 per cent of Malaysia's GDP comes from agriculture and mining and the rest from manufacturing, high technology and so on.

I believe that our Government is definitely on track when we look at the clean, green food basket for Asia and South-East Asia. The population is growing there, they are our closest trading neighbours and they like good quality food. Among other things, we are extending the airport to ensure that the fresh, quality produce arrives in Asia as soon as possible. As the member for Unley has already pointed out, recycling this water is fundamental to the Virginia area. For too long they have been under extreme difficulty with the aquifer because they have been pulling out more than is being recharged.

This is a great way of overcoming an environmental problem, both in that basin and also with the fact of the killing of the seagrasses and the general degradation of that part of Gulf St Vincent. Finally, I want to tie in a couple of points that have been touched on. One of those is the cost of this water. I have watched with much interest the discussion that has gone on about the cost of the water at Bolivar. I note that the member for Taylor has stated that she feels that 10¢ to 13¢ per kilolitre is at the top end. I know that the member for Taylor is committed and wants to look after her constituents, but I would like to remind the House that down my way we also have a policy on the opportunity of bringing recycled water into my electorate—something that I will not give up on.

Frankly, in my opinion 10¢ or 13¢ per kilolitre is not expensive these days for tertiary treated water. I know that my constituents would be very pleased if they could get water at around 10 to 13 cents a kilolitre when the Christies Beach treatment plant water comes back into our basin. Finally, I congratulate everyone on what is happening but remind them that we are looking forward to a similar project coming into my electorate in the near future.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM**

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That the thirty-third report of the committee on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrade be noted.

The Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing proposed to upgrade the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium at a cost of

\$8.125 million. This upgrade will ensure that the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium meets the Federation Internationale Football Association (FIFA) requirements, thus allowing Adelaide to bid for and, hopefully, host a preliminary round of the Sydney 2000 Olympic soccer competitions. The major component of this proposal is the extension and upgrading of the existing western grandstand. This will result in the provision of an additional 3 000 undercover seats, thus providing and maintaining a total ground capacity of 15 000 persons both seated and standing. Given that grandstand seating provides both an improved view of the game and protection from bad weather, the existing 1 000 undercover seats generally sell quickly prior to each game.

As demand far exceeds supply for this type of seating, there is often a significant drop in game attendances on wet days. The extension of the western grandstand will alleviate this problem to a large extent. The proposed extension to the western grandstand will also increase the areas of oval for use by the West Adelaide and Adelaide City soccer clubs, while providing additional corporate and general admission facilities. As part of the stadium upgrade, it is proposed that some works also be undertaken on the eastern side of the ground. These works will include a new entrance; additional paving and fencing; construction of shade structures to protect people standing on the eastern banks; and an upgrade of toilet facilities.

The Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing (in conjunction with Services SA and the South Australian Soccer Federation) has determined that construction management is the most appropriate method of procurement for this project. It is proposed that construction management will allow the South Australian Soccer Federation to maximise sponsorship opportunities by the establishment of trade packages during construction; allow an earlier possible start on site; and allow the flexibility of some occupation of the stadium, including potential soccer matches, during construction.

Based on the evidence taken from witnesses, the committee sought additional information on the use of construction management for this project and subsequently found it necessary to seek further, detailed clarification of several issues. Government officers also sought the opportunity to clarify previous evidence given. It subsequently became apparent that the committee had been presented with conflicting views by witnesses as to how the construction management process or, more specifically, the tendering process, would be conducted. During the initial hearing, witnesses representing Services SA advised the committee that the project team would share the responsibility of appraising the trade packages with the construction manager. This group will then collectively make a recommendation to the Hindmarsh Stadium Redevelopment Executive Committee with regard to the acceptance of a particular tender.

The committee was also advised that, in the event of a conflict occurring between the Soccer Federation and the construction manager over awarding of a contract, the Executive Committee would make the final decision. However, in Parliament on 26 June during Estimates Committees the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing stated that the 'inference that any member of that [Executive] Committee, whether a member of this Parliament or any other members, might have a role in that decision is incorrect'.

Having regard to its responsibilities to both members of the public and Parliament, the Public Works Committee sought assurances through the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing from the Crown Solicitor that the procedures

being adopted for construction management are well founded, lawful in all respects and legally defensible. Contrary to media reports, the committee did not go direct to the Crown Solicitor but, rather, wrote to the Minister, who provided the information promptly as requested. Advice received indicated:

That the process... would be legally defensible as an appropriate arrangement expeditiously and efficiently to undertake the redevelopment of Hindmarsh Stadium in the light of all relevant circumstances, provided that each of the following conditions are satisfied.

1. Cabinet approves the Minister for State Government Services to be principal contracting party and to be contractually responsible to undertake the development.

2. The various commercial, prudential and risk management issues attendant upon the Minister for State Government Services directly contracting to undertake the redevelopment are adequately addressed, especially in respect of the contractual relationship between the Crown on one hand and the Soccer Federation on the other.

3. The processes set out by Services SA are implemented and observed. This would include the following:

3.1 all usual Government tender processes are implemented and observed;

3.2 the Minister is exclusively responsible to accept the lowest conforming tenders;

3.3 the Hindmarsh Redevelopment Executive Group and the Hindmarsh Redevelopment Committee are, in relation to the actual undertaking of the development, merely performing a liaison or consultative function and do not have any right or power to determine or influence the acceptance of tenders or the performance of the Minister's contractual, prudential or construction responsibilities and obligations.

4. Any 'sponsorship' arrangements proposed by individual tenderers for 'trade packages' are considered separately from the acceptance of the actual tender and are negotiated independently by the Soccer Federation directly with any such tenderer.

My committee wishes me to stress that its approval for the proposed works was subject to all the above conditions being met. In addition to concerns raised in the committee by members regarding the construction management process, the committee also has concerns relating to car parking facilities available for patrons, particularly as no new sites were identified by witnesses during the process of the taking of evidence. I refer to 'new sites' because we received evidence on the upgrading of existing car park spaces but no new sites were given to the committee as possibilities, although I have heard rumours that other sites are being considered.

There is a limited amount of on-site car parking at the Hindmarsh Stadium, with most of the parks being taken up by officials, police, ambulance and service vehicles. Some off-street car parking, primarily for corporate ticket holders, is provided, but the balance of parking occurs in the streets and the surrounding areas. Parking problems are experienced with current capacity crowds, and extreme difficulties will be experienced if additional space is not secured for car parking prior to the completion of this project. As such, the committee urges the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing and the Soccer Federation to address this issue as a matter of urgency.

All land involved in the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrade is owned by the City of Hindmarsh Woodville and is leased to the South Australian Soccer Federation for 21 years, with a right of renewal for a further 21 years. Although the Soccer Federation has secured use of this facility for a further 42 years, as landlords the city of Hindmarsh Woodville will be the major beneficiaries of the stadium upgrade. To date the Hindmarsh Woodville council has not been approached to make a contribution towards the cost of the stadium upgrade, and the committee recommends that this matter should be discussed with council. Further-

more, given the level of capital expenditure associated with this project, the committee expressed concern at the possibility that the facility may no longer be available to the South Australian Soccer Federation at the end of the lease term. As a parallel, it is worth noting the matter of the Burnside council's forcing Athletics SA off the Olympic Sports Park and selling the property to the highest bidder, despite the investment in that property by State and Federal Governments and the sports themselves, because I do not think any of us want to see a repeat performance of that situation.

In summary, the committee believes that the opportunity for Adelaide to host preliminary rounds of the Sydney 2000 Olympic soccer competition is unique and therefore it is very supportive of the proposal to upgrade the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. The committee considers that, in addition to the Olympic competition, such an upgrade will provide the opportunity for Adelaide to host other major national and international competitions both prior to and after the Olympic Games. The committee notes that, in addition to the 3 000 undercover seats, the proposed upgrade will also result in improved corporate, general admission and club facilities and will establish the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium as the only premium soccer facility in South Australia. Subject to some technical qualifications for use during the construction phase of the project to which I referred earlier in my speech, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public works proceed.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** This is an extraordinary day: an absolutely extraordinary report has been brought down by the Public Works Committee.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Giles has not seen anything like this for 21 years and I have not seen it for 2½ years. We have the Public Works Committee, Government controlled, bringing down a most critical and scathing report on a Government capital works program. The Opposition has expressed some degree of concern about this project, but I must say that my job is made very much easier when the Government's own Public Works Committee has been so critical of this very important project. From the outset, the Opposition supports the upgrade of Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The honourable member referred incorrectly to the Government's Public Works Standing Committee; I thought it was a committee of the House, not a Government committee.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise, Sir. It certainly is not a Government committee: it has clearly not accepted the Government's line on this matter. I will speak next week, but I look forward to hearing the member for Mitchell's contribution, because we heard him on the public airwaves expressing his very serious reservations about this process. The least the member for Mitchell can do is show that he has not been intimidated by some of his own members, and I look forward to his speaking on this Bill.

As I said in the Estimates Committee, I have the interests of the member for Coles very close to my heart. I am keen to see that the member for Coles is not in any way disadvantaged. Next week I will make some comments on the member for Coles' role in this. I will not try to say it in 30 seconds,

because it is very important information. I say that with all due regard; I want to make sure that the member for Coles is protected from members such as the member for Mitchell and others.

I look forward to hearing the member for Mitchell speak next week. We have heard him publicly and we have read his comments as the Acting Chairperson in this report. I hope that the member for Mitchell will not run off in a cowardly way and decline to speak up on this very important issue. I will raise some good points the next time I speak, including some concerns expressed by the Auditor-General. I will keep members in suspense until we meet again. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### EUTHANASIA

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I move:

That this House, regardless of our individual views and attitudes to the law relating to euthanasia, and in keeping with our respect for the spirit of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, calls on Mr Speaker in the House of Representatives and all honourable members of the House of Representatives and Mr President of the Senate and all honourable senators in the Commonwealth Parliament to desist from contemplating any proposal to override any such law in any of the Territories in the Commonwealth of Australia.

'Such law', as referred to in the second to last phrase, is a law relating to euthanasia. As we all know, the Northern Territory's Legislative Assembly passed a Bill and proclaimed an Act to make it possible, under the conditions that it thought appropriate, for the practice of euthanasia. Subsequent to that, a Federal member of Parliament has decided that he disagrees with that view and, accordingly, has given notice in the House of Representatives that he will introduce a Bill that will override the prerogative of the Northern Territory's Legislative Assembly in making that law and make it unlawful.

Whilst the Commonwealth retained unto itself the power to override any law made by the Legislative Assembly in the Northern Territory, we all believe, I am sure, that the Northern Territory ought to be autonomous in the same way as the States are autonomous as provided under the Constitution of Australia.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, as the member for Unley says, it either has a Parliament or it does not. That Parliament is either democratically accountable member by member and as an institution to the people of the Northern Territory in elections at the ballot box or it is not. It ill behoves the House of Representatives or any member of it or, for that matter, in my opinion, the Senate or any member of that Chamber to decide that they know better than the democratically elected representatives of any State or Territory Parliament and, in the process of making such decision, arrogantly to override that decision made quite properly according to law in the Chamber of that State or Territory.

The entire proposition before us today is about the spirit of the Constitution, because the House of Representatives and/or the Senate cannot do that in the situation where a State Parliament makes such a law. The Constitution does not allow the Federal Parliament, or any House in it, to override any law of that kind made by a State. I believe that that is the essence of devolving power that makes our democracy such a valuable, effective and productive place for people to live. It is a federation: it is not a republic governed by a central,

single legislative organ—not that I imply that all republics are, but they tend to be.

A notable exception is the republic of the United States of America, where the States make laws that the Congress cannot override, whether through the Representatives or through the Senate. I urge all members to give serious consideration to this proposition and to give swift passage to it so that the Federal Parliament and the Houses of which it is comprised will know that we in this State support what our Premier has said; namely, that those Houses of Parliament in Canberra ought to butt out.

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** I rise to support this motion and I commend the honourable member for it. As we know, the Northern Territory was surrendered by South Australia to the Commonwealth in 1911. Pursuant to section 122 of the Federal Constitution—that is the provision relating to new States—the Commonwealth had powers to make laws for the Government of any territory. The Commonwealth Government had the right to make those laws either to give the Territory Government the power of peace, order and good Government, which is the normal provision in all State and Commonwealth constitutions; or, alternatively, to limit the power of the Territory and in fact legislate for it. It had the choice to do that. However, under section 78 of the Northern Territory Act the Commonwealth Government elected to give the Northern Territory power to legislate for its peace, order and good Government—which, as I said, appears in all State Constitutions.

One could theoretically argue that the Commonwealth, because it created the Territory, has made the Territory a creature of the Commonwealth Government. However, one would have thought that the convention since 1978 would illustrate that in fact the Commonwealth Government does not interfere in the internal laws of the Territories—in particular, in this case, the Northern Territory.

Having said that, section 122 is wide enough to provide for direct administration of the Territory by the Commonwealth without a separate territorial administrative body or institution, and it is wide enough also to enable the Commonwealth to endow the Territory with separate political representation, administration and institutions.

In 1978 the Commonwealth Government elected to do precisely the latter: it created the Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory and gave it power in relation to peace, order and good Government. That was under section 13 of the Northern Territory Self-Government Act 1978, where members of Parliament had a term of four years, as is the case in this House. The Commonwealth Government, therefore, it seems to me, elected to give the Northern Territory control over its own fiscus. It is amazing and inexcusable, to say the least, that the Commonwealth is now attempting to deprive the Northern Territory of the right to legislate in what one could only call a moral area.

I should make myself very clear on this issue. I voted against the euthanasia Bill in this State, and that is still my view. However, I do not support the Commonwealth Government in interfering in relation to the Northern Territory of Australia Rights of the Terminally Ill Act 1995, because it is an abrogation of Territory rights when they have the right of peace, order and good Government in their own fiscus. We have the same provision. The way the Commonwealth is behaving is a threat not only to the Territories but also to the States and to the sovereignty of the States. This

motion is about the Commonwealth interfering in State and territorial rights: it is not about euthanasia.

Members, no doubt, will remember the controversy in 1995 when the Federal Government attempted to override Tasmania's anti-gay laws. The Commonwealth was able to do that because sections of the Tasmanian Criminal Code in relation to homosexuality breached the rights in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Australia was a party. I was totally opposed to the Tasmanian homophobic legislation, but I am also opposed to the use of the external affairs power to override State law. That issue is what this motion is about.

How can one argue that the action of the Commonwealth was in respect of an external affairs power or in relation to international relations when one deals with laws on homosexuality? That was the way the Commonwealth would have had to argue. It seems to me that that issue is clearly one of an intrinsic State matter, particularly in view of the fact that it had to do with the issue of morality and law. It was purely a conscience matter, which one would have thought was the province of the State. It is not the Commonwealth Government's right to interfere in moral matters in relation to the laws in the States or Territories.

One thing that disappoints me greatly is that the present Prime Minister gave us an undertaking prior to the Federal election that he would limit the use of the external affairs power by the Commonwealth. Obviously he said that because he was well aware that the use of the external affairs power was encroaching on the sovereignty of the States. We have a Prime Minister who said that but who is now saying the opposite. He is saying that the Commonwealth Government will interfere in relation to a Territorial law which is purely concerned with a moral issue, which it seems to me is an abrogation of the power of the States under the peace, order and good government provisions given by the Federal Government in 1978.

The Prime Minister cannot consistently say that he will limit the use of the external affairs power and at the same time say that the Commonwealth Government has the right to interfere in the euthanasia law in the Northern Territory. It is clearly a contradiction and one that is hypocritical on the part of the Prime Minister. I hope that he comes to his senses and retracts from that position.

On numerous occasions in this House I have attacked the former Federal Labor Government for its centralist policies. It frequently used the external affairs power to impose laws on the States. Its competition policy legislation is an imposition on the States. Its national uniform legislation and its approach thereto was nothing but a disgrace, because the States were constantly presented with legislation that they did not have a chance to vet. They were presented with such legislation through COAG and through the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

Members are aware that the Premier meets with other Premiers, they send legislation off to a pack of bureaucrats who come from Canberra who draft it and give it back to the committee, and the Premiers go back to their Party room or Caucus and say, 'This is federally agreed legislation. All the States and the Commonwealth have agreed: you are stuck with it.'

In addition, I mention the use of the industrial affairs power. It has just been determined that public servants and teachers can come under the power of the Commonwealth Industrial Commission. That takes away from the States control over their own employees. Once again, it is a breach

of the sovereignty of the States, and one could go on about the extension of the Commonwealth powers over the States.

When speaking to this motion, I am not referring to euthanasia: I make that clear. If my record in this House is looked at, it will show that I constantly oppose the encroachment of Commonwealth power on the States. It seems that the action of the Commonwealth Government in trying to stop the Northern Territory euthanasia law, no matter whether one agrees or disagrees with it, in the end will cost the States and the Territories and affect the separation of powers between the Commonwealth and the States. Once again, it is clearly an instance of the Commonwealth Government's attacking the sovereignty of the States, and I am totally opposed to that. Therefore, I commend the honourable member for moving this motion, and I support it.

**Mr QUIRKE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I move:

That this House expresses its grave concern regarding the Commonwealth Government's interim and long-term funding proposals under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and the consequent impact on the housing construction sector, market rents and homelessness.

The Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is the agreement under which the Commonwealth and the States have funded the provision of public housing. Generally speaking, the funds have gone into building new houses, and public housing has therefore been under the joint ownership of the Commonwealth and the relevant State. The provisions of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement have, for example, prevented Liberal States from selling off public housing, but the States have control and management of the administration of their public housing.

In South Australia this had been through the independent body, the South Australian Housing Trust. However, this Liberal Government moved early in its term and abolished the trust as an independent body and has brought it directly under the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under the previous Federal Labor Government, the then housing Minister (Mr Brian Howe) proposed a model of assistance that directed Federal funds to tenants rather than to the States. The idea was to introduce more equity between public and private housing tenants, reduce the public housing waiting lists and allow people more freedom of choice as to where and in what sort of accommodation they lived.

However, the Labor Government had planned an extensive consultation period after the model was developed and had no intention of making the provisions a cost cutting measure. The motivation of the current Federal Liberal Government seems to be somewhat different.

The Liberal model has not been made public and even public and private housing interest groups such as Shelter have no idea of the details of the model. Basically, we know that the proposal is that low income renters, whether in public or private accommodation, will be paid rent assistance through the Department for Social Security. In turn, this rent assistance will be paid to either the trust or the private landlord. All rents will be assessed on market rental values so, rather than subsidise public tenants being charged, say, \$65 a week, they will be charged by the trust \$120 a week

and they will use their DSS subsidy to make up the difference.

The Government has pledged that existing public tenants will not be disadvantaged under the new system in terms of security of tenure or paying any more than 25 per cent of their income. The Federal Government has also said that the scheme will be cost neutral to both State and Federal Governments.

There are problems for both State and Federal Governments here. This scheme has been tried before, for example, in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom scheme proved that open-ended rental subsidy can be a disaster for Treasury. If the Government guarantees that no low income tenant will pay more than 25 per cent of their income in rent, the cost implications will be enormous. This is especially so in States such as New South Wales, where rents can be very high.

On the other side of the spectrum, the Government has little control over private landlords in terms of the amount of low cost rental accommodation they will provide or in terms of the amount of rent they can charge. The possibilities are quite strong that landlords will increase rents for low cost accommodation when they know that low income tenants have an additional amount of rental assistance.

The Government will also have to grapple with the possibility of setting up a system of regional sliding scales of rent assistance, depending on the average market rental. For example, in a city such as Sydney they would even have to vary the assistance for tenants living in Housing Commission units close to the city who would be paying a high market rental against those living in the outer western suburbs of Sydney or the regional cities of New South Wales. That would be mirrored in South Australia, where market rents in Port Pirie or Whyalla, for example, would probably be much less than those in some parts of Adelaide.

There are problems for tenants as well. Even if we can accept that existing trust tenants will be protected, how much can that be, given that the State and Federal Governments are not supposed to be spending any more on housing? If a tenant lives in a small but pleasant unit in Norwood, will the Government be prepared to subsidise that tenant right up to the market rate while subsidising a tenant in a small but pleasant unit at Angle Park, a much lesser rate?

If a couple's family has moved away and they continue to occupy their three-bedroom renovated home in Mitchell Park for the rest of their lives, will the Government be prepared to subsidise them right up to market rent for a large house when they need only a one or two bedroom unit at a lesser subsidy? What price will the Government continue to pay these tenants for security of tenure and guarantee of rent at no more than 25 per cent of their income? A more likely scenario is that the Government will decide an average rent for average appropriate income.

If you choose to live in a better area or a bigger than average house, you will just have to be prepared to foot the bill. This will eventually mean that most tenants will have to move to more affordable areas, basically in outer suburban areas such as the outer northern suburbs that I represent, where there is more low cost public housing and more public housing generally. This will apply even more so for new tenants than existing tenants because they will have to seek affordable market rentals. What about those existing Housing Trust tenants? What will happen to them if they decide to transfer to a smaller or more appropriate house near their job? Will that take them off the 'privileged existing tenants starters' list and put them into the 'new tenants' list where

they do not have those guarantees? Further, what will happen in a street where tenants who live side by side with each other may be paying vastly different rents and living under vastly different conditions because one side is an existing tenant and the other side is a new tenant?

Another unanswered question—and one that is worrying many tenants—is whether their rent assistance money will be counted as income. This has many implications not only for those on benefits but also those who are working and receiving a low income. The tax implications and limits for various payments such as family assistance may have flow-on effects for many of these families if that rental subsidy is counted as income. There are problems not only for Government and tenants but also for the Housing Trust, which will no longer have a capital income stream for building new houses or renovating older stock, especially now that the Federal Liberal Government has cut out the Better Cities funding. This will probably have the effect of further depressing our already abysmal housing construction situation in South Australia.

The revenue for building, renovation and maintenance will have to come solely from rental income. To compete in the rental market, the trust will have to provide housing that suits tenants' demands. That is not a bad thing, because we desperately need more two-bedroom accommodation, separate housing units and renovated housing stock. However, this work will probably have to be funded by selling existing stock, and we all know that the stock that will command the best prices will be in sought after areas such as inner city suburbs, West Lakes, and so on. This will exacerbate the trend to concentrate public housing in areas such as the outer northern suburbs.

The other problem for the trust will be that in this time of change and cost constriction it will more than ever have to ensure that it provides a service to pick up those who cannot get housing anywhere else—those who are not acceptable to private landlords and those who are thrown out of their private rental accommodation because they have not paid their rent regularly or have perhaps caused damage to the property. What we will probably see is an increase in the level of homelessness. That is particularly worrying in terms of youth homelessness, which is already at an unacceptable level. Young people are frequently unacceptable to private landlords, who think they will cause too much noise or damage, or will not pay the rent. This is one of the many great problems that are completely unanswered.

This is one of the reasons why Shelter, other Labor spokespeople around Australia and I have been calling for much more consultation on this huge change. The Federal and State Liberal Governments have agreed to the setting up of a working party which consists of bureaucrats and I believe, as most do in the housing sector, that those bureaucrats will not come up with answers to this question without the help of people who have experience in public housing at this time, and people who might have experience in the future. We are just not confident that they will come up with the right answers to these questions.

Tenants are very fearful of the outcome of this, and it is no good Liberal Ministers going around telling Labor people and public housing interest groups that they are just stirring up trouble. These are very real and critical questions. Housing is a very basic right, and that right must be protected. One of the things we must guard jealously is the situation involving the low level of homelessness in this country. One of the

reasons why it is pleasant to live in this country is that we do not see in our streets people living in cardboard boxes.

The other issue that I want to address briefly is community housing. Community and cooperative housing caters for people who have special needs and who get together and build accommodation that is appropriate for their needs. Apart from Aboriginal housing, the Commonwealth seems to have made no provision for community housing, because capital funding will not be made available and the subsidy will go directly to the tenant. That does not sit very well with the way in which community housing is run—it goes completely against the way in which community housing was set up.

In South Australia, despite a promise by this Government to inject capital funds into community housing, there has been a complete turnaround in recent months, and the Minister has said that the only injection of funds he is prepared to provide will be through the transfer of South Australian Housing Trust stock to community housing groups. This is of great concern to community housing groups, because one of the main factors of community housing is that appropriate accommodation is built in appropriate places, and often that accommodation must be modified compared with standard accommodation. There is concern that the Housing Trust stock may not be situated in the right place and be not of an appropriate standard for the needs of the people in question.

We have yet to see what sort of Housing Trust stock these community housing groups will be offered. I think they have been very cooperative with the Government in going on with the scheme until they see what sort of stock they have been given, whether it is renovated appropriately to their standards and whether they can deal with it. We will see during the next few months what the Government's position on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is, but again I must express my disappointment in the fact that we have seen no public statements from either the Premier of this State or the Minister for Housing about the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

No reservations have been expressed, there has been no statement of position on housing in South Australia, and no minimum standards have been demanded. This is in complete contrast to Premiers and Housing Ministers in other States. Not only the Labor State of New South Wales but also the Liberal States of Victoria and Queensland have been very vocal about the problems they see with this scheme. And there are problems. This Government may like to try to gloss over them, but at some time or another it must address these problems.

**Mr Brindal:** What are they?

**Ms HURLEY:** I have just outlined problems for the Government, tenants and the Housing Trust. We would like to see a model of what is proposed. We would like to see the Government come out and defend public housing and housing generally in this State and say clearly that it will not tolerate public housing tenants in this State being disadvantaged, that it will not tolerate an increased level of homelessness, and that it will not tolerate a further depression of the already abysmal housing construction sector in this State. The Premier may like to grandstand about side issues such as the Adelaide City Council, but when it comes to real issues such as jobs, housing and income, he is not prepared to take a stand against the Prime Minister.

**Mr BASS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## HUMBERSTONE, Mr J.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I move:

That this House congratulates Mr John Humberstone for winning the World Championship Gold Medal in the original rifled musket event at the World Muzzle Loading Rifle, Pistol and Shotgun Championships held at Wedgenock, England in August 1996.

At the World Muzzle Loading Rifle Pistol and Shotgun Championship held at Wedgenock, England, in August this year—

**Mr Brindal:** Were you there?

**Ms HURLEY:** No, unfortunately I was not. I would like to have been. The gold medal for the original rifled musket event was won by Mr John Humberstone of Victor Harbor, South Australia. Also, Mr Humberstone was placed equal fifth in the original colt revolver event. This is the first time an Australian has won a gold medal in this championship. John Humberstone has previously won a silver medal in a world zone championship in South Africa, in the Oceania and Masters Games, and John is a consistent medal winner—gold, silver and bronze—in State and national competitions.

John was the most successful member of a six person team, all from the Adelaide Black Powder Muzzle Loading Club, based at Castambul, located in the foothills of Adelaide. I have visited the Castambul rifle range and shot a colt revolver. I enjoyed the days I spent at the rifle range very much. It was a privilege to visit Castambul, fire these historic pieces and experience the hospitality and the very social and casual atmosphere. It was a very interesting experience to go through the ritual of loading the black powder and firing the gun, with all the attendant smoke but not as much noise, I might say, as modern weapons.

My husband has a replica colt revolver which he often fires at the Castambul range. The rifle Mr Humberstone used in these events was a 130-year-old colt rifled musket of the type issued to Union soldiers in the American Civil War, as was the revolver he used. John and his wife run a successful motor engineering business at Victor Harbor. The team comprised John Humberstone, Dianne Humberstone (John's wife), Kym Atkinson (team captain), Laurence Rees, Charles Toohey and Graham Cutting. The team travelled to England entirely at its own expense, with absolutely no State or Federal assistance. Germany, for example, fielded a team of 40 competitors, which was fully funded by the Government.

Not only did John and his team bring back a gold medal but they also won for Australia the right to hold the World Muzzle Loading Championships, which will be held in South Australia in the year 2000. It is quite significant that South Australia will be the host of this event. I am confident that it will be a wonderful event and will attract many interstate and international competitors and observers. In fact, the world championship generally attracts about 300 to 400 competitors from anything up to 200 countries. The South Australian muzzle loading discipline is the most experienced muzzle loading event manager in Australia, having previously staged Masters, State, national and Oceania games competitions.

The international target shooting fraternity holds the world championship and Olympic medal prestige. The next international event in the muzzle loading discipline calendar will be the Oceania Games, to be held at the Castambul range in February next year. It gives me great pleasure to move this motion and to congratulate John Humberstone. He is a quiet achiever in a little known sport. He is successful in his own business but he has found time to do many other things. He is the only person to have attended every national muzzle

loading championship since its inception over 20 years ago. He has previously travelled to America, New Zealand, Hawaii and South Africa for international shoots. He has made many international friendships that were a great help to Australia acquiring the world championships for the year 2000. He has received an award for services to his sport. He also finds time to restore vintage motor cycles.

The muzzle loading fraternity get by with very little recognition and no Government support or help of any type. In South Australia they have taken on the management of this very large event. I wish John Humberstone and all the muzzle loading shooters and the event organisers great success for the year 2000. I am very confident that they will put on a very well managed and well organised event. I certainly hope that it provides greater exposure for the sport of black powder shooting.

**Mr BASS (Florey):** I support the motion and I congratulate John Humberstone for winning the gold medal at the recent world championships. The Adelaide Black Powder and Muzzle Loading Club at Castambul has been visited by some auspicious members of Parliament, myself included, as well as the member for Playford and the Speaker. We also use that range to practise with our firearms on occasions. I must disagree with the member for Napier: on all but one occasion I can honestly say that I believe that the black powder club firearms make more noise than modern arms.

It is very pleasing to see that Mr Humberstone is still using an original muzzle loading firearm. These days, many of them are modern made muzzle loading firearms and one of our local residents, Mr Trevor Bugg, who makes the rifles for these firearms is renowned throughout Australia. In fact, it is accepted that he is the best barrel maker for muzzle loading firearms. It is not just the actual manufacture and using of the firearm. They must be loaded, they melt down lead and mould their own projectile, and they actually locate and fit their own flint. If anyone understands how they work, it is very different from a modern firearm where you pull the trigger, there is a noise and the projectile leaves instantly. When you pull the trigger on a muzzle loading firearm, it creates the spark, the spark hits the gunpowder, it runs along a small groove and goes into the chamber, ignites the black powder in the chamber and the projectile is released.

Recently, we were at the black powder club range at Castambul and we saw Lawrie Lees and Trevor Bugg practising. I might say that they are probably more accurate with their old-fashioned equipment than I am with my modern equipment. Again, I congratulate John Humberstone and the team that went to England and competed. I can assure the member for Napier that I will do all I can to assist the Adelaide Black Powder and Muzzle Loading Club to ensure that the world championships in the year 2000 are a success. I am quite sure that the member for Playford and the Speaker will also support me.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I will make a couple of quick remarks. In fact, not all firearms which are used at the Castambul range go bang with black powder. There are modern firearms which can do the same thing. The club is a specialist black powder range and, as I understand it, trains at least half of the Australian team.

I well remember a member telling me earlier this year that these firearms would be the last that John Howard would ban. I point out that, because of the Government's intransigence with respect to the Bill that passed this place earlier this year,

flintlocks used at this firing range are considered to be at least as dangerous as high powered bolt action, lever action and pump action rifles. When sensible moves were made by the member for Florey and I to put these muskets at least in the category of repeating rifle .22s that can take and dispense 20 rounds, a very long time before someone could even prime one of them, we confirmed what we believed all along, that is, the Prime Minister and his team do not know which end of the gun goes bang.

Obviously Mr Humberstone has done us proud. I understand that some members have had discussions with the Major Events people, because this is the first time that a world championship has been held in the Southern Hemisphere. I understand that there are problems with the negotiations because some people within Major Events do not appreciate the significance of this event. I take this opportunity to make these remarks so that the Minister can kick the necessary number of backsides and to give the event some support.

Motion carried.

### FRIENDS OF PARKS

**Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson):** I move:

That this House congratulates the Friends of Parks on a successful 1996 annual conference.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak to this motion today. It was an honour to be one of the southern members of Parliament, together with Minister Wotton, who attended the twelfth annual forum (and, indeed, the first forum in the southern area of the State) of Friends of Parks in South Australia. Friends groups carry out a very vital role in the national parks system. I am the first to admit that without those friends groups a lot more work and funding would be required to maintain our parks system. In the past year, records indicate that 5 976 people attended working bees in parks. There were 430 registered projects. The monetary value of contributed time amounted to between \$3.5 million and \$4 million. This time has been contributed by people who care about the environment and who are prepared to join in the worldwide community input to help preserve our planet. In fact, South Australia has one of the highest community participation rates in environmental projects.

The theme for this year's forum was 'Human Impact on National Parks, Positive and Negative.' The host group, which was from my electorate, was the Onkaparinga Friends of Parks. The group chose this theme in an effort to promote discussion about the range of impacts that people may have on national parks. A park such as Onkaparinga is a good example, because it is the heart of a rapidly expanding urban development. Clearly, the unavoidable impact on a park needs to be well managed with community involvement in park planning, management and on-going education. The Onkaparinga friends group is to be congratulated on its leadership in this regard. I cannot express how appreciative I am of the efforts of Colin Malcolm, Gail Rees and the committee of the friends of the Onkaparinga park—not only on their professionalism and the way they organised this twelfth annual forum of Friends of Parks but also on the dedication and commitment that they have to maintaining and enhancing the Onkaparinga park.

Of course, the same can be said for all other friends groups, whether they be friends of the Simpson Desert, Innes National Park or wherever. I was disappointed that I could not spend more time at the conference, but I did have a very

busy schedule in my electorate. Certainly, when I was there on the Saturday and Sunday it reinforced to me how dedicated and committed those people are, and the fact that our national parks have a good future if we maintain the current trend of friends of parks working with DENR and in particular the Director, Alan Holmes, and all those rangers who are so committed to the parks.

I also place on record how appreciative I am of what our Environment Minister, the Hon. Mr Wotton, has done with our parks, and in particular the way he works with and supports the friends groups. In fact, it is worth noting that, whilst not very much recognition is given to the Minister for this, in a previous Liberal Government it was he who initiated Friends of Parks. There are now 5 976 people in South Australia who are involved as friends of those parks. Interestingly, at their AGM yesterday, the Noarlunga volunteers—another very good volunteer group—pointed out that 48 per cent of the GDP of Australia is contributed through volunteerism. Australia is a model that other countries look at with envy when it comes to volunteering. Clearly, volunteers are vital. The work the friends groups do is all free. Not only is it saving money directly but it is also costing money out of those people's pockets when they need the right sort of vehicles and equipment and when they go away camping, sometimes for a week at a time, to keep our parks in good order.

The Government is committed to doing whatever it can to improve and enhance our parks system in South Australia, and a range of initiatives has been put forward during this current term of office. I reinforce again that, with the size of national parks systems within South Australia and also the vast distance over which our national parks are spread right across South Australia, which we all know is a very large State, without these friends groups it would be impossible to look after our national parks. Once again I congratulate all those friends. From what I heard at the conference, it is fair to say that it was probably one of the very best that they have had. I look forward to seeing a lot more support and development in our national parks as a result of these friends groups and, as a member of Parliament, I offer them my full support.

Motion carried.

### NETBALL TEAM

**Mrs HALL (Coles):** I move:

That this House congratulates the South Australian netball team on its magnificent victory in winning the Australian Championships in Perth.

It seems that there is no holding back our State's sports teams. Women's teams in particular have performed well on the national stage of late, bringing glory and prestige and an armful of trophies back to South Australia. In women's basketball the Adelaide Quit Lightning recently racked up its third national title in a row, beating the highly fancied, much publicised and heavily backed Sydney Flames in a grand final thriller in the harbour city. Our South Australian women's volleyball team are also national champions. More recently, our McDonalds South Australian netball team broke a 13 year drought and secured the title. It is no exaggeration to suggest that the best local netball competition in the world is right here in Adelaide. Many Australian players, past and present, have made their reputations right here playing for local clubs.

There is no more intense rivalry, as we know, in any other sport than that of Contax and Garville, who battled it out again in our grand final. Shortly after, however, their elite

players put aside their allegiances to clubs and joined forces to represent South Australia. The team travelled to Perth, hot on the heels of the local season finale. An early loss was inflicted but perhaps attributable to a small dose of post-grand final blues. In any case, things got better in a hurry. Our crowdeters belted New South Wales in the semifinal before thrashing Victoria in the game that counted, the grand final. After threatening to win the title for the past few years and failing to do so, it was a determined team that contested the tournament. Many casual followers might have presumed that the loss of the Australian and State skipper, Michelle den Dekker, would have been too large to cover. While her skill and competitive spirit were unquestionably missed, the depth of talent in the South Australian team was enough for the team to record a stunning championship victory.

To the real stars in our winning team—the players—Captain Jenny Borlase, Jacqui Delaney, Audine Cobb, Rebecca Sanders, Peta Squire, Kathryn Harby, Sarah Sutter, Jane Branford, Natalie Avellino, Danielle Grant and Trudy Henderson, our warmest congratulations. Julie Francou coached the triumphant team and was ably assisted by Lyn Davey, Pat Warren, Shylie Davidson and Tony Jarrett. Our netball success extends beyond the open age category, though. South Australia currently holds the under 17 and the under 19 titles. We came third in the under 21 championships earlier this year. We have seven players in the national squad of 18 and another three more have been invited to train with that squad.

Netball has a fine tradition in South Australia. Country people are familiar with the Saturday rituals—men, boys and a few girls playing football in some rustic setting while the women and girls are out on the back court shooting a ball usually through a fairly rusty hoop. City people are probably, sometimes annoyingly, familiar with the Saturday logjam around the top of Anzac Highway as parents drop their children off for competition netball. As we now know, though, thankfully that is all soon to change. Netball is the biggest single participation sport in the State and it is finally to get its own home in the form of a new stadium at the Mile End railway yards development. The main indoor facility will house four courts of an internationally accredited standard with seating for 3 000. There will be excellent facilities for players and the media, corporate boxes and other modern conveniences.

In addition, there will be eight outdoor courts with provision for a further 26. The facility, as we know, is long overdue. Netball has grown and continued to thrive despite a lack of suitable facilities and, as the leading State in the world's leading netball nation, it is only fitting that our finest will play in a stadium worthy of their ability. Certainly, this Government is very committed to, supports and promotes the game of netball. It is a great irony that while we in South Australia are recognising the contribution made to netball by netball, the Australian Institute of Sport has decided to drop the sport from its program. Its reasoning, or more probably I might say its lack of it, is difficult to fathom. This withdrawal of support seems to be a penalty for success. Does that mean, for example, that women's hockey, cycling and other sports in which we excel will be accorded the same treatment? It would seem bizarre to me to drop the sport when Australia sits on top of the netball world and when the game is being considered for inclusion in Olympic Games. The institute has invested much time and money on track events and we have not seen a men's Olympic medal since 1968—and that success pre-dated the AIS by many years. I am no



expert in track events, but it seems apparent that the Australian Sports Institute has done very little to increase the performance in this area, yet there is no suggestion that we cut that particular program.

That failure in track events stands in sharp contrast to the success of the netball program. With netball's demise from the list of AIS anointed sports, I hope that our Minister for Sport, the Hon. Graham Ingerson, will see how, indeed if, the South Australian Sports Institute can pick this up and take the opportunity that it probably gives to South Australia. Despite its popularity and its participation rate, netball does not attract the publicity accorded to many other sports. In world terms, it is not a high profile sport. The media in South Australia does a great job with netball, and certainly much better than their counterparts in the Eastern States. They seem to do their best to ignore the game until the seasons reach their competitive climax. We still have a long way to go before netball gets the column inches and minutes on TV that the sport deserves.

There will probably be many bleary-eyed sports fans this week as a result of watching the baseball World Series. The Americans, as we know, crown the winners of their major sporting competitions as world champions. This annoys many because it ignores the reality that many of these sports are played elsewhere in the world. Still, when was the last time anybody sent a team to play those American champions and knocked them off? How many non-Americans are actually good enough to play in their competitions? It is certainly bravado on their part, but not all of it is misplaced. It is also called marketing.

Next year we will see the beginning of a new national netball competition. I suggest that we salute the winners as world champions in netball and honour them appropriately. If there are grumbles from other netball nations, so be it. Let their teams apply to join our league—or let them send players in an attempt to make our teams. Naturally, it would be more than ideal if the first world champions would be of the two teams out of Adelaide. Of course, that would come as no surprise to those who follow and understand netball. We have been world leaders here for a long time, and we are about to move further ahead.

South Australia's victories over New South Wales and Victoria were magnificent achievements in themselves, but also signals of what is to come. I ask members to join me in recognising the accomplishments of the McDonald's South Australian netball team. Their efforts and winning performances are worthy of our support.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I add my congratulations to those of the member for Coles to the South Australian netball team on its magnificent victory. I will not say very much about it, because the member for Coles has adequately covered the details of this magnificent victory. It is further evidence of South Australian athletes and teams performing well, not only at interstate but at international level. There should be support for the sports referred to by the member for Coles: I do not have time to detail them now. The great achievements by South Australian athletes, especially in recent years, would probably be, on a *pro rata* basis, the best in the world: given our small population, the achievements and performances of South Australian athletes internationally and interstate would probably rank them the best in the world. With those few remarks, I support the motion and ask members to do likewise.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

### **SOUTH EASTERN WATER CONSERVATION AND DRAINAGE (CONTRIBUTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT COMMISSION BILL**

The Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### **SHOOTING BANS**

A petition signed by 1 247 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the recreational shooting of ducks and quails was presented by Mr Foley.

Petition received.

### **MULTICULTURALISM**

A petition signed by 82 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Federal Government to give a firm commitment to the principles of multiculturalism was presented by Mr Rossi.

Petition received.

### **QUESTION**

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

#### **WIELAND, Mr R.**

In reply to **Ms WHITE (Taylor)** 2 October.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Mr Ray Wieland is contracted by the following events supported by Australian Major Events to provide operational management expertise:

- (1) World Solar Challenge
- (2) Adelaide International Horse Trials
- (3) World Cup Cycling

For ease of management, Mr Wieland is employed by AME as from 2 October 1996 but monies to cover his remuneration are contributed by each of the event budgets as listed above.

### **QUESTION TIME**

#### **AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL**

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Given that the Premier and the Minister for Transport now have copies of the Brew report regarding the future of Australian National, will the Premier release the full report before he visits Port Augusta next week and will he tell AN workers which recommendations of the report he supports and the ones that he has rejected?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is not my report and it is not for this Government to release it because it is a Federal Government report. If the Leader wants a copy of the report, I suggest he go to the Federal Government.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** They won't release it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I also understand that the trade unions have a copy. I should be very surprised—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I said, I understand that the trade unions have a copy. I suggest that the Leader go to the Federal Minister who is in charge of the report, or that he go to the unions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has had a request to allow a grievance debate after the Address in Reply has been presented to the Governor. The question whether the Chair will accede to that request depends entirely upon the conduct of members in Question Time. It is entirely in the hands of the House. The member for Norwood.

### ROXBY DOWNS

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** Will the Premier advise the House of the community benefits that will occur in regional South Australia as a consequence of the expansion of the Olympic Dam mine at Roxby Downs? I am advised that this morning the Government signed agreements with Western Mining Corporation relating to the indenture for the major development in regional South Australia.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** This morning the Deputy Premier and I signed amendments to the indenture agreement for Olympic Dam—an incredible achievement for South Australia. It is the biggest single development project this State will see for at least 10 years. It involves an investment of \$1.25 billion, which is equal to \$800 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. It will have an enormous benefit on jobs in South Australia, particularly for regional parts of the State, including Port Augusta and Whyalla.

It is estimated that the project will create 200 permanent jobs at Olympic Dam on an ongoing basis but, very importantly, it will create something like 1 000 additional direct jobs during the construction phase. Those jobs will be distributed between Adelaide and the northern parts of the State, including Olympic Dam. It will be a great boost to the building industry, because a large number of single men's quarters will be built as one of the first steps of the development. We expect the development to start on-site in about the middle of next year and, as I said, it will be an enormous boost. As part of the commitment given by the Government, a \$3.7 million medical centre will be built at Roxby Downs to service the community, and that medical centre will have 10 acute care beds.

Mr Speaker, the important thing here—apart from benefiting your community and your electorate—is the sheer proof that the South Australian Government is delivering on these major projects. Here is the major expansion to Roxby Downs we talked about before the election. In addition, driving up Mount Barker Road (South-Eastern Freeway), one sees the benefits becoming evident of the project on which we delivered but about which the former Government could only talk. One can also see work under way on the Southern Expressway, which was talked about by the previous Government for 10 years. It talked and promised but did absolutely nothing.

This Government is delivering. At the airport, the preliminary works have commenced for the extension of the runway—again a commitment of this Government. Very

shortly, across the road on North Terrace, one will see a new development project for EDS, providing a major new information technology precinct and, again, the creation of hundreds of jobs and a clear sign that this Government has the confidence of people to invest once again in South Australia.

### AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** What representation has the Premier made to John Howard over the scrapping of a special 12-month retaining program for workers retrenched from Australian National—a program which is vital to the future of the people and the City of Port Augusta?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The State Government has set up a task force to work through all these problems with the Federal Government. The Minister for Transport is chair of that task force, in which the unions are involved. Meetings have already been held at Port Augusta dealing with a number of the issues. I know that the Minister, as chair of that task force, is taking up a number of those issues with the Federal Minister John Sharp.

### ROXBY DOWNS

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Will the Minister for Mines and Energy inform the House of the nature of agreements that have been reached with Western Mining Corporation on changes to the indenture agreement which controls the operation of the Olympic Dam mine? I note that a short while ago the Minister gave notice that he will introduce a Bill to amend the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982. His announcement follows an earlier decision by Western Mining Corporation to go ahead with a \$1.25 billion expansion of the Olympic Dam copper, gold, silver and uranium mine.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The Premier has already outlined the importance of this development to the future of this State, and that, together with our exploration effort, augurs well for our mining industry, which has lagged well behind all other States until now. As members would know from the press statements that have already been made, the capacity of Roxby Downs to provide product of the order of 350 000 tonnes of copper is now taken under this indenture agreement. The previous agreement of 150 000 tonnes of product has been increased to 350 000 tonnes, with the expectation that Roxby Downs itself will produce some 200 000 tonnes over the next five years.

The reason for the indenture change is obvious: the resources that are available to Roxby Downs at the moment cannot cope with that sort of demand on them. The indenture facilitates change in a number of important areas, including a change in the capacity to provide power to Roxby Downs. As members would recognise, a 150 megawatt line goes from Port Augusta to Olympic Dam, but Western Mining wants to have a higher capacity of up to 250 megawatts, and the indenture facilitates that arrangement. Of course, any building or purchase of power off that system will have to be at commercial prices.

In terms of alternative power sources, Western Mining has also indicated that it may wish to utilise gas, and the Government has said that it will use its best endeavours to facilitate the provision of gas, simply by allowing a pipeline to stretch from the Cooper Basin to the Olympic Dam development.

That is only a facilitation. Again, if any pipeline is laid or gas is supplied, it will be subject to the vagaries of the commercial market.

Another issue is whether Roxby Downs should have potable water. The Government has stated that, provided all those things are negotiated at commercial values, namely, the water licence itself and the purchase price of water, it is willing to facilitate that provision to Roxby Downs. It reinforces the extent to which the Government will achieve royalty from the development, and a royalty of 3.5 per cent will apply to the product output at the mine gate. Under the indenture, should other ore be allowed to be shipped into Roxby for processing, namely in the form of copper aggregate, and if that is mined in South Australia, the full royalty will apply to that processed mineral.

A number of other changes have been made to update the indenture and agreements that have been in place for some years, and we will now have a more modern and more appropriate indenture upon which the future development of Roxby Downs can proceed. We are delighted with the negotiations, which have been carried out in a very efficient fashion. They were hard but well negotiated, and I believe that both parties can be well satisfied with the outcome.

#### GRIFFIN PRESS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** In light of the Howard Government's decision to remove the bounty on book production, what action is the Premier taking to prevent the possible loss of hundreds of jobs from the Griffin Press company? The Howard Government has decided to remove the book bounty by the end of this year. A total of 80 per cent of the value of the bounty in South Australia supports Griffin Press, one of the existing industries that has helped build our State.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have raised the removal of this bounty with the Federal Government and the Prime Minister, in particular. I asked him to look at the impact this decision would have on the printing industry in South Australia, and I know that other States have made similar cases. I have yet to receive a response from the Prime Minister.

#### PLAYFORD HOTEL

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** Will the Premier advise the House of details of a new international hotel development announced for the centre of Adelaide this morning and how that development fits into the Government's vision for the rebuilding of industry and commerce in the heart of Adelaide? I understand that, this morning, the Singapore-based company Provisions Suppliers Corporation announced that, in conjunction with an Australian company, Hotel Management Consultants Pty Ltd, it would build a new hotel on the site of the former News building on North Terrace.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Further proof that this Government is delivering is that, this morning, an announcement was made by Provisions Suppliers Corporation that it intends to build a five-star, 180 apartment hotel on North Terrace. It will be located immediately east of the EDS building; therefore, immediately east of the new information technology precinct. It will be part of a very significant development (almost \$100 million worth of development) in that area. Car parking for 200 vehicles will be located immediately behind the EDS building as part of the hotel

development. A number of those car parks will be leased to the occupants of the EDS building.

This is another very significant development for Adelaide. As I said, combined with the EDS building, approximately \$100 million worth of development will occur in that part of North Terrace. I understand that the city council has put aside some money for streetscaping immediately in front of this area, which will be a further significant improvement. This development will be very significant in attracting a new range of tourists to South Australia. Here is a corporation which has a number of interests around the world, particularly in South-East Asia, and which is very keen to use this hotel to sell tourism packages to the people of Singapore, Malaysia, and other areas of South-East Asia.

That will be very good in further boosting tourism in South Australia. This announcement comes on top of a very substantial development that has already taken place at Wirrina. I understand that over \$60 million has now been committed at Wirrina, and one has only to look at the scope of the development there to appreciate that it is a fantastic complex. It will be the first integrated resort outside the whole of Queensland, and we now have this new development in the centre of Adelaide. I understand that the hotel developers are specifically looking at attracting golfers and other people interested in recreation to stay at this hotel, as well as linking it into the EDS development.

Already talks are taking place between the developers and EDS about the use of the new hotel and how it can be used as part of this international development. It is also appropriate to indicate to the House that the new hotel complex will be called the Playford Hotel. It is very appropriate that the new hotel is to be named after a great Premier of South Australia. In the one-hundredth year of his birth, we have the announcement of a new hotel named after Sir Thomas Playford—the Playford Hotel.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition on the radio this morning knocking the developments of this Government. The Leader of the Opposition knocks every new venture we attract to this State. It will be interesting because he has been knocking the fact that we are about to invest \$70 million in a major new complex for information technology and, no doubt, he will again knock this major new tourism development in Adelaide. It is quite clear that, despite the Leader of the Opposition's public statements that he wants to take a positive stance, every time we come out with an announcement he is out there wanting to knock it. It is no wonder members opposite are known as knockers around the State, and it is no wonder that they could not achieve any development when last in government.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Given the Minister of Health's statements that the contract with Healthscope to manage Modbury Hospital showed that the Government had 'out-negotiated the private sector', why has the Government now agreed to renegotiate key financial elements of the contract? On 27 June the Minister told the House:

If the private providers' return from the contract is unsatisfactory, that means that the contract that the Government wrote is a very tight one for the private sector; clearly, that is the implication. It is not a matter of its being an unsatisfactory contract.

A Health Commission document dated 15 October 1996 entitled 'Managing the Public-Private Interface' states that the Government will renegotiate key contract provisions that

impact on how much the Government pays Healthscope. These include a renegotiated definition of 'workload', a renegotiated specification for calculating the price of the services and a new process for dispute resolution.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I draw the attention of the House to my answer to a question from the member for Reynell yesterday which indicated that the ALP's loosely-cobbled together policy document released at the weekend involved a number of exercises where it was, in fact, proselytising the virtues of the public and private sector producing services in the health area to ensure that public services were increased and benefited. That is exactly what is happening here. A number of new procedures are being made available throughout the world at a pleasingly but incredibly rapid rate, and that means that, in fact, there are a number of opportunities to improve the way services are provided. That is exactly what we are looking at.

For instance, there are a number of discussions about intensive care and other new services on which we will make sure we are able to capitalise and from which we will make sure the people of the north-eastern suburbs who attend the Modbury Public Hospital benefit. As I have said to this House on many occasions, the opportunity to capitalise on new technology means that the world of health care is ever changing. I assure the House and people from the north-eastern suburbs that that is what we will continue to do in any discussions that we have with Healthscope.

I remind members opposite that the bottom line in the Healthscope Modbury Public Hospital exercise—and I do not even need to remind the people who live in the north-eastern suburbs because they already know—is that 97.9 per cent of people who attend that hospital are completely satisfied and would recommend going to that hospital to their relatives and to their friends. So, that is a great satisfaction level. As I indicated in a report which I tabled several weeks ago, the taxpayer of South Australia has benefited to the tune of \$7 million.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** Will the Minister for Infrastructure report to the House any progress on the sale and upgrade of Adelaide Airport in the light of recent proposals being prepared for the sale of airports interstate?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, there has been positive progress in relation to the Adelaide Airport terminal and its upgrade. Since Barry Murphy took over as Chair of the Federal Airports Corporation (FAC), we have with the FAC a very cooperative body which is working with officers of the Department of Manufacturing Industry to bring about a combined domestic-international new terminal building. At a Federal Cabinet meeting in Adelaide on Tuesday, following a meeting called by the Premier with Minister Sharp, the Federal Minister for Transport clearly stated that he would assist us in the process of the extensions of the runway and in facilitating the assessment of the new domestic international terminal.

There is no doubt that both the runway and the terminal buildings need upgrading, because South Australia's international image and competitiveness are on show for people from interstate and overseas. It is a prime gateway and clearly gives first impressions regarding tourism in South Australia. The Federal Airports Corporation, which currently has the lease of the airport, has appointed a project manager to progress the scheme. The original configuration undertaken

by the department which was presented to Ansett and Qantas and which is now their preferred option is being considered by the project manager and the FAC team. That brief is to take the concept designs that we have prepared and move them to commercial negotiations with a view to concluding them by the first quarter of calendar year 1997. At that point the FAC would be in a position to recommend that the Federal Government airport sales task force proceed with the leasing of Adelaide Airport.

Of course, that will depend on the willingness and cooperation of the two major domestic carriers, Qantas and Ansett. They have signed a standstill agreement in which they are cooperating with the State Government and the FAC to look at working towards this new integrated domestic international terminal and to get well beyond the two tin sheds that we currently have at Adelaide Airport.

Last week I wrote to both the Federal Finance Minister John Fahey and Transport Minister John Sharp indicating the progress to date and thanking them for the support that Barry Murphy and FAC officers are now giving us in developing the proposal. We sought assurances that the Adelaide bid was being seriously considered—and I certainly had that verbal assurance from Minister Sharp—and that there will be diversity of lessees across airports and a need to develop a strong, independent, competitive growth in airports across Australia, that is, that the interests of regional economies are taken into account in any subsequent leasing arrangements. I am pleased to say that a cooperative base has been established between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments. The matter is being progressed expeditiously, and I am positive that the outcome will be in the interests of South Australia.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Does the Minister for Health agree with a decision by Healthscope at Modbury Hospital that members of Parliament who seek treatment for a constituent should nominate who should be taken off the waiting list; and does he condone this style of management for a public hospital? In a letter sent to members of Parliament, the head of Healthscope's Orthopaedic Department at Modbury Hospital, Mr Robert Atkinson, has suggested that, if members of Parliament have any ideas for managing what he describes as 'limited resources' for dealing with the orthopaedics waiting lists, he would like to hear from them. Mr Atkinson states:

If you believe that a patient who approaches you has a case, we would wish you to choose which patient who is on the list is taken off, in order for the patient who you are supporting to be moved further up.

Statistics to June 1996 show that, compared with other South Australian hospitals, the Modbury Hospital's orthopaedics list had the longest median waiting time of 19 weeks and the highest average turn-around time of 4.4 months.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Commenting is out of order. The Minister for Health.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** What one can do with selective quoting! I would ask the member for Elizabeth at some stage to read into *Hansard* the whole of Mr Atkinson's letter. I do not have it with me now but I have seen it and, in essence, what he talks about at the end of the letter is how annoyed he is at the fact that Healthscope, Modbury Hospital, surgeons, medical staff, nurses, and so on, are doing such an excellent job and how they have increased the number of

operations is never given any publicity by the Labor Party. One can only wonder why the Labor Party and its compatriots—and by that I mean the people from the Modbury Hospital local action group who during the Federal election authorised anti-Liberal Party advertisements—are not telling the full story about how the number of patients—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:**—who are being seen at Modbury Hospital is increasing. One can only assume that it is for their own political reasons. The simple fact of the matter is that the number of patients being seen at Modbury Hospital has increased: it is as simple as that. If the Opposition chooses not to acknowledge that, so be it. The facts are that for the period from 6 February 1995 to 30 June 1996 there were 2 882 weighted inpatient separations in excess of the target number as defined in the contract. That is the inpatient separations.

I acknowledge that there was a decrease in the number of outpatient occasions of service but, if you equilibrate those, that translates into 124 weighted inpatient separations. If you subtract 124 weighted inpatient separations as the equivalent of the decrease in outpatients from the 2 882 weighted inpatient separations, what you have incontrovertibly is that in the period from 6 February 1995 to 30 June 1996 Modbury Public Hospital activity was 2 758 weighted inpatient separations in excess of the target number as defined in the contract. Not only that: 97.9 per cent of the people who went there, including the 2 758 increase, were satisfied with the service, and every taxpayer in South Australia benefited to the tune of \$7 million.

#### MOUNT LOFTY

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Given that the Tourism Commission has recently launched a major campaign promoting conservation areas, what steps have been put in place to safeguard these areas, and what role will the new Mount Lofty summit development play in the promotion of ecotourism?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am very pleased to be able to answer this important question. I think that most members of the House recognise the growing potential of ecotourism in South Australia, a State which has many natural attractions to offer visitors. Ecotourism, we would also recognise, is also important to South Australia because of obvious economic and job creation opportunities. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that ecotourism also plays another role, and that is an important role in educating visitors and locals of the need to develop a stronger conservation ethic and to better appreciate our unique environment so that those areas are protected for future enjoyment.

Many millions of dollars have been spent in South Australia to provide infrastructure that is adding to visitor comfort and enjoyment. Provision of better roads, boardwalks, carparks, information centres and viewing areas have done much to alleviate pressure of indiscriminate activities in our parks and reserves. In fact, two major South Australian attractions have been singled out as prime examples where nature and tourism are working closely in harmony. I refer to the Seal Bay Visitor Centre on Kangaroo Island and the recently completed Naracoorte bat cave project, both of which have been featured in a collection of tourism management success stories launched by the Federal

Minister for Industry, Science and Tourism. They are two excellent projects. The World Heritage listed Naracoorte bat cave project allows 50 000 visitors a year to view one of the biggest populations of bats through a hi-tech video system using remote controlled cameras and infra-red lighting.

The Seal Bay Visitor Centre on Kangaroo Island, complete with its new boardwalks and information facilities, will provide a unique opportunity for 120 000 visitors a year to come face to face with rare Australian sea lions while at the same time protecting their breeding habitats and sand dunes. Not only are these projects helping to protect the environment, but they contribute substantially to economic activity and job creation in this State. I point out that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources is now Kangaroo Island's single biggest employer.

The member for Davenport specifically mentioned the Mount Lofty summit development. This development will play a significant role in helping to promote ecotourism and our national parks, providing a window to the rest of South Australia as well. This will be achieved by installing the latest information technology with large video screens, enabling visitors to call up information on our parks and ecotourism facilities such as Kangaroo Island, the Naracoorte caves and our new whale park at the head of the Bight. These video screens will be part of the interpretive facility being built in conjunction with the new bistro, which will feature tourist attractions together with a strong conservation message.

With about 500 000 tourists expected to visit the facility each year, the Mount Lofty development will be a valuable addition to serve as a window to South Australia by promoting the State, its various locations and what they have to offer. The opportunities to promote South Australia through the Mount Lofty summit development are enormous. The Minister for Tourism and I are looking forward to the opening of the facility later this year and to the opportunities it will bring to South Australia.

#### EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Unley and the Deputy Premier to order.

**Mr FOLEY:** Thank you, Sir. Under the computer outsourcing contract with EDS, what financial and other obligations exist between the Government and EDS involving accommodation arrangements for the data management centre?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am not quite sure what the honourable member means by 'financial and other obligations'. There are no specific financial obligations whatsoever. It was up to EDS to choose a site and it did. It had to consult the Government and the Government had to be satisfied with the proposed site. EDS has chosen a site, which I think is the best site as it has argued the case. Yesterday I gave the five reasons why EDS has selected that site. It is a very attractive deal for South Australia, but the Leader of the Opposition was running around this morning knocking this project.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** We will make sure that all the workers on the site clearly understand that the Labor Party of South Australia is opposed to this development going ahead, whereas the Liberal Government will be out there—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The member for Hart raised Bannon. I guess he wants to draw a comparison between the REMM development—

**Mr Foley:** The ASER development.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—or the ASER development—REMM or ASER—and this development. There is a huge difference. With REMM and ASER the State Government was effectively carrying the full risk.

**An honourable member:** That's what you're doing.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** We are not.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Hart to order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Here there are back-to-back lease agreements which take the risk away from the Government.

**Mr Foley:** For seven years.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** For the other eight years it will be a condition for the continuation of this contract with any party that takes on the data outsourcing for the Government. Therefore, there is no risk. There are back-to-back leases. Even though the member was an adviser to the previous Labor Government, he is so thick that he cannot understand it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** At no stage did John Bannon have back-to-back leases. What was done with the ASER and REMM developments was entirely different. Frankly, if the member for Hart cannot pick that, he is not fit to be a Minister in any future Government in this State.

## ROAD TOLL

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Minister for Police inform the House of the initiatives that the Government is considering to reduce the road toll in South Australia?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the member for Reynell for her question because I know she is concerned about speedsters. I should like to address the question of 'not giving a damn'. I have heard from the member for Playford and now the Hon. Terry Cameron that they do not want speeding fines. The implication is that they want us to catch the alcoholics and leave the speedsters alone. They say that we should not be raising revenue by catching people for speeding. That is the level of intelligence offered by the member for Playford and the Hon. Terry Cameron. I should have thought that they knew a lot better, but they do not.

As regards the effort on the road, I do not feel that we have really come up to the mark. In 1991-92, under the former Government, there were 245 788 infringement offences and we collected \$20.2 million in revenue. Last year there were 193 302 infringement offences—more than 20 per cent less—and revenue was only \$18.99 million. I believe that I have let down the community: there has not been enough effort in this important area.

We are not about to give lollipops to speedsters, which is what the Opposition is suggesting. It suggests that we should not raise any revenue through speeding fines. I do not know how it will reward or chastise them, but there are some very serious implications in the Opposition's protestations. I should like to read into the report details of some of the incidents over the last month which have been captured on camera. These incidents involve cars travelling at more than

40 km/h above the speed limit. If Opposition members cannot see that they are putting lives in danger, they should not be in this Parliament. They are suggesting that we should let the motorists in question off—give them a lollipop!

On 25 September 1996, Port Wakefield Road at Greenfield, 128 km/h; and 1 October at Fitzroy Terrace, North Adelaide, 114 km/h (this is in a 60 km/h speed zone); 11 October, on Daws Road, Daw Park (near where I live) 124 km/h; 16 October, Grange Road, Kidman Park, 118 km/h; 18 October, on Port Elliott Road, Hayborough, 118 km/h; in an 80 km/h speed limit on Main South Road, O'Halloran Hill, 135 km/h; and 20 October, Marion Road, Brooklyn Park, 117 km/h. There were 56 incidents captured by camera, apart from all the other incidents where cameras were not operating. If the Opposition is really serious about road safety, it should look at the road toll and some of the trauma caused and not complain about the fines—in fact, the fines are too low. It is time for an all out war on speeding, and we do need some of these whole of Government initiatives.

In order to come up with a coordinated campaign, there will be a greater targeting of speeding—including the issue of whether demerit points should be imposed on those people caught speeding by camera—and drink driving (and at least the Opposition said it supports that). Also we will look at educational programs, the quality of advertising on television, the penalties that prevail and positive reinforcement. This Government will come up with a total package. We must remember that 10 years ago Victoria's road toll was worse than ours. Now it is considerably better than ours. We have had a look at some of the initiatives taken in Victoria and, while some of them may not be palatable, they are effective. We intend to get the road toll down and save lives on the road, even if the Opposition wants to play political games.

## EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Those on my right.

**Mr FOLEY:** What is the difference in cost to the Government of the decision to enter into a 15 year head lease on the 11 storey building on North Terrace that will accommodate EDS rather than locating EDS at Technology Park, Salisbury as the Premier announced on 30 October last year?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The analysis of the Government was that it was cheaper for the Government for EDS to put its building on North Terrace than it was under the proposal to put it at Technology Park. It was cheaper at North Terrace, because at North Terrace the Government was not indirectly underwriting the cost of the building, therefore, reducing the cost. I can give the honourable member the details in broad terms. It is likely to be about \$4 million to \$5 million cheaper for the Government, because there is none of the sorts of costs that were otherwise being carried at Technology Park. The honourable member has raised this because he has been out there arguing this case. An analysis has been done, and we picked the cheapest venture for the Government. EDS is carrying a back to back lease on this; therefore, there is no exposure to the Government whatsoever.

### MEDIC ALERT

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** Will the Minister for Health inform the House whether private organisations can effectively engage in medical information provision?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Kaurna for her important question. This week celebrates the success of one of the most longstanding collaborations of the private sector providing information in the medical area as it is the twenty-fifth anniversary of Medic Alert. As a number of members in the House would know, Medic Alert is an international non-profit organisation that provides personal medical information and identification via a 24-hour, 7 day a week telephone service link to a computer database. Its national headquarters is based in Adelaide, and it is linked through 23 affiliated networks in 40 countries around the world. There are over four million Medic Alert members world-wide. Over 100 000 Australians and over 70 000 South Australians have been enrolled since 1971. In fact, on a *per capita* basis, our percentage of members is the highest in the world. That is not a reason for complacency, because I am informed that two million Australians have special needs, be they allergies, chronic medical conditions, disabilities, implants, being on medication, and so on.

It would certainly assist ambulance and emergency personnel if more people took out individual Medic Alert membership which can obviously be vitally important, in the truest sense of the word, when a patient is unable to communicate information or when no next of kin is present. The Medic Alert emblem itself is proudly South Australian. It is locally manufactured and exported to Fiji, Malaysia and New Zealand. The cost is kept to an absolute minimum—a one-off payment lasts for a lifetime, with no annual fee.

Recently Medic Alert was appointed as the register for the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act, following this Chamber's agreement to put that into the Bill following a deadlock conference. So, those people who choose to do so can be registered at a central location. The Medic Alert bracelet system is extraordinarily good, and it is a simple fact that the more people who are enrolled the better. I urge everyone with a medical condition to enrol because, put simply, Medic Alert prevents emergencies from becoming tragedies.

### FIREARMS

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Does the Minister for Police still remain opposed to compensation for unregistered semiautomatic long arms in this State? Is this stance supported by the Prime Minister, or has the Prime Minister demanded otherwise, as a result of the Commonwealth agreeing to pick up all the costs associated with the buy back?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** We outlined the policy previously on how we were going to handle the buy back system. I pay tribute to the Police Department for the way it has handled the whole situation. We now have the strongest returns of any State on a *per capita* basis: 30 000 firearms have been returned. We are more advanced than any other State. I know that, when the matter was previously discussed at a Police Minister's conference, we said, 'We have the best licensing and registration system in Australia; we can get mobile; we can get our legislation through; and we can dispense with this earlier than everybody else.' One reason we dispensed with it earlier than everybody else was that I

would not put up with truckloads of illegal firearms coming across our border.

If the member for Playford thinks that I should have our good police officers of the State tied up day after day when we have some of the greatest scoundrels yet to be caught from Queensland and New South Wales—and they have already been operating in Victoria—shifting all their illegal firearms across the border, he has another think coming. That might have been the way the former Government operated, but at least we take some strategic decision. I suggest that in this State we do it particularly well because we put a lot of thought into it. In terms of illegal firearms, I quite clearly indicated that my first point of call was no compensation—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Just wait for my second point of call. My first point of call is no compensation for illegal firearms. The Prime Minister has asked us to reconsider our view on illegal firearms. We have said that we are not willing to reconsider until all the schemes are operational around the whole of Australia so that we do not cop all the illegal weapons and become a dumping ground. That is a reasonable compromise, which I am sure the member for Playford would recognise.

### AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House whether the Government needs to make any changes to our agricultural policies following recent public announcements by the ALP?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I, too, have seen a copy of the policy, and it certainly makes interesting reading. I thought I should share with my colleagues some of the insights of the Labor Party policy release and point out some of the inaccuracies in the document. Obviously the Deputy Leader, who rightly claims to have an immense knowledge of agricultural issues, had very little input.

The Opposition forgets that, while it was in office, the portfolio of primary industries was treated with some contempt. In fact, it used it to lock away Independent support in the House. That Minister turned out to be one of the better ones, largely because he took advice from colleagues on this side. Under the Labor regime, the Department of Primary Industries suffered numerous cutbacks, and I find it amazing that Opposition members talk about this Government ignoring country areas. They are ignoring the facts.

Let us look at some of the ideas and statements that were put forward at the weekend. The document refers to poor agricultural and irrigation practices which are reducing productivity. That assessment is at least 10 years out of date. Massive inroads have been made in that area and productivity has grown markedly, with record yields in grains, wine grapes and horticulture, and that has contributed an enormous amount to the South Australian economy.

The document states that agriculture has led to significant environmental degradation. Once again, that statement is years out of date. The Landcare movement in South Australia has been a howling success and we now have over 300 groups. We have seen minimum tillage, shelter belts and many other techniques put into place by our farming community. Farming is more sustainable now than it has ever been. The soil structure is improving markedly. Smart farming is quickly rehabilitating the damage that was done by inferior practice, and not only the ALP but many in the community fail to give farmers anywhere near the amount of

credit they deserve for their efforts for more sustainable agriculture and helping the environment.

We read of threats from weeds, pests and diseases. South Australia has won the Cooperative Research Centre for Weed Management; RCV is wiping out rabbits; and we have played a major part in the review of AQIS, with input from South Australian farmer of the year Andrew Inglis and PISA's Peter Allen. In the past few days, there was a quick response to the anthracnose outbreak on Eyre Peninsula, where a terrific effort has been made by PISA and the farming community of Lower Eyre Peninsula.

On the issue of sheep lice, the Labor Party has missed the point again. Mr Speaker, in the past day or so, you may have heard the ALP candidate for Stuart talking about the sheep lice problem, and putting forward a simple solution to a complex problem. If that solution were taken up, it would create enormous problems for the industry through residue and resistance problems.

The Opposition also spoke about the need for micro-economic reform, which is a path down which this Government and the Federal Liberal Government are heading, but we also need to focus on macroeconomic reform. The impact of high labour costs can be seen in the beef industry and in some of our value-adding industry. The beef industry overseas has been destroyed because of high labour costs here and, quite frankly, the unions just do not care. To them, maintenance of the outdated award seems to be far more important than the local jobs that are being lost because of that award.

We also read of the Labor Party promoting increased production. Once again, that has been done, but it misses the point because we must become more market-pulled than production-driven. They also raise the issue of supporting rural adjustment schemes, but all the Labor Government gave us before were welfare schemes; and, with hindsight, it is widely recognised in the rural communities that we got no value for the dollars that were put in. It is important not to rely on welfare band-aids. Adjustment is about finding a cure and enabling farmers to become far more self-reliant, with the aim of long-term viability.

It is worth noting that South Australia leads the nation in property management planning. Farmers are keen to do the course so, once again, the Opposition is off the mark. With its policies, the ALP would alienate farmers and regional South Australia. I find this document proof of how out of touch Labor members are with mainstream rural South Australia.

## FIREARMS

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Now that he has announced that there is a change of policy, will all those persons who have surrendered semiautomatics in this State on the assumption that they would not be compensated now be compensated for surrendering those weapons?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** There has been no change in policy. I said to the House that I will consider the Prime Minister's request when every State has its scheme up and running, and that means I will consider it. It does not mean that I will agree, so the honourable member should get it right.

## AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** Will the Minister for Emergency Services provide a progress report on the continuation of the reform process taking place within the South Australian Ambulance Service to make it one of the most renowned ambulance services in the country?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I thank the member for Hanson for his question and I acknowledge his strong support for some very positive changes that have occurred in the ambulance service in South Australia. They are changes of which this Government is extremely proud but, more importantly, they are changes of which the ambulance service staff themselves are extremely proud.

Two weeks ago I had the privilege of officiating at a graduation ceremony of two distinct groups of ambulance service staff and, afterwards, I had the opportunity to talk to a number of staff. The comments made by one of those ambulance officers are particularly relevant. That staff member had worked for an interstate ambulance service prior to transferring to South Australia to work for our ambulance service. That staff member had worked for almost two years under the previous Labor Government and is now working under the Liberal Government. He volunteered to me that he had a particular concern about the changes that were made in the first 12 months of this Government and about the direction the ambulance service was taking.

In fact, he went so far as to say that it was his concern that the ambulance service in this State had the potential to be ruined. That staff member volunteered that his view of the ambulance service today is very different, and so was that of the staff present at the time. However, along with his workmates he believes that we have the best ambulance service in Australia, based on his experience in other States. That view was echoed by many other staff to whom I spoke that night and by others to whom I have spoken since and prior to that night.

On that night, I handed out graduation certificates to the third group of paramedic graduates in South Australia, and those professionals have now joined an advanced emergency care group who have been taught in South Australia. A further 20 paramedics are under training at this time. By the turn of the century, it is this Government's aim to have a paramedic officer riding in every South Australian ambulance emergency vehicle in the metropolitan area, as well as in our major regional centres. That means that we will have 105 paramedics in South Australia by the year 2000.

The second group of 22 graduates on the night were those who had successfully completed a Diploma in Applied Science in ambulance studies, a professional qualification and professional recognition of their work in the ambulance service, and a professional recognition that was not there before. Under this Government, the ambulance service is moving forward in South Australia.

## PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** My question is directed to the Minister for Local Government Relations. What provisions are made by the State Government to allow its employees to participate in the affairs of local government? I have been approached by a councillor who is also a State Government employee. This person has been refused use of time off in lieu entitlements as well as annual leave entitlement provisions to attend a monthly council meeting.



**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I do not know the details of the situation to which the honourable member refers. If she likes to see me—

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** What the honourable member has told me surprises me greatly. I would like to know the specific details of the incident to which the honourable member refers. If she gives that to me, I assure her that I will investigate that matter. All I can say at the moment is that the information that she has provided surprises me greatly.

---

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that his Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the Speaker and honourable members for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 3.15 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and the seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting this Address.

*[Sitting suspended from 3.5 to 3.50 p.m.]*

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by the House on 16 October, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the honourable Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the fourth session of the forty-eighth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I refer today to a very important issue. Last week this House supported the Premier's motion condemning attacks on multiculturalism and indigenous people. That motion was moved with reference to members in other States. We have a problem in our own backyard and to not speak about the comments made by the technical mayor of Port Lincoln would be negligent of us as a Parliament. I join with members today in congratulating the courageous stand of the nine council members who resigned in disgust over the remarks made by Port Lincoln Mayor, Peter Davis.

The councillors—Rod Cox, Gordon Hartley, Graham Mantle, Chris Marshall, Allan Reynolds, Greg Anderson, Eric Russell, Wes Trotman and Jill Parker—should be congratulated for taking a stand on this important issue, and I know that I speak on behalf of all members. I speak as an Australian and as a South Australia although, given his comments, the technical mayor of Port Lincoln would not put me in that category. However, I can assure members and the technical mayor of Port Lincoln that I have been elected to this place by greater numbers than he has.

I find it ironic that he has been elected to local government by ratepayers who might not necessarily be Australian citizens—no doubt that would be the case in Port Lincoln and other areas. I very much doubt that, when he was elected, he inquired whether or not the ratepayers were Australian citizens. It was good enough that ratepayers elected him mayor. I find it unbelievable and hypocritical that members are quite prepared to take the contributions but are not prepared to make a stand and accept people as they are. I wrote a piece about four or five years ago at a high school in which I was teaching and which represented a broad section of the community. It is entitled 'Australian', as follows:

It's not determined by colour and blood  
By class, religion or past  
Whether we came or were born  
We all have a right to call it our own.  
It's this that makes us great  
A spectrum of humanity and rights  
For we are many yet one  
Our ideals are second to none  
Our identity like the dreaming  
Has a past, present and future all rolled into one  
Our face is changing and yet unchangeable  
Our future is shaped by this humanity  
We are sometimes referred to Italians and Greeks,  
Poles, Aborigines, English and Micks  
But none of these can really stick  
For we are all part of something old and new  
We are all Australian!

If the Mayor of Port Lincoln looked at what is behind those sentiments, he would have a change of heart.

**Mr Lewis:** If he had a heart.

**Mr SCALZI:** Well, when Mother Theresa was asked about someone who did not seem to have a heart she said, 'He is a very distressed Christ.' I believe there is hope in all of us, including the Mayor of Port Lincoln. If we resorted to saying that the Mayor does not have a heart, it would mean that we were negligent in indicating the best part of humanity. Hopefully, the Mayor of Port Lincoln, like everyone else, can be redeemed. It is important that we condemn his statements and that we speak out in support of our true multicultural society. A grafted tree bears the best fruit.

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

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Today in Question Time I asked the Minister for Health questions about Modbury Hospital. I want to put on the record a letter I received on Monday this week, as follows:

To the member for Elizabeth,

I would like to draw your attention to what I consider to be a problem at Modbury Hospital—my own personal experience.

I have suffered from arthritis for some time now and my GP referred me to see Dr Sheppard, the visiting rheumatologist at Modbury. He had a look at my condition and referred me to Dr Atkinson, the orthopaedic surgeon. I was amazed when I was given my appointment card. The waiting time was nearly eight months. I waited patiently until the day came, and there was no Dr Atkinson. I found out when a report was sent to my GP that I had been examined by an intern who suggested that I should have knee replacement. My GP was angry and told me to go back and demand to see Dr Atkinson. I went back to Dr Sheppard. He also was angry when I told him what had happened. He took me to the administrator's office. There was some argument in his office, and Dr Sheppard left.

I was then told there had been a mix-up and I was assured I would see Dr Atkinson and he ordered an appointment that took another two months. I attended that appointment and was attended by a registrar, not Dr Atkinson. At this point I told him I was assured I would see Dr Atkinson. He said, 'If you want to see him, you go to his rooms and pay the money.' I did my block and walked out. I

went straight up to the admin office and complained. At this time it was explained to me that I don't understand the rules. Dr Atkinson can run his clinic any way he wants. I made another appointment with Dr Sheppard. When I explained what happened he said, 'Look, I think it best to get you out of this hospital. I will get you into the Adelaide.' He went and made an appointment. When he returned he sat down and we chatted for a few minutes. He suggested that I should contact somebody and complain about all of this carry-on. He said that he had written letters but didn't think that they could be taken much notice of. Yours faithfully, Brian Smith.

The other point I made earlier this afternoon related to orthopaedics at Modbury Hospital. I will revisit the figures. In relation to orthopaedics, Modbury Hospital is the worst performing hospital in our metropolitan area. There is a 7.1 month clearance time at Modbury Hospital in the speciality of orthopaedics. This compares with 1.2 at the Women's and Children's Hospital; 4.9 at the RAH; 3.7 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; 4.6 at Flinders Medical Centre; and .3 at Lyell McEwin. In terms of all surgical procedures, again, Modbury has the highest average turnaround time in months. It takes longest at Modbury—4.4 months—to clear the surgical lists. This is the hospital that the Minister continues to hold up as the shining light of his time as Minister for Health.

The Minister continually quotes to us a 97.5 per cent satisfaction rate from a patient survey. I would be very surprised to hear of any survey with a 97.5 per cent satisfaction rate, particularly in the health system, but this is what the Minister holds up day after day. I have just given one example—perhaps that was in the 3 per cent who were not satisfied—but we know that there are many others. Let us be quite clear about this: if the private management of Modbury Hospital were so successful, why is it that in the statistics it comes last?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Napier.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I want to speak today about an application to establish a bistro in a shopping centre at Craigmore. This bistro would incorporate a number of poker machines. I should explain to members a little about the Craigmore shopping centre. It is a relatively small, local shopping centre with one supermarket, one greengrocery and a couple of other specialty shops such as a newsagent, a snack bar, and so on. So, we are not talking about a major shopping centre by any means, but there are several vacant shops in that area, one of which is quite large, and it is proposed to open a small bistro with poker machines. That application was rejected by council, and I have been contacted by a number of shop owners in the shopping centre and people in the area to complain about the installation of gambling and poker machines in a small shopping centre. I must say I have to agree with those complainants. This shopping centre is right at the back of a primary school and is in the middle of a mainly suburban area. I believe that poker machines have no place whatsoever in such a shopping area.

I am not opposed to poker machines as such. I was not here when the legislation was debated, but I believe I would have voted for it. Poker machines have been good for the local hotels and, on the whole, for our area. The hotels have been refurbished, and people can now go to a very pleasant hotel, get a good cheap meal and have a sociable time at lunch-time or in the evening. The people who play poker machines are not those whom you would not want around your area: they are ordinary people like us, but I do not

believe that gambling of any sort belongs in a small, local shopping centre.

I understand that the intention of the legislation was to allow poker machines not in such areas but in hotels and clubs. The legislation does not specifically exclude poker machines from any shopping centre; I understand that, as long as they are on licensed premises, an application to install poker machines is perfectly valid. But I find it distressing to think that you could walk in to buy your weekly groceries or have a snack and maybe get distracted by the thought of gambling a little of that money. There are enough temptations for people who are inclined to gamble a little more than they should, without putting these gambling machines right in the place where they would need to go to do their ordinary weekly shopping. It is worth bringing up in this House that this sort of thing that is happening, and I register my concern, as have residents all through the council area, at the prospect of having this bistro and poker machines in a shopping centre.

I applaud members of the council for rejecting the application. I believe the appeal is currently before the Development Assessment Commission, and I only hope that the outcome of that appeal is within the spirit of the legislation that was originally passed. I emphasise again that I have no particular objection to gaming but, just like we place various functions in appropriate places through our planning laws, I believe that we should be entitled to say that there is no place for gaming machines in our shopping centres.

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Today I rise to congratulate the Loxton community and recognise its success with a local project brought to fruition last weekend. Last Sunday I had the pleasure of opening the Loxton Tourism and Arts Centre, a facility developed from the conversion of the old South Australian Metropolitan Fire Services fire station. This project was made possible through a State Government grant of \$45 000 under the Cultural Facilities Program, which was matched by funding from the District Council of Loxton. So, in total, something of the order of \$90 000 covered the basic cost requirement of the project. The council was responsible for the grant submission to the Department of Arts and Cultural Development as well as for the land and the building for the centre, involving the renovations and alterations, and for the ongoing support for the operation of the tourist office.

It has been almost six years since the Terrace Gallery was opened in Loxton, giving locals the opportunity to display and offer for sale the work of local artists and craftsmen, and it has obviously been a very successful undertaking by the local Terrace Arts Council. The enthusiasm and effort of the local community managing and staffing that gallery from the beginning has, importantly, led to the interest in moving to the old fire station at Loxton. Relocation to the centre now caters for this Terrace Arts Council and for its desire for more substantial facilities, and I note that the centre has been particularly designed to accept the South Australian Touring Arts Exhibition program.

I recognise also the importance of this new development with respect to tourism promotion. I wish to place on the record that in the past 10 years the Riverland has seen very strong growth in tourism. Industry figures show that tourism in the region is growing strongly. It has recorded the highest growth in visitor numbers for any country region in the State over the past six months; there is undoubtedly an increase, especially in the number of people staying in caravan parks, and the back-packer market is growing as well.

I note also that, in this year's *Yellow Pages SA* Tourism Awards, Big River Tourism Marketing Board won an award, a distinction for outstanding effort in the Tourism Associations category. I believe this must be particularly rewarding for an organisation in its first full year of operations following the amalgamation of the Riverland and Murraylands as the Big River Country. So, a high level of tourism awareness and promotion has very successfully been developed for the region.

Loxton specifically over recent years has been well recognised and has had tremendous cooperation and success in the district with respect to tourism promotion. This involvement has included the council, and support from business houses and the Loxton Hotel, where the previous tourist office was located as the town's tourist shop front. The Loxton tourist booklet has been regularly updated and has kept Loxton as a leader in the tourist development market. Coupled with this is Loxton's unique attractions: its Christmas lights, the historical village, the Mardi Gras it runs, its entrance to the national park and its well recognised success as the tidiest town in South Australia this year, going very close in the national awards.

So, there is no doubt in my mind that this has been a tremendous and very successful achievement by the Loxton district. This community venture has involved those two communities as well as Loxton council. I congratulate all those involved in the upgrading of the existing building, particularly Rod Pfeiffer as Chairman of the organising committee, Ruth Pfeiler and those from the Terrace Arts Gallery. I understand that the project was proposed as a community cultural centre, and I commend the support and the vision of all those involved, including the community groups which have joined together, and wish them well in developing a relationship which undoubtedly compliments and enhances each other's aims. The volunteers who have successfully operated the tourist gallery will now have a role in promoting tourism in the district, and this fits in well with the goals of the tourist industry to increase cooperation and the other service standards in the districts. Art and tourism go hand in hand, so this is a progressive partnership venture of which the people of Loxton can be proud and from which they will undoubtedly benefit.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I wish to raise a matter of public concern about the growing costs associated with the rebuilding and repair work being done to make good the damage caused by the union riots and rallies at the Federal Parliament House in Canberra. Members will recall that the rally and rampage were organised by the trade union movement in Canberra on the lawns of Parliament House on 19 August this year.

The people of South Australia should know of this disgusting example of thuggery by the unions and the Labor Party because it is the taxpayers who will be expected to foot the bill for the repairs. Those repairs are now estimated to cost in excess of \$1 million. That \$1 million cost to the taxpayers of this country was incurred so that the likes of Jennie George and Bill Kelty, backed publicly by the Labor Party and the Democrats—and one may ask: is there really any difference?—could allow the thugs in the union movement to smash down doors and dismantle and steal from the gift shop in the front of the building. This effort by the Labor Party and the unions was a direct attack on the people of Australia and on that symbol of democracy in this country—the Houses of Federal Parliament.

Most disturbing to me was the public support given by Jennie George and Bill Kelty, who described the rally as the most successful rally ever staged. This was Bill Kelty's idea of declaring war on the democratically elected Parliament of Australia, because his mates, which his unions funded, were rejected so resoundingly by the people of Australia. Bill Kelty got his desired war, because 116 Federal police officers were injured on the day of that riot. It is estimated that it may be several years before the final costs from those claims through COMCARE are known.

Like all Australians, I am disgusted and appalled that a minority ratbag element within the trade union movement was dumb enough to follow people like Kelty, Jennie George and Kim Beazley into a riot. The bill will continue to mount while the police chase suspects, the court cases are heard and prosecution costs are incurred or paid for by the taxpayer. What upsets me even more is the sadness I feel because some, perhaps very few, at the rally who were there to make a genuinely peaceful protest got swallowed up by the real agenda, which was to destroy our democracy, spurred on by a series of outrageous and unacceptable speeches which were aimed at stirring the crowd into a riot.

With all of this there is still no apology from the trade union movement, the Georges, the Keltys, the Labor Party and the Democrats. I have heard many people spout about how Pauline Hanson is a disgrace to Australia for exercising her democratic right in the Parliament, but no-one is hounding those people for their direct assault on our Australian way of life.

On a positive note, I should like to record that today I had the privilege of representing Minister Bob Such at the graduation of LEAP students at the Noarlunga TAFE. This LEAP scheme was called Noarlunga Roadside Vegetation Survey. I should like to congratulate the 15 students who were involved in the program. Each of them took part in what I consider to be a very difficult program for a group of LEAP people, because on 78 kilometres of roadside they had to identify and produce a herbarium of all that vegetation, which was then placed on a database computer program and which has now been handed to the council.

The council will use that database to ensure that it maintains and protects the species of native plants on roadsides when maintenance cutting is proceeding. That sort of information was not previously available to areas such as the Noarlunga district, which is becoming more urban but still has some rural roadside vegetation, so the work of those students has been of great benefit to the council. It was supported by the Noarlunga City Council which never baulks at any support for programs such as LEAP. I place on record my congratulations to those participants.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** I want to talk about a number of issues. Yesterday, the Premier tabled in the Parliament the South Australian Constitutional Advisory Council, first report, 'South Australia and Proposals for an Australian Republic'. One significant part of that report concerns the role of the State Governor and, of course, it says in the report that the State Governor must continue and must be an independent person, with bipartisan support, must be non-partisan and above politics. Therefore, I was very surprised the other day when, following my letter to the Premier, he met with me and the member for Napier to discuss proposals for the commissioners for the City of Adelaide and suggested that I should go and see the Governor. He suggested that I should sit down with Sir Eric

Neal and talk about the appointment of commissioners and how they worked in Sydney.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier went out and repeated what he said was in the conversation, and Scott Ashenden went public. I said to the Premier then that I would never go and see the Governor of this State and have a political conversation with him, because that would be grossly inappropriate. The Governor would not be involved in that process. I have enormous regard for the Governor of this State. At his swearing in, he talked of the importance of the Constitution in terms of the independence of the Governor. For the Premier of this State to try to involve the Governor in political controversy is unprecedented—absolutely unprecedented. For Scott Ashenden, the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, to tell the *Advertiser* publicly to call upon me to go and see the Governor is a disgrace.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is reflecting on the Governor in his comments. The Leader is just totally dishonest in his remarks.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I advise both members that, according to Standing Orders, it is improper to involve the Governor in a derogatory manner in debate in the House, irrespective of the source of the debate. I advise members to depart from that subject.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier's own report (page 154) states:

The politicians who made Australia's State and Federal constitutions retained this part of their heritage because they valued the Crown as a source of constitutional continuity, standing above and apart from Party strife and pressure groups.

This is the report tabled in this Parliament yesterday by the Premier of this State. It goes on (page 155):

However, the monarchy has served Australia well. Its detachment from political intrigues has been an important safeguard against the great scandals and corruption that have sometimes plagued countries which have opted for presidential systems of government. As well as adding to the system of checks and balances built into our constitutional law, as is explained further below, it allows the Head of State to maintain a dignity unattainable by those who remain embroiled in Party strife.

That is the key point. We defend the Governor. He must not be involved in Party intrigue and Party strife or in political debate and political negotiation. It would be an outrage if the Prime Minister of Britain asked the Queen to be involved in the negotiations with the Leader of the British Labour Opposition. We will not be involved; neither will the Governor. The Premier has dishonoured his role and that of the Governor in this State.

Today I had the privilege of meeting with AN workers who have lost their job and taken redundancy packages on an absolute agreement—a contract from the Federal Government—that if they took a redundancy package they would then have 52 weeks of training. That has now been dishonoured by the Howard Government. I will go to Port Augusta next week with members of shadow Cabinet, and I want to see those workers again. We have advised them to take legal action, because they entered into a contract and were conned and lied to by the Howard Government and by Australian National. I have a piece of paper which was given to them saying:

This program is different to any other; it is an entitlement.

They have lost that entitlement. They have given up their jobs. Their jobs have been taken away from them on the basis that they would accept a year's retraining to get other jobs. We now have middle-aged men who will not be able to fund their children's future.

---

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION)  
(AMENDMENT OF INDENTURE) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Mines and Energy)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982. Read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The Bill sets out proposed amendments to the *Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982* (the *Indenture Ratification Act*) and includes provision for ratifying amendments to the Olympic Dam and Stuart Shelf Indenture. The amendments are required in order to facilitate the proposed major expansion of the Olympic Dam mine and processing plant announced by WMC in July, 1996 and to anticipate the future development of the project.

I will first give some brief background to the project and the expansion and then outline the proposed amendments.

By 2001, WMC proposes to more than double the annual production at the Olympic Dam mine from the current level of 85 000 tonnes to around 200 000 tonnes of refined copper and associated uranium, gold and silver. It is expected that WMC will invest approximately \$1.25 billion to accomplish this and will consolidate Olympic Dam as a world class mining and milling operation and bring the total investment on the ground to over \$2.3 billion.

The Olympic Dam mine has made a significant contribution to the State's economy since production commenced in 1988 and the expansion will provide additional benefits to South Australians. For example, it is expected to give rise directly to a further 200 permanent jobs on the site. This will bring the total to nearly 1 200 jobs. As well, an average of approximately 1 000 construction jobs will be created during the next 4 years. Due to the economic multiplier effect of such a large, complex operation, thousands of South Australian families will benefit through the increased economic activity resulting from the project.

Royalty payments to the State are currently around \$12 million each year. Royalty payments should more than double following expansion. In addition to these increases, the State will also benefit from other taxes and duties. Exports of Olympic Dam products will also more than double—from the current level of \$270 million to around \$600 million.

The Olympic Dam orebody is one of the world's largest orebodies. As a consequence of the expansion, the benefits outlined will continue to flow to the people of South Australia for at least 100 years at the proposed expanded rate of production.

The *Indenture Ratification Act* sets out the rights and obligations of the Joint Venturers and the State, especially in regard to the provision of infrastructure and services for the Olympic Dam operation and for the town of Roxby Downs.

The Indenture was originally negotiated on the basis of a conceptual project producing up to 150 000 tonnes of copper per year. Accordingly, the original Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was for an annual production rate of up to 150 000 tonnes of copper. That EIS was recently re-endorsed by the Commonwealth following a public review. As was the case with the original Indenture and Act, the amendments attempt to anticipate future

development of the project. Therefore, the amendments address issues for a conceptual project producing up to 350 000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of copper and associated products. Accordingly, WMC intends producing a comprehensive statement addressing the environmental issues for such a project but, as a result of the time required to collect the necessary data and carry out associated studies, this statement will not address fully issues relating to water supply and tailings disposal beyond those needed for the proposed expansion to 200 000 tpa.

Although WMC has no current plans to increase mine output above 200 000 tpa of copper and associated products, WMC will have smelting and refining capacity above this which WMC may use to treat copper, gold and silver in forms such as concentrates sourced from outside Olympic Dam. Such smelting and refining will not contribute significantly to water consumption or the production of solid residues. Clearly, if WMC later decides to expand the mine beyond 200 000 tpa, additional work will need to be done on tailings disposal and water. These will be the subject of a separate environmental study in the future.

The *Indenture Ratification Act* modifies the operation of several Acts and the list of these Acts has been brought up to date without significant additional modifications to the operations of the majority of those Acts. I will however mention four Acts, where new issues under the amendments to the Indenture have arisen.

#### Development Act 1993

Current section 7(2)(a) of the *Indenture Ratification Act* makes the *Planning and Development Act 1966* subject to the Indenture in respect of the development, division, zoning and use of land. This Act was repealed by the *Development Act 1993* and the amendments provide that the provisions of the *Development Act* are subject to the provisions of the Indenture.

It is proposed that the Indenture be amended to provide for the conduct of environmental assessments in keeping with normal practice for mining operations within South Australia. However, it is recognised that the Commonwealth Government can independently call for an environmental assessment under the provisions of the *Environmental Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act 1974* (Cth) and it is therefore proposed to avoid a duplication of processes by the State in the event that a Commonwealth environmental assessment is required. Under section 7(3) of the *Indenture Ratification Act*, the Minister for Mines and Energy exercises powers normally exercised under other Acts but only with the agreement of the Ministers responsible for those Acts. This arrangement will obviously continue and apply to the amendments. In this instance, it is the Minister for Mines and Energy who may require Environmental Impact Statements or Public Environmental Reports pursuant to the *Development Act*.

#### Water Resources Act 1990

Current section 7(2)(h) of the *Indenture Ratification Act* makes the *Water Resources Act 1976* subject to the Indenture. This Act was repealed by the *Water Resources Act 1990* and the amendments provide that the provisions of the new Act are subject to the provisions of the Indenture. This will ensure the continuation of rights, given to WMC under the Indenture, in relation to the drawing and taking of water.

#### The Residential Tenancies Act 1995

Current section 7(2)(n) of the *Indenture Ratification Act* makes the *Residential Tenancies Act 1978* subject to the Indenture with respect to the provision of residential accommodation for employees, contractors or agents of the Joint Venturers where such accommodation is owned by the Joint Venturers. This Act was repealed by the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995*. The amendments to the Indenture will also apply to residential tenancy agreements in which the Joint Venturers or an associated company are acting as a landlord.

#### The Petroleum Act 1940

The *Indenture Ratification Act* and the Indenture do not currently provide for the grant of a petroleum pipeline licence. The need for one was not envisaged at that time. WMC now consider that such a licence may be required to meet the gas supply needs of an expanded project in the future. To provide WMC with adequate certainty, provisions have been included in the Indenture for the issue of a pipeline licence under the *Petroleum Act*. The amendments to the *Indenture Ratification Act* in respect of the *Petroleum Act* give the Minister power to grant and renew a pipeline licence in accordance with new clause 19A of the amended Indenture. This will assure WMC of the grant and subsequent renewal of a pipeline licence.

Finally the Bill proposes ratification and approval of amendments to the Indenture. The proposed amendments to the Indenture address a number of issues and I will outline the most important of these.

#### Conceptual maximum production rate

As noted earlier, the expansion involves raising ex-mine production to approximately 200 000 tpa of copper in the first instance. The Indenture currently addresses production only up to 150 000 tpa of copper and it is proposed to raise this to 350 000 tpa in order that the Indenture may cater for further expansion. Consequentially, there are numerous requirements to amend references to 150 000 tpa in the Indenture to 350 000 tpa.

#### Non-minesite material

WMC will now be able to source from outside the Special Mining Lease copper, gold, silver and other minerals approved by the Minister in various forms including concentrates and limited amounts of ore and treat them at Olympic Dam under the provisions of the Indenture. This will enable the company to utilise spare, short-term processing capacity while mine production is ramped up to 200 000 tpa of copper, a process that will take some time. With the construction of a new smelter, WMC will have a capacity to treat substantially more than 200 000 tpa as long as the old smelter is operated in conjunction with the new smelter. While WMC has no immediate plans for expanding mine output beyond 200 000 tpa, it may wish to treat concentrates, ores and other substances by utilising the old smelter, suitably refurbished, after mine production is ramped up.

#### Royalties in respect of non-minesite material

WMC will have to pay additional royalties to the State in respect of any ore treated or processed at Olympic Dam that is extracted within South Australia but from outside of the Olympic Dam area. The provisions will ensure that royalties paid on any ore treated at Olympic Dam is at the same rate irrespective of whether it is sourced from Olympic Dam or from elsewhere in the State. Currently, the rate is above the rate generally applicable in the State.

#### Compliance with Codes

At all times, the most up-to-date standards and Codes of Practice on radiation protection, safe transport of radioactive substances and management of radioactive wastes are used, as soon as they are adopted at a National level. References in the Indenture have been updated to reflect the most up-to-date codes, already in use.

#### Potable water supply

The amendments replace a lapsed right to the supply of treated water from Port Augusta. WMC may negotiate a commercial arrangement with SA Water for the treatment and delivery of water from the Morgan take-off to Port Augusta. Because of limitations on availability of water from the River Murray, WMC will be required to purchase entitlements to water on the open market.

#### Power supply

The provisions of the Indenture originally provided for the supply of a maximum of 150 megawatts of electricity. The proposed amendments aim to raise this to 250 megawatts. The amendments provide a basis for ETSA Corporation and the Joint Venturers to enter into a commercial, arms-length agreement for the additional 100 megawatts. These amendments will not have any affect once a competitive electricity market is established at a State or national level.

#### Access to electricity transmission

The amendments give WMC a more specific right than that already contained in the Indenture, for access to ETSA Corporation's transmission system. This provides a basis for ETSA and WMC to enter into a commercial, arms-length agreement for access to and the use of ETSA's transmission and distribution system so that it may sell any surplus electricity it generates.

#### Roxby Downs health and medical facilities

The Government will be providing substantially upgraded health and medical facilities at Roxby Downs township. This will include an upgrade of existing services with particular focus on acute care and birthing facilities.

WMC's proposed investment is the single largest investment in this State for many years. The Olympic Dam mine is a major contributor to the State's economy, producing high value products. The contribution will continue for many years—for more than 100 years at the proposed rate of production. This Bill provides the legislative basis for the continued development of this project, which is obviously of great importance to this State.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

##### *Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

##### *Clause 2: Interpretation*

Indenture is defined as the *Olympic Dam and Stuart Shelf Indenture* (a copy of which is set out in the schedule of the principal Act).

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 7—Modification of State law*

Section 7 provides that the laws of the State are modified so far as is necessary to give full effect to the Indenture. If any provisions of State law are inconsistent with the provisions of the Indenture, the provisions of the Indenture prevail. The proposed amendment revises the names of Acts listed in subsection (2) and provides that the Minister has power to grant and renew a pipeline licence under the *Petroleum Act 1940* in accordance with clause 19A of the Indenture.

*Clause 4: Amendment of Indenture*

The Indenture is amended in the manner set out in the schedule of the Amendment Deed contained in the schedule of this proposed Act. The amendments of the Indenture are ratified and approved (by force of this proposed Act).

*SCHEDULE—Amendment Deed*

The Schedule contains the Amendment Deed.

**Mr QUIRKE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ANIMAL AND PLANT CONTROL (AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION AND OTHER PURPOSES) (INTERIM CONTROL BOARDS) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986. Read a first time.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The prime object of this short Bill is to facilitate the effective operation of local animal and plant control boards during the amalgamation process for Local Government.

A main reason for the amendment is to allow statutory funding of animal and plant control boards by local government and the Animal and Plant Control Commission.

The Animal and Plant Control Act provides for the control of animals and plants for the protection of agriculture and the environment and for the safety of the public.

The Animal and Plant Control Commission which is under the general control of the Minister for Primary Industries is responsible for administering the legislation through local animal and plant control boards.

The Act allows for one or more councils to form a control board to operate in the area of the constituent councils.

Prior to the current amalgamation of councils there were 30 multi council boards and 10 single council boards which employed 75 full time equivalent (FTE) authorised officers.

The council amalgamations present an opportunity to reduce the number of boards after the local government changes have been made.

The proposed amendment to the *Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act* will facilitate this without prejudice to the current administrative structure which has been established on the recommendations of the Commission.

Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Insertion of s. 15A*

This clause inserts a new section in the Act to deal with the problem that arises when a constituent council of a control board amalgamates with another council. It is provided that the control board in this situation will remain in existence and its area and membership will remain unchanged until a proclamation is made to dissolve the board. If a vacancy occurs in the board's membership during this period, the Commission will appoint a suitable person to fill the vacancy.

**Mr ATKINSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SOUTH EASTERN WATER CONSERVATION AND DRAINAGE (CONTRIBUTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992. Read a first time.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Program is to be funded by contributions from the Commonwealth Government (37.5 per cent), the State Government (37.5 per cent), and the local community (25 per cent). In 1995, amendments were made to the *South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992* ('the Act') to provide a mechanism for collection of the community contribution. That mechanism is contained in section 34A of the Act.

Following the 1995 amendment, negotiations with the community have continued regarding collection of the levy. The basic proposal is for collection of an annual amount (calculated on a per hectare basis) over a period of six years. Following negotiations, however, it was determined that a number of different payment options should be offered to landholders liable to pay the levy. These options would include early payment of amounts due, with a discount and payment over a longer period with an interest component.

In addition it is considered desirable that there be a mechanism for reimbursement of a levy paid in relation to land that has an effective management plan in place for conservation of wetlands or vegetation or reimbursement in the event of the project being completed under budget.

Under the Bill the Board may prepare a scheme, with Ministerial approval, providing for the above matters.

It was also considered that there should be some penalty for non payment of the levy in terms similar to that contained in the *Local Government Act* for late payment of council rates.

The Bill replaces section 34A of the Act to provide for these more complex levy collection arrangements.

It is also proposed to amend section 50 of the Act, which deals with waiver and deferral of payments, to allow conditions to be imposed. This would increase flexibility by allowing the Board to grant, for example, deferral of a payment on the condition that interest is paid for the period of the deferral.

The other provision in the Bill deals with the validity of Ministerial notices fixing the rate of the levy. Because negotiations regarding collection of the levy were still being finalised at the commencement of the current financial year, it was not possible to publish the necessary notice in the *Gazette* (formally fixing the rate of the levy) before that date. There is, however, legal authority that it is not valid to fix a rate during the financial year that the rate is to be applied.

The time taken to negotiate the new collection arrangements has not delayed the design work for the first stage of the project, but the funding is required this financial year if construction is to commence this summer. If the project is to remain on schedule it is therefore essential that collection of the levy commence during the 1996/1997 financial year and clause 4 of the Bill has been included to provide for this.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Substitution of s. 34A*

This clause substitutes a new section 34A into the principal Act, dealing with contributions by landholders to the cost of works undertaken by the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board.

Proposed subsections (1) and (2) correspond to current subsections (1), (2) and (3).

Proposed subsection (3) provides for backdating of an exemption granted under subsection (2) so that if, for example, a landowner prepares a management plan for conservation of wetlands or vegetation, the levy can continue to be charged until the Board is

satisfied that the plan has been put into operation. Once satisfied that this has happened, the Minister can grant an exemption effective from the actual date that the plan commenced operating in relation to the land. It is then envisaged that, under the terms of a scheme prepared under proposed subsection (10), the Board would refund contributions paid in respect of the land during the period backdated.

Proposed subsections (4), (5), (6) and (7) make provision for the matters currently dealt with in subsections (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8).

Proposed subsection (8) ensures that, if the Minister varies the rate of contribution, such variation may only effect payments to be made following the commencement of the financial year next following publication of the variation. This means that if, for example, a person chooses to pay an amount early under a scheme prepared under proposed subsection (10), that person will not be liable to make extra payments if the rate is subsequently varied.

Proposed subsections (9) and (10) provide the Board with the necessary powers for collection of the levy. Proposed subsection (10) allows the Board to prepare a scheme (the terms of which are to be approved by the Minister) which would set out the details of the different methods a landholder may choose for payment of the levy. The scheme may also provide for recalculation of contributions where a landholder wishes to change from one method of payment to another, and for refunds to be made in certain specified circumstances.

Proposed subsection (11) provides a monetary penalty for late payment, with a power to remit such penalty, in appropriate cases, being provided under subsection (12).

Proposed subsections (13) and (14) correspond to current subsections (10) and (11).

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 50—Power to waive or defer payments*

This clause amends section 50 of the principal Act to allow conditions to be imposed on the waiver or deferral of payments under the Act.

*Clause 4: Validation of notices relating to 1996/1997 financial year*

This clause provides that a notice fixing a rate of contribution in respect of the 1996/1997 financial year will not be invalidated on the ground that it was published in the *Gazette* after the commencement of that financial year.

**Mr ATKINSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### MOTOR VEHICLES (DEMERIT POINTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Police):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to clarify the intentions of the existing provisions of the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* in relation to the disqualification of drivers who accumulate 12 or more demerit points within a three year period.

The Points Demerit Scheme was established to contribute to road safety by applying a sanction against drivers who repeatedly offend. The scheme provides that a driver is liable to disqualification from holding or obtaining a licence for three months if an aggregate of 12 or more demerit points is accumulated within a period of three years.

During 1992 the demerit point provisions in the *Motor Vehicles Act* were amended to ensure that demerit points accrued as a result of offences committed interstate were also included in the aggregate. Recent advice from the Crown Solicitor suggests that an unintended consequence of that amendment may allow the most recent offence not to be included in the aggregate.

The proposed amendment clarifies the intent of the Points Demerit Scheme to ensure that all of the points accumulated by a driver in the preceding three years are included in the aggregate, and will ensure that the Scheme continues to operate as an effective deterrent against repeat offenders.

The provisions in relation to this interpretation are retrospective because they clarify the original intent of the Parliament. Failure to provide retrospectivity could result in a large number of damages claims against the government by drivers who assert that the

previous interpretations of the Act, and hence their disqualifications, were made in error. Such retrospectivity will not apply in respect to criminal proceedings, in cases such as driving while disqualified, where these proceedings apply to an offence which occurred before this amendment and were commenced or completed after the commencement of the amendment. Such cases will be determined by the Court.

The proposed amendment also clarifies the Third Schedule of the Act to ensure that drivers who are convicted of exceeding the speed limit by exactly 15, 30 or 45 km/hr will accrue demerit points as intended by the National Points Demerit Scheme. In the case of exceeding the speed limit by exactly 15 or 30 km/hr the offences will attract 3 points instead of 1 and 4 points instead of 3 respectively. The speeds at which the demerit points attributed changed were previously out of step (by 1 km/hr) with the National Points Demerit Scheme. The existing wording for exceeding the speed limit by 45 km/hr was ambiguous and could be interpreted so that 4 points were accrued. The amendment will also ensure that in the case of exceeding the speed limit by 45 km/hr or more the 6 points required by the National Points Demerit Scheme will be applied.

#### Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Amendment of s. 98BC—Liability to disqualification*

This clause amends section 98BC to clarify the intent of that section. The amendment makes it clear that a person is liable to be disqualified if he or she incurs 12 or more demerit points in a period of three years, up to and including the most recent date on which an offence was committed.

*Clause 3: Amendment of Schedule 3*

This clause amends schedule 3 of the principal Act to make it consistent with the Uniform National Points Demerit Scheme.

*Clause 4: Effect of disqualification notices issued prior to commencement of Act*

This clause makes the amendment to section 98BC operate retrospectively except for the purposes of criminal proceedings commenced or completed after the commencement of the amendment that relate to the driving of a vehicle before that commencement.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through all stages without delay.

Motion carried.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** For myself, I would have thought it appropriate for the Minister to read the second reading explanation rather than incorporate it, since I have not had the opportunity of reading it and I am supposed to respond immediately. As it happens, I have read the debate in another place, and I am able to refer to it.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is completely out of order.

**Mr ATKINSON:** He is out of order, Sir, but he is right. To show courtesy towards the House, as the Deputy Premier did not, I shall explain to the House what the Bill is about. I ask Government members to listen carefully and I will explain what their Government's Bill is about. Once upon a time in 1992 the Parliament decided—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not want the member for Spence interrupted; he is a quiet, retiring member.

**Mr ATKINSON:**—that demerit points, if they were accrued interstate, should be added to the tally of demerit points accrued in the State of South Australia. I do not know much about this because I have never driven a motor vehicle, and I do not intend to, but I understand that it is of concern to every other member of the Parliament. At that time, section 98BC of the Motor Vehicles Act was amended to read as follows—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will be tried under Standing Order 137.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Unley is right in that the section refers to a period before the current Liberal Government, but section 98BC provides:

A person is liable to be disqualified under this part from holding or obtaining a licence for a period of three months if the person has incurred an aggregate of 12 or more demerit points in respect of offences committed within a period of three years preceding the most recent date on which the person committed an offence in respect of which the person incurred demerit points.

Can members see anything wrong with the drafting of that section?

**Mr Lewis:** No.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Ridley says 'No.' But what the member for Ridley ought to know, if he examines the text of that section, is that it does not include the current offence: it refers to 'preceding the most recent date on which a person committed an offence'. You might rack up 12 demerit points but, if you challenge it in court, you would argue that the only demerit points that can be taken into account are those that occurred before the most recent offence.

**Mr Lewis:** I have.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Well, the member for Ridley has incurred demerit points. Many members of Parliament have incurred demerit points. As I often tell my constituents, I am the only member of Parliament who does not drive, apart from those whose licence has been suspended, but we will not go into that just now.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** It is best not to go into it, I think.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you members.

**Mr ATKINSON:** My wife wishes that I drive, but that is a battle I will have to fight later on. The Government proposes to amend the Act so that the word 'preceding' is deleted and the words 'up to and including' included, so that it would read 'an aggregate of 12 or more demerit points in respect of offences committed within a period of three years up to and including the most recent date on which the person committed an offence'.

The Government's worry about this is that people who have been suspended and had their licence to drive suspended on account of demerit points accrued interstate may challenge their suspension on the grounds that they were incorrectly suspended because the latest offence of which they were guilty was taken into account when, under the 1992 draft of the Motor Vehicles Act, it should not have been. The Government is further worried that there may be suits for civil damages for being wrongfully suspended from driving on account of that misunderstanding about the Motor Vehicles Act.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** No, the member for Unley is wrong. In fact what happened is that the Parliament agreed unanimously to this change, so all Parties were wrong.

**Mr Brindal:** Including you.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Opposition always has a chance to scrutinise Bills and, if the Government puts up Bills and there are ambiguities or defects in those Bills and members of the Opposition fail to pick them up, they are equally responsible.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** Yes. I can't see a change of circumstances. It is in that connection, on that very point, that I ask

the Deputy Premier whether he has achieved quite what he wants with this Bill, because clause 4 of the Bill contains a retrospective element. We know that, when the Liberal Party was in Opposition, it was uniformly opposed to retrospectivity of legislation. Now that the Liberal Party is in Government it has adopted a different attitude. The Government also says that the amendment we propose would apply retrospectively to 1992. Let me read the clause to the House and see whether members think it is retrospective.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Unley criticises me on the grounds of pedantry. If there had been a bit of pedantry in 1992 on the Motor Vehicles Act we would not be in this situation.

**Mr Brindal:** Where were you? In maths class?

**Mr ATKINSON:** I did get a pear for confession in 1992, but not for maths. Clause 4(2) provides:

Subsection (1) does not apply in relation to criminal proceedings commenced or completed after the commencement of this Act that relate to the driving of a vehicle before that commencement.

My point is that the Government wants this enactment to be retrospective. I would have thought the Government would want it to apply to criminal proceedings commenced or completed before the Bill we are now considering. The sort of person we want caught by this Bill is someone who, in the period between 1992 and 1996, had their driver's licence disqualified for demerit points incurred interstate, but as I read clause 4 of the Bill it does not catch those people as it intends. The Opposition and the Democrats in another place undertook to support the Government on a bipartisan basis to ensure that this Bill was retrospective so that drivers whose licences were suspended in those circumstances would be caught by the Bill. It appears that the Bill does not achieve its object, but I am willing to be corrected on that.

Apart from that, the Government has taken the opportunity to clean up the schedules to the Act so that the number of demerit points earned for some offences are the same as demerit points earned interstate. With that, the Opposition supports the Bill and hopes it has the effect for which the Government aims.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Police):** I thank the honourable member for his contribution. I appreciate his support and the fact that he has avowed and declared that, if there is an error due to some oversight in every Bill that has been passed with the Opposition's support, the Opposition will wear it. I am pleased with that being on the record. The honourable member accurately stated the situation: in 1992 an error was made in the wording. Many thousands of people were legitimately caught under the disqualification rules that applied; however, on a technicality, this Bill could and would be read as stating that the last offence which brought them to the 12 or more points could not be counted when the disqualification was pursued.

In relation to the last matter raised by the member for Spence, I have not read the contribution of the Minister in another place but I would assume that if I had read it I would reply in this fashion. We wanted to ensure that there could be no follow-up court action for those people who were legitimately disqualified but who under this Bill could contest whether the law as we wished it to be implemented was actually implemented in that form. As the member for Spence has pointed out, there is grave doubt whether, indeed, it succeeded. We need a retrospective reference in this Bill so that there is no capacity for any person caught by that law to



take legal proceedings against the Government. That is fair and reasonable, because the Government's intention at the time was quite clear.

If the member for Spence actually reads clause 4 he will note that it deals with criminal proceedings. The disqualification of motorists follows an automatic procedure; it does not involve criminal proceedings. The legal advice stated that we would have some difficulty creating retrospectivity if we created a tort in the process which did not exist at the time. We did not wish to create an offence that would be affected. So, it is quite clear that it relates only to criminal proceedings. That was the explanation provided to Cabinet, it was a clear understanding, and I think the member for Spence would readily appreciate that, if someone had gone to court on the basis of the law as it stood at the time and the matter involved criminal proceedings—which could be driving without a licence and other matters—and if that person could prove that the law did not apply, we could not take away that person's rights. I hope that is how the honourable member—

**Mr Atkinson:** By 'criminal' you mean in terms of imprisonment?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** That is correct: where there is a penalty that would involve a term of imprisonment.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Police):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I want to place on record that I listened intently to the Deputy Premier's explanation of clause 4 and that I am wholly satisfied with it. I compliment the Deputy Premier on his attention to detail.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk to deliver a message while the House is not sitting.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 5 November at 2 p.m.