

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 13 February 1997

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the forty-fourth report of the committee on the MFP economic development stage one project be noted.

MFP Australia proposes to enter into a joint venture for an economic development project which will create 4 500 new jobs and house 10 000 people at the Levels over the next 10 years. The estimated cost of the project is in the vicinity of \$850 million, with funds being sourced from the Commonwealth, State and local government as well as the private sector.

The MFP Smart City is intended to be a model twenty-first century community that brings together business, education and up to 10 000 people in an environment incorporating world leading technologies. It involves the integration of Technology Park and the University of South Australia into a mixed use development which will have the potential to create significant economic opportunities. The MFP stage one project contains a number of key physical features characterising the structure plan that will provide a unique environment for innovative and economic development. These features include: mixed land use areas, provision of a range of new housing products, innovative transport systems, water management systems, including lakes, wetlands and water reuse; and, finally, strong community identity—urban designed elements such as an integrated town centre and a university gateway entrance with linked community facilities.

The proposed development will provide the infrastructure to attract new investment in technology related businesses, whilst providing a site for Australian companies wishing to develop and export technology and services to the Asian-Pacific markets. In addition, the development will provide a platform for innovation in areas such as education, health, transport, information technology, as well as energy. The development will be implemented through a joint venture agreement that will work in conjunction with the key investment attraction arms of Government. The proposed joint venture will be owned and controlled equally by MFP and the Delfin Lend Lease consortium and will be the primary development manager through which key parties such as Telstra, the University of South Australia and the Salisbury council contribute to stage one of the development.

The key benefits of this project are the creation of 4 500 full-time jobs on site, the attraction of \$200 million worth of investment in technology related businesses, and a four-fold increase in commercial space on site. Approximately 2 500 people are expected to be attracted to South Australia as a consequence of the development over the next ten years. In addition, the economic evaluation undertaken by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies identified several spill-over effects that may occur as a result of this project. These include an increase in skills available to local firms via

access to innovation, an increase in business opportunity and the halo effect of increases in land values.

This study also concluded that real per capita Gross State Product in consumption will increase resulting in real increases in the wealth of South Australians. The proposed development will also have a positive impact on families. New jobs will be provided on site and people will have the opportunity to live close to where they work. A range of facilities including education, health and transport will also be provided on site which will meet the needs of these families. In addition, people living on the site will benefit from being part of the most advanced community in the country.

In summary, the Public Works Committee strongly supports the proposal for the MFP development at The Levels and reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed works proceed.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION (CASUAL VACANCIES IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

Mr EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a simple Bill that sets out a practical method of parliamentary reform. If we look at some recent reforms within the Parliaments around Australia, some have been administrative and some legislative, but all have been aimed to improve the institution of Parliament. Some of these reforms affected the Upper House in South Australia, where we no longer have regions but a Statewide voting system, whilst casting a valid vote for the Upper House was simplified by placing the number 1 above the line.

The Estimates Committee format was introduced by the Tonkin administration as a way of dealing with questions on the budget. Electorate offices were established in the 1970s. When my father first came into this place, there were no electorate offices, and that change was effected to improve the system. The provision of media advisers to Ministers was something that occurred in the Dunstan years. Microphones were introduced into the Chamber during the Playford era because of hearing difficulties. Indeed, permission for the various media coverage of Question Time has been granted in recent years.

The fact that the Clerk now reads petitions is something that has changed in the last 15 or so years. The fact that we can have advisers actually sit in the Chamber and advise Ministers is something that has changed in recent times. The fact that we can have desk top computers within the Chamber has only occurred during the course of this Parliament, and the use of mobile phones in the Parliament is also a change. The point I am making is that the institution of Parliament, the way Parliament is administered, is an evolving thing and is changing on a daily basis.

For decades modern politics has involved political Parties, and the Parliament has adapted to the involvement of the Parties within the system. This Bill recognises the political realities of modern politics. The Parliament has recognised Parties in all sorts of ways. We have positions such as Party Whips. The Parliament provides accommodation known as Party rooms. There are informal arrangements between the

Parties with respect to Party question lists and Question Time.

There is also a more formal recognition in the other place where the filling of a casual vacancy in the Upper House is by Party nomination and a joint sitting of the Parliament. That is exactly the same process as suggested in this Bill. Party involvement is well and truly entrenched within the parliamentary system. The Parliament is a slowly evolving institution, and this is the next logical, practical reform.

Some members may recall that Jeff Kennett proposed to abolish by-elections altogether. I stress to the House that his proposal is totally different from my proposal. Mr Kennett's proposal was to ban any by-election when the Government had a majority of five seats, regardless of the timing of the by-election or the margin by which the member held the seat. I hope that members recognise the significant difference between Mr Kennett's proposals and the proposals contained in the Bill.

Under the Australian system, it is a political reality that in some electorates the electors are so much in favour of one view that the other view has no chance of winning. This usually occurs where one seat, whose voters are so much in favour of one view, is surrounded by a number of seats whose electors are strongly of the same view, and so will not be affected by any future redistribution. For example, that situation occurs where one Labor seat is surrounded by other Labor seats or one Liberal seat is surrounded by other Liberal seats.

There is no doubting that this occurs, and it is recognised by everyone. All politicians know it, the media well understand it and, importantly, the general public understand the issue. The facts are that politics in Australia has evolved to a point at which, in some instances, some seats, given the tight conditions laid out in this Bill, will be won by only one Party. There is no better illustration than when Parties do not nominate candidates at by-elections where they consider they cannot win. This is accepted as a reasonable tactic by the media, by political analysts and by the general public. The tactic is often used by political Parties. To my knowledge, all political Parties have used that tactic from time to time. This Bill recognises that point. It recognises that it is a reality of politics that has existed in South Australia for some 80 or 90 years.

Further, the Bill recognises that the voting public may well be sick and tired of being at the call of every politician with an ego. Just because a defeated Prime Minister, Party Leader or Minister believes it is in their career's best interests to retire from politics, the voting public is expected to go through the torment of a by-election. In the circumstances outlined in this Bill, the voting public would be annoyed at having to go to the polls again.

There is a view that, in some seats where one Party dominates the voting, the voting public is very cynical about politicians who retire and then force the people to vote again. This creates an image of politicians acting purely out of self-interest, which in my view creates the wrong impression of most MPs and makes the voting public very cynical about the whole process.

In the seats to which the Bill refers, that is, the two candidate preferred margin of 60 per cent or greater, the vast majority of voters are annoyed and disgusted that they are forced to reappear and vote just because a defeated politician decides that it is in their best interests to retire and seek a new career path. I put it to the House that the voters in those seats to which the Bill refers would be grateful at not being

inconvenienced by having to vote twice within a matter of weeks or months, simply to satisfy the career prospects of some member of Parliament.

The records show that many Leaders or Ministers resign within 12 months after their Party loses an election if they do not retain their Party position. They deliberately delay it 12 months so that the voters do not react against the Party for making them vote twice within a short space of time.

I am advised by the Electoral Commissioner that the cost of a by-election ranges from \$110 000 to \$160 000 per by-election. Under the circumstances outlined in the Bill, this money could well be spent better on education, health or providing services to the community. If we were to ask the voters in the electorates to which this Bill refers whether they would rather have \$160 000 spent on a by-election or on the local school, I suggest that they would prefer the money to be spent on the local school.

The mechanics of this Bill are simple, practical, logical and worthy of serious consideration. It provides that no by-election is to be called where a member, who at the time of election to the seat was recognised as a member of a political Party, resigns within six weeks of being elected and was elected by a majority of 60 per cent or more of the two candidate preferred vote—that is, when two candidates remain. I have not included the same process for the death of a member, because death is not usually of a member's choosing.

I have deliberately chosen a period of six weeks for a number of reasons. Six weeks allows for all the selection processes of parliamentary positions to be finalised—ministry, Speaker, committee positions, etc. Parliament would have hardly sat and, if it had, it would have hardly made any decisions because of the slow nature of the decision-making process of Parliament. Therefore, any by-election held within six weeks would not be influenced by the decisions of Government. Any by-election after six weeks would naturally be contested under the normal rules and the Government would be held accountable, quite rightly, for the decisions that it made in Parliament. Of course, within six weeks there would be no effect from any redistribution. Some have asked why I have chosen 60 per cent. Well, 60 per cent seems to me to be a reasonable benchmark. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them two tables of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

Table 1
Two candidate margin for the 47 seats in the House of Assembly for the recent State elections

	Average	Median (middle value)
1979	61.33	60.07
1982	62.59	62.13
1985	61.53	62.47
1989	61.21	59.30
1993	61.87	60.90

Table 2
Two candidate margins of seats held by Labor in 1989

	1989 election result based on 1991 redistribution	1993 election result (before by-elections of 1994)
Hart	72.2	58.7
Elizabeth	66.8	52.7
Price	66.0	61.0
Ramsay	63.9	60.3
Spence	63.9	57.7
Taylor	63.9	59.4
Ross Smith	63.3	52.1
Napier	61.2	56.4

Playford	59.8	52.1
Giles	55.8	54.3
Torrens	54.5 lost to Liberal	

Mr EVANS: Table 1 shows the averages and medians of the two candidate margins in the 47 seats in the House of Assembly for the five State elections from 1979 to 1993. The average ranges from 61.33 per cent to 62.59 per cent. The median or middle value ranges from some 59.3 per cent to 62.47 per cent. Therefore, 60 per cent seems a reasonable benchmark. Table 2 shows the two candidate preferred margin of seats now held by Labor. It shows those seats which had a two candidate preferred margin of greater than 60 per cent after the 1989 election and which were still held by Labor after the 1993 election. This table illustrates that, even with all the force of the State Bank behind the Liberal Party, it could not win from Labor any seat which was held by a two candidate preferred margin of greater than 60 per cent.

I put to the House that, if a three year campaign on the State Bank could not win those seats, a campaign within six weeks of an election will also not win those seats. Therefore, in my view it is reasonable to argue that, for a seat that was above the 60 per cent mark and held by the sitting Party at the 1993 election, it will not change hands at a by-election with unchanged boundaries just six weeks after a State election. A number of by-elections have been held in South Australia over the years. I am advised that between 1974 and 1994 there have been 13 by-elections. On only four occasions has a by-election been won by a person representing a different Party than the previous member.

There was a by-election in 1974, nine months after the previous State election in the electorate of Goyder when Steele Hall resigned to go to the Senate and the LCL lost the seat to the Liberal Movement. In 1980, five months after the State election, in the seat of Norwood, Webber lost to Crafter in a matter that went to the Court of Disputed Returns and Liberal lost to Labor. In 1984, some 24 months after the State election, in the seat of Elizabeth, Duncan resigned to go to Canberra and Labor lost to Independent Labor. In 1993, some six months after the State election, and due to bereavement, the seat of Torrens went from Liberal to Labor.

I make the point to the House that under this Bill none of those by-elections would have been affected because they were all further out than six weeks after a State election, and they were all brought on by circumstances not described within the Bill. None of the by-elections would have been affected by my proposed legislation. I am saying to the House that not one by-election has been held in the past 20 years that would have been affected by this legislation. The Bill does not apply to Independents. In my view, an Independent would not retire six weeks after an election and nominate another Independent to replace him or her. The Bill simply does not apply to Independents.

The legislation simply recognises the fact that for decades the parliamentary process needed reform in relation to by-elections. This reform offers a quicker, cheaper, more logical and practical method of facilitating what already happens within the parliamentary system. There has been much talk from the Opposition and some Government members about the need for parliamentary reform. This Bill provides a simple mechanism for the improvement of the parliamentary process. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 is formal.

Clause 3 inserts a new section that provides for the filling of casual vacancies in the House of Assembly. The clause provides that where a member of Parliament, who at the time of their election was an endorsed candidate of a Party, resigns within six weeks of their election and the two candidate preferred margin by which they were elected was 60 per cent or more, then the vacancy is filled by a Party nomination to a joint sitting of both Houses of Parliament.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the forty-sixth report of the committee on the Flinders Medical Centre private hospital development be noted.

The South Australian Health Commission proposes that a new private hospital be constructed at the Flinders Medical Centre, with all construction and operational costs being borne by the private developer, Ramsay Health Care Pty Ltd. Flinders Medical Centre is a world class, major teaching hospital which services the southern region of Adelaide. The hospital has an extremely efficient but busy accident and emergency service, which has placed significant constraints on its ability to provide the elective surgical and medical services expected by the residents in the south and south-west suburbs of Adelaide. In addition, the catchment area of the hospital includes both the rapidly expanding outer metropolitan suburbs as well as the ageing populations in Marion, Mitcham and Glenelg. This catchment area results in a sustained and increasing demand from the public for hospital services provided by the Flinders Medical Centre.

Once complete, this project will see a \$30 million private hospital established at the Flinders Medical Centre site and will provide the Flinders Medical Centre with the options of purchasing selected public patient services from the private hospital. Flinders Medical Centre will also be able to sell a range of services to the private hospital operator. Furthermore, Flinders Medical Centre will directly lease an area within the new Ramsay private hospital health facility designated the Lions Eye Centre, with the lease period being some 20 years. In addition, a formal agreement has been signed with the Flinders University of South Australia for temporary car parking arrangements on the university sports field for up to four years. This will allow an independent car parking assessment to be completed to determine the actual car parking impacts of this new facility.

Flinders Medical Centre was originally planned to be a 700 bed teaching hospital; however, only 500 beds were constructed. As a result, there are inadequate beds to meet public and private demand; unacceptably high occupation rates, sometimes exceeding 100 per cent; waiting lists for elective treatment; pressures to shorten the length of stays of the chronically ill; and clinical departments that are housed in makeshift accommodation due to a lack of purpose built space. Complex tertiary level services and 24 hour accident and emergency treatment services are available only at Flinders Medical Centre in the southern metropolitan area. As the population of the southern metropolitan area is projected to increase by a further 50 000 (16.6 per cent) between the years 1991 and 2011, the current pressures on the centre will obviously increase.

Implementation of this proposal will benefit the families living in the south and south-west suburbs of Adelaide by significantly improving access to public and private hospital

services in the area and strengthening the range, level and quality of those services. Given the above, the Public Works Committee endorses the proposal to construct a private hospital at the Flinders Medical Centre site and reports to Parliament that it recommends that this proposed public works proceed.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the forty-seventh report of the committee on the Adelaide International Airport runway extension be noted.

This is a very significant report. It is a very large project being undertaken here in South Australia. When combined with the Glenelg Patawalonga redevelopment and the harbor redevelopment at the mouth of the Patawalonga at Glenelg, it is one of the largest urban redevelopment projects this State has ever seen. Given the amount of capital expenditure and the number of earth moving contracts that will be let, it is really a massive and significant project here in South Australia, which project has been implemented by the Government.

The South Australian Department of Transport proposes to extend the airport's main runway by 572 metres to the south-west, resulting in a total runway length of 3 100 metres. This length would allow, in most conditions, fully laden direct flights to most major Asian ports. Currently, Adelaide International Airport has the shortest main runway of any Australian mainland capital airport. As a consequence, the airport's existing runway imposes weight and payload constraints on international passengers and freight flights, particularly those flying direct to any of the major Asian ports.

As reported to Parliament by the committee in July 1996, the proposed runway extension will cut across the existing Tapleys Hill Road and impinge into the West Beach Recreation Reserve. As such, it will be necessary for a portion of Tapleys Hill Road to be realigned. The works associated with the road realignment will include the replacement of the Sturt River Bridge, the Reece Jennings Recreation Bikeway and an upgrade of the Warren Avenue junction. The Public Works Committee is mindful of the debate regarding the final alignment of Tapleys Hill Road and the committee members have considered the impact of all alternative options very carefully. Based on the evidence presented, members are satisfied that the final design represents the best available option in terms of environment, community and economic impact.

In addition to the realignment of Tapleys Hill Road, there will be other works associated with this project, including improved runway and taxiway lighting, relocation of navigational aids, increased capacity of emergency power generating equipment, and additional drainage, access roads and boundary fencing.

Over 75 per cent of South Australia's air freight exports are perishable goods, the majority of which are exported via interstate airports. This situation exists because goods exported from Adelaide direct have to be shipped in cargo holds of passenger aircraft. Such arrangements expose the exporters of time sensitive cargoes to delays and increase shipping times associated with passenger airflight schedules. The ability to avoid such delays and ensure that goods arrive at overseas markets in an unspoilt condition is absolutely

essential if we are to be serious about developing an export product out of Adelaide. The proposed development of the runway will provide an opportunity for exporters to offer a better quality service and make South Australian goods more competitive in the international market.

Furthermore, the extension of the airport's runway has the potential to increase the number of international flights flying directly from Adelaide, thereby providing greater variety and flexibility for tourists. This in turn will potentially result in the multiplying effect of improved tourism and direct international export opportunities to local industries. It is a program which, at the end of the day, when in place, will mean jobs and further development in South Australia.

It should be noted that funding of \$28 million has been allocated for this project by the Federal Government in the 1996-97 financial year. Additionally, the Federal Government has given a commitment to pay the State up to \$20 million from the proceeds of the sale of the Adelaide Airport lease.

In summary, the benefits of improved export options, reduced delivery times and the ability to reliably provide high quality goods on time and at reduced costs will all help make South Australian products more attractive to our overseas buyers. This should increase export markets, provide positive economic returns and improve tourism opportunities. Given that summary, it is very easy for us to recommend to the House that this project proceed.

It is interesting that the Commonwealth Public Works Committee was in town last week. It has taken evidence, and I would be most surprised if it produced a report which differs from our own, that is, that this is a fantastic project for the future development of this State, which depends, to a very large degree, on this project getting up and running as quickly as possible. As such, the Public Works Committee endorses the proposal to extend the runway and recommends that the works proceed as quickly as possible.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In rising to support this motion, I want to reiterate the comments of the member for Morphett. The airport runway extension will enable fully laden passenger and certain freight aircraft to take off, which cannot occur at present because of the length of the existing runway. Of course, that will assist this State's export earning potential and capacity. The Federal Government is contributing \$28 million towards this project. One small detail omitted, I think, by the member for Morphett was that a Federal Labor Government was responsible for this airport runway extension.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He overlooked it.

Ms WHITE: I think so. Certainly all members of the Public Works Committee agree that the Federal Labor Government was responsible for providing that commitment. The member for Morphett has provided all the details of this project, and I will not repeat them, other than to say that it is welcomed by the State and by the Labor Opposition, and it will greatly enhance export potential for many producers in this State.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): The member for Taylor quite rightly acknowledged the role of the Federal Labor Government in first putting up this money. It would be remiss of me if I did not remind the House that this is truly a bipartisan issue but, most importantly, the work to extend the runway started under the former Labor Government. That Government has coped much criticism from members opposite for things for which they choose to criticise it. However, it is appropriate

that significant achievements made by the former Federal Labor Government be acknowledged. Under former Premier and Minister Lynn Arnold, together with Barbara Wiese, as Minister for Transport Development, a lot of work took place involving the transport hub, following the Arthur D. Little report that highlighted the need to improve the Adelaide Airport infrastructure.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is very good history, as the member for Mitchell says—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is not rewriting history: it is educating those of you who are not familiar with what occurred pre-1993 when you were still hiring cars and undertaking other activities. The reality is that the Adelaide Airport extension program started under a Labor Government. It was acknowledged and highlighted by a former Labor Government. It was the former Labor Government that made the resources available for the transport hub.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is a question not of being positive but of simply stating fact. The Adelaide Airport runway extension is a very good bipartisan initiative—one started under the former Labor Government, to be concluded under this Government (although by the time the tarmac is laid out it may well be another Labor Government). However, we will still be gracious. We will stand in this place and acknowledge your work. We will not be small or narrow minded or vindictive. We will invite you to the opening.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I know. The Feds are paying for it. We will ensure, if we are in government, that we invite the member for Morphett and the current appropriate Ministers. The whole issue of the Adelaide Airport needs to be addressed. The Government is having discussions with various parties about the upgrade, but we desperately need to have addressed the whole infrastructure of the Adelaide Airport. My colleagues and I fly very infrequently, but when we fly with Ansett it is amusing that you have to walk out onto the tarmac and follow one of the coloured lines to find your aircraft. I think that an air bridge and improvements in infrastructure are now very much on the agenda. Now that the runway issue has been addressed, let us look forward in a bipartisan context to having the whole terminal and its infrastructure upgraded. As my colleague the member for Taylor said, that will be done with the Opposition's support and a truly bipartisan approach.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Following that rather bold attempt by the member for Hart to do a little bit of grandstanding in order to take some credit for the upgrade of the Adelaide Airport runway, I want not only to reinforce my personal support but to reiterate—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: Well, that will come eventually, too, in terms of growth that will happen in the Riverland. I want to put on the record my support for this project and to emphasise that it was this current Liberal State Government that committed \$20 million to ensure that this project would go ahead. There is no doubt about that: there was no guarantee whatsoever in 1993 that this project would progress or proceed.

I commend the Public Works Committee and all the Cabinet Ministers who were involved for their progressive attitude in making sure that this project proceeds as fast as

possible. It serves to illustrate in the total operation of this State that this Government is one of vision, action and development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ANDREW: The recommendation of the Public Works Committee to proceed with this project is an example of that.

Members interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: Well, there are plenty of things that I could list. I know that members would love to hear of other good news, particularly the member for Hart, who tried to promote a little bit of a positive attitude. It is nice to note that the Opposition knows that the word 'positive' exists. Let us think about the developments that are happening in this State now, whether it be Wilpena, the MFP, Wirrina, more than \$1 billion at Roxby Downs, or the Southern Expressway. I am proud of the fact that in my local area \$17 million has been allocated for the Berri bridge and \$17 million for the upgrade of the Morgan to Burra Road as well as \$100 million plus for filtration plants throughout the whole State. This Adelaide Airport runway extension fits in and is entirely consistent with the pro-development and pro-action strategy of this Government.

I refer briefly to the direct benefits that this project will bring to my electorate of Chaffey. I note from the committee's report that of all our air freight exports about 70 per cent are perishable goods, and a large percentage of those come from my electorate. In terms of growth and development in irrigated areas in this State and the production of other perishable products in the aquaculture industry along the coastline of this State, those products can now be exported to markets particularly in Asia at the best possible time so that optimum quality produce is received. The horticulture and aquaculture industries will undoubtedly continue to request and demand this sort of infrastructure in order to meet the requirements of the Asian markets, which are growing at a tremendous rate. Not only will our quality produce be more appreciated and get to the market in optimum condition, but there will be a reduction in cost for our suppliers who currently, in some cases, have to road transport their product overland to Melbourne, in many cases at a higher cost than otherwise if a direct air freight service was available out of the Adelaide Airport.

I commend the Public Works Committee for its good work in confirming that this project is soundly based and does need to be proceeded with as soon as possible. I commend the State Government for getting on and ensuring that this form of infrastructure takes place as quickly as possible so that we can continue to deliver business growth and economic development to this State.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I take this opportunity to speak on the development of the Adelaide Airport, especially after some comments made previously. As a member of the Public Works Committee involved in taking testimony from those people involved in this issue and as one involved in a private enterprise that has a lot of dealings with the Adelaide Airport, an interest I declare—I call on the Adelaide Airport on a regular basis—I support the extension of the Adelaide Airport. A need exists for the revitalisation of the facilities at the airport, upon which I call regularly.

The member for Hart said that the Keating Government was responsible for this development. It was in the dying days of the Keating Government that it finally agreed to spend money on looking at this proposal. It was not until the

change of government that we received full and final support for the proposal. The previous Government was tardy with regard to the upgrade of the facilities. The Adelaide Airport is one of the few facilities on mainland Australia with no covered drawbridges to the planes. The facilities inside the terminal are second grade and it is about time that a revitalisation of the Adelaide Airport occurred. It has been blocked in the Senate by the Labor Party. It has blocked opportunities for leasing out of the facilities to ensure that the revitalisation of the airport occurs. I support the extensions to the Adelaide Airport, and take this opportunity to remind this House of the need for the revitalisation of facilities at the Adelaide Airport.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In concluding the debate, I will pick up a couple of comments of my friend the member for Hart. In his presentation he reminded us that the Adelaide Airport development was started under Labor. I acknowledge the financial contribution of the Federal Government to both the airport and the Glenelg development generally, through the Better Cities money, and it is appreciated. However, it should be remembered that we are South Australian taxpayers and the Commonwealth has a responsibility to feed money back into South Australia. I also remind the honourable member that, whilst his Government was very happy to say that it was involved in getting planning under way, like the Glenelg development nothing ever happened in the 11 years under Labor.

The last thing that happened at the Adelaide Airport was when the Government led by Hon. David Tonkin as Premier built the international terminal. Before that time, there were no international flights at all. After the Liberals went out of Government nothing happened at the Adelaide Airport. The honourable member complained about following coloured lines. During the 11 years his Party was in Government it could have done something about the aerobridges. It had a sympathetic Federal Treasurer and Prime Minister. Surely, it could have prevailed upon him that South Australia existed, but there did not seem to be any communication between the South Australian Labor Government and the Federal Labor Government about benefits for South Australia, particularly benefits for export from South Australia.

It was not until the Liberals returned to power in 1993 that something did happen. We got the airport under way. Massive earthworks are under way preparing for the runway redevelopment. The honourable member also might not like to be reminded that, whilst the Opposition claims to have started the planning for the Adelaide Airport, it was also responsible for Vodafone and the problems we have with that. Let me remind members of other things it started. It started the problems in South Australia with the roll out of cables. It started the problems we have in South Australia in relation to tariffs for the motor vehicle industry.

Let members opposite not be too quick to hop up and remind the House of what the Opposition started. Most things that the Labor Party started in this State have ended up as disasters for this State. This Government within three years has been required to turn around a litany of disasters of the past 11 years to get something to happen in this State. If nothing else, every member in this Chamber does know—whether or not they are prepared to admit it—that over the past three years things have started to happen and will continue to happen in the future.

In conclusion, this debate is about the extension of the international airport runway. I hope that most members will

acknowledge that it will bring prosperity and development to this State. I acknowledge that it is a bipartisan approach and I thank members opposite for their support. We speak here as South Australians: it is good for the State and we are pleased it will proceed as quickly as possible.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BOLIVAR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That the forty-fifth report of the committee on the filtration plant at the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant be noted.

(Continued from 6 February. Page 874.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Both sides have spoken at length on this motion. It is generally supported in the Parliament and I suggest it be put to the vote.

Motion carried.

HOUSING TRUST WATER RATES

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Hurley:

That the regulations under the South Australia Housing Trust Act 1936 relating to water rates, gazetted on 1 August and laid on the table of this House on 1 October 1996, be disallowed.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 757.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support this motion put forward by the member for Napier. My comments go to the heart of the way that this Government goes out of its way to defy the wishes of the Parliament. The Housing Trust regulations dealing with the increase in water rates have been disallowed by the Legislative Council, yet the moment they were disallowed this Government reinserted them straight away to quite deliberately defeat the purposes of the constitution of this State which allows either House of Parliament to disallow regulations.

The Government has done it with respect to not only water rates but also recreational net fishermen, as well as with a number of other powers because, when it does not suit the Government of the day and one House of the Parliament disallows regulations, the matter is simply reinserted immediately and the Government keeps doing that until such time as it makes a mockery of the whole system, whereby at least one House of the Parliament has the right to disallow regulations put in place by the Government of the day. Quite frankly, that cannot be allowed to continue. Governments want the power of regulation in Acts mainly for quite sensible reasons; in the case of unforeseen circumstances occurring at the time a Bill is passed into law, they want the ability to accommodate that matter quickly through regulations, if necessary.

The safety valve against abuse of that power by Government was that either House of Parliament had the power to disallow those regulations. On a number of occasions—and I have already listed a few—one House of the Parliament, namely, the Legislative Council, has expressed a view and, in accordance with the Constitution of the State, regulations were disallowed and then flagrantly violated by the Government. Let me put this Government on notice: in future, when this Government comes to the Parliament seeking to include in its Acts of Parliament clauses that allow it to insert additional powers to itself by regulation, the Opposition may not be in a mood to allow that type of legislation to pass.

This Government has shown flagrant violation of the Constitution with respect to this matter and, since it cannot be trusted to abide by the spirit of the Constitution and the law with respect to this matter, the Government has brought this situation on its own head. I simply point out and put the Government on notice that, in future, with respect to every Bill it introduces seeking to insert powers of regulation, we will simply say, unless we can be convinced to the contrary, that we will not give the Government that power and that in future everything it wants to change that it would otherwise have done by regulation will have to be done by amendment. The Government has brought this on its own head. It has been warned. Take it on notice.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I support the remarks of my colleague the Deputy Leader. It has concerned me for some time that the practice involving subordinate legislation in this Parliament has been completely abused by this Government. It may seem to be a relatively minor thing, but I would argue that all members of Parliament, whether in Government or in Opposition, ought to be concerned about what is happening. The reasons given by the Deputy Leader as to why we have subordinate legislation are but a small part of the reasons. The reasons, in my view, are absolutely impeccable and ought to be there.

It is nonsense to keep coming back to the Parliament with, say, an increase in bus fares every time it is desired to change them rather than having a regulation making power to do that. However, when something is not in an Act of Parliament, when it is at the Government's discretion to introduce something within the spirit of that Act, and no broader than the Act—and that is why we have a Legislative Review Committee—the Parliament has always said, 'We will, if necessary, exercise a veto on the Government's making those decisions', because they may not be what the Parliament would agree to. Over the years I have seen regulations gazetted the instant they have been knocked out by the Parliament.

I do not necessarily have a total objection to that because, if it is deemed by a Government that the practice should continue until something is sorted out, I think that is fair enough. I have never in Opposition objected to that. I have seen it only very few times—you could count them on one hand—in my 20 years here. Where it has reached this stage, Governments have gazetted the regulations while something is sorted out. They have not blatantly laughed at the Parliament. I have seen Ministers laughing at the Parliament, saying, 'Aren't we clever; we will gazette these—'

Mr Brindal: I remember you doing that, Frank.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You do not. I did not want to be interrupted or become engaged in a slanging match, because I do not believe that this is at all Party-political. Parliament is allowing its powers to be usurped by the Executive unnecessarily, and Parliament ought not do that. That is why the legislation is framed in the way it is. Over the last few years—in fact, it is really only over the last few months—some Ministers have developed this attitude that, because they can re-gazette the regulation, they will do so every week if necessary if one House of Parliament knocks it out. That is an affront to the Parliament and absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Act and to the spirit of having a regulation-making provision. I agree completely with what the Deputy Leader said. The practice of those Ministers who have laughed across the Parliament and stated quite openly, 'We'll do what we like: we don't accept Parliament's

decision in refusing this particular regulation; we'll continue to re-gazette it forever and a day', is totally contrary to the Parliament's keeping to itself that power of veto over regulations of which the Parliament does not approve.

I note that it is really one or two of the tyro Ministers who have suddenly become puffed up with their own importance, but those Ministers who have smirked, laughed and demonstrated to us how clever they think they are will have problems, because clearly they cannot be trusted with legislation containing a regulation-making provision. If all members of Parliament, irrespective of which side they sit on, believe that that is legitimate, then take away the Parliament's veto; say that the Government has the right to make regulations—end of story. If you think that the regulations are *ultra vires* to the Act, go to the Supreme Court: take away our right to veto, and let us have that debate. I would oppose that, but let us have that debate. That would be far more honest than what is happening now with certain Ministers.

First, Ministers ought to realise that Parliament is not a joke. They should not sit there and sneer and laugh at the Parliament's decision. Parliament has made the decision and, whether or not we agree with it, that is the system. If we do not like the make-up of the Parliament, that is why we have elections. But, if the Parliament has made a decision, that is it. Wiser heads in the Party room—and if there are any in the Cabinet—ought to say, 'It is wrong to flout the will of Parliament in this way.' But, secondly, at a more practical level, it will cause this Government a lot of trouble. It will do so, because the make-up of the Legislative Council is such that there are some quite large egos there, and some of its members can maintain a presence in the Legislative Council only by demonstrating—usually to minority groups—that they can be effective. If some Ministers are taking away their right to be effective, they are going to do it another way. They will maintain their effectiveness to get their approximately 10 per cent of the vote. You are taking away their effectiveness.

Members should not laugh at it because they can retaliate—and they will, and they are right to do so. All I am asking for is that wiser heads in the Party room and in the Government say to those Ministers, 'It is unacceptable to the Parliament, work it another way.' You would not need to be Rhodes Scholar to work out how to get the money for this provision in some other way. You would say, 'The Parliament has made a decision, end of story, we will come at it from another angle.' It is easy, but to sit there after being a Minister for five minutes and to sneer at the Parliament and say 'I can do anything I want and every time the Parliament knocks out this provision I will re-gazette it, because I am the Minister'—sitting on the seat there all puffed up with importance—is wrong.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did not. I had an enormous respect for the Parliament. If the member for Unley or the member for Elder can draw to my attention any action I have taken that showed disrespect for the Parliament, whether in this particular way or any other, I would certainly apologise.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Before any of the members opposite who were here make these accusations across the Chamber they ought to do their homework and come up with some examples, and I would suggest that that is the last we will hear of that particular charge. All I am asking for is that commonsense prevail and that these puffed

up, jumped up Ministers understand what the regulation-making provision is about and that they respect the will of Parliament when it exercises its veto.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

**WORKERS REHABILITATION AND
COMPENSATION (DEFINITION OF TRAUMA)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 758.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the Bill put forward by the member for Spence. Indeed, it is an amendment to an Act which is long overdue. Over the past few days members opposite have been talking a lot about giving people a fair go. What about giving a fair go to the sufferers of mesothelioma? I thank the Minister for Health for his help with pronunciation. However, I would also particularly thank the Minister for Health if he were to vote for this measure. As the member for Spence quite rightly pointed out in his second reading explanation, there are a number of workers who because of working in various trades, particularly in the building industry, come across asbestos on a regular basis, and the disease does not become apparent for some 30 to 35 years as it lies latent in the body for that period of time.

It is simply because of the effluxion of time that workers who are injured find themselves without any recourse to workers' compensation, simply because this Parliament decided—and rightly in my view—when a new workers' compensation Act came into force in September 1987 that injuries sustained prior to that date came under the previous workers' compensation legislation and that the past private insurers should be held accountable for the cost of any injuries. Unfortunately, life is not as simple as that, as the member for Spence pointed out, particularly when he gave the example of a Mr Huntley. In that case the person concerned worked for a series of employers in the building industry. In the building industry it is an itinerant type of work. A worker follows the job and employers change on a weekly or monthly basis. Many of the employers end up in liquidation, sold out, or whatever, during that 30 to 35 years before the worker contracts this hideous disease which, as we all know, ends in a very painful and slow death.

The member for Spence simply seeks to amend the Act to provide that those workers who are unable to claim against their previous insurer can do so under the WorkCover system. In the main, it should not be a hugely costly exercise because by the time those particular workers find out they have the disease they are either retired or near retirement age and, as we know, in terms of income maintenance, the workers' compensation legislation cuts out at age 65, or six months after they cease being in the work force and, in any event, ceases at age 70. In the main, it is the medical costs that need to be picked up. In so far as the medical costs are concerned, they can be expensive, but by that time, regrettably, the injured worker does not have a long time to live. For all the reasons that were very eloquently put forward by the member for Spence, I urge the House to show compassion for the small group in the work force who, through no fault of their own, find themselves unable to get proper workers' compensation simply because this Parliament brought into

place a new workers' compensation Act on 1 September 1987.

The Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal recognised the justice of Mr Huntley's case and interpreted the legislation in such a way so as to enable him to claim compensation under the current Act. Regrettably, the Supreme Court overturned that decision. Unfortunately, again, the Supreme Court does not recognise real life situations, as far as I am concerned, when it deals with industrial relations matters, in particular workers' compensation issues. It does not deal with it on a day-to-day basis and it does not have the expertise that a specialist industrial tribunal such as the Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal has. Members opposite have spent much time over the past few days talking about a fair go. What about a fair go for injured workers who suffer from this dreadful disease and who, through absolutely no fault of their own, but simply by the effluxion of time and the type of disease they have contracted find themselves unable to claim compensation. It is a disgraceful situation and one which justice demands be remedied and remedied straightaway: it has been denied for far too long.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

**REHABILITATION OF SEXUAL OFFENDERS
BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 761.)

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Before I pass remarks on this Bill, I apologise to the member for Giles for interrupting him because I acknowledge that the points he made were very important and touched on us all in this House. I commend what he said to all members because it is in that vein that I wish to address the House on this Bill introduced by the member for Kaurana. The member for Giles is quite right; he always has acknowledged Parliament as an important forum and has never belittled it. I think that is what lies at the crux of this and a number of private members' Bills with which we will deal this session.

I believe that most members have already made up their mind. If most members in this place have already made up their mind on this measure, I suggest that they read it, because I am appalled at the way that this Bill, introduced by the member for Kaurana, has been treated in the media. Every member in this place knows that this is the chemical castration Bill. I suggest that members read in their dictionaries the meaning of the word 'castration': to remove the testicles. They should read also this Bill. The two bear no similarity to each other.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence does himself no credit when the House is trying to debate a serious matter, and all he can do is pass stupid, flippant comments relating to my genitalia rather than his. That is what lies at the crux of this Bill: the ignorance of the media which perpetrate basically a lie to the people of South Australia by saying that the House is now considering chemical castration. It is not.

The Bill deals with a possible method of providing for the rehabilitation of some sexual offenders. Under the Bill, a court can order that a person undergo counselling, but, if the person is not suitable as a result of the counselling, it is not proceeded with. If a person is suitable, a whole series of provisions in the Bill ensures that it is not compulsory, not

coercive and not enforceable on anyone. It is a voluntary procedure and it is reversible—it is not permanent.

For those members who say, 'This is no good; it is an infringement of rights', I would say: do you proffer the same argument when many men, because of blood pressure, either too low or too high, have to go on various prescription drugs which decrease their potency? Many men are made impotent because they take drugs to treat other disorders. Do we jump up and down about that in here, or do we acknowledge that they have a problem related to their physiology and this is an unfortunate side effect?

This Bill is important for the people of South Australia, not—I would put to the House—for the sexual offenders, but for the victims of sexual offence. Go and talk to the children who are attacked by sexual offenders. Go and talk to the woman who lives in terror and who came to see me when I represented the electorate of Hayward. I will tell the House the story briefly. She had been befriended by a young man who was nothing but sweetness and light. He befriended her and then seduced her, and then he began living with her. Some years later she found that he had progressively interfered with and sexually molested each of her children, and she was beside herself, feeling guilt and remorse.

This man had been so devious that he would do it taking the eldest daughter to the shop. He would drive her in the car to the delicatessen and bring her back. He would not be gone an unnecessarily long time, perhaps just a few minutes too long, and on the way he would interfere with the daughter. The mother did not know. She was carrying enormous guilt and pain. It destroyed her life and that of her children. She came to see me at the time he was about to get out of gaol, because she knew that he would not be reformed, and he had made the vilest threats against her and her family.

She told me that this man was being released and, like many victims, she thought that his period of imprisonment was too short. What terrified her most was that she would be a victim for the rest of her life, because she and her children would live in real fear of this person, and no steps had been taken to rehabilitate him. This is the problem. We sit in this Parliament and sanctimoniously condemn these people, and so we should, and lock them up, but what do we do? We do not even compel them to attend counselling, because that would invade their civil rights. We have the people and, as was recently talked about in the paper, a known, long-time sexual offender is about to go out and do it all again. What do we say to his potential next victim two days after we let him out the door? He was a criminal, he served his time, he paid for his crime, so we will let him out to do it again. That is basically what we do.

This measure might not be correct, but at least it tries to look at the problem. It suggests that, if we encourage those who are not in control of their sexual urges through counselling and chemical means to lower their sexual urge, there might be fewer potential victims, and we might make those people happier in their life. Some sexual offenders might be torn between knowing what is right and the darker impulses which drive them. They might not all do it happily or willingly or think that they are the best people in the world. They might be torn and driven. If this measure helps them to find rehabilitation and some peace in their life, and if it saves one child or one mother only, it might be worth it.

I will not argue for compulsory castration. I will not argue for locking people up for life, or anything like that. But I will argue strongly before this House that members should read this measure to see what it is about. If the measure is

moderate and might result in some good, I hope the whole House will consider it carefully, and not be driven on blindly by the idiots in the media who want to make a cheap headline and want to reduce everything to a cheap grab so they can say, 'This is the chemical castration Bill.' I defy anyone in this House to say how this means castration or that there is any level of compulsion. If it is voluntary and it might do some good, it is about time this House, which is elected by the people, acknowledged that.

The point made by the member for Giles is very important. Basically in this Bill it amounts to this: as the member for Giles said, we go to the polls once in four years, we could elect a representative Government, the governing Party could meet once and, in the case of the Liberal Party, it could elect its Leader who could pick his or her Ministers, and we could go home, have four years off, have a wonderful time, receive the same pay and never come in here. If we have nothing to contribute, we should not be in here; but we do have something to contribute.

As the member for Giles rightly said, Parliament should be the check and balance on the will of the Executive Government. Parliament is the will of the people to whom the Executive Government is answerable. In addition, Parliament is the representative of the people to make informed decisions. We have the privilege of being given full time to study and work out measures which may incrementally help our society. That is our obligation and our duty, and we should not be deflected from that duty by idiots in the media whose intelligence is probably lower than that of any single member of this Parliament but who deign to dictate drivel and to dictate this House's actions.

I do not say that this Bill should pass but, as I said regarding the measures on prostitution reform and euthanasia, it deserves the serious attention of this House. It should pass its second reading so that we can all think about it and make a good decision for the people of South Australia, and not be driven along by second-rate employees of Mr Rupert Murdoch.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My contribution will be no less passionate than that of the member for Unley in the way in which I seek to attract members' attention to the substance of the legislation before us, to attract their attention to the parallels that already exist in the way in which we treat people who have behavioural aberrations so far removed from the norm that they are incapable of either responsible conduct in the community or coherent communication to others who wish to relate to them. Of course, I am referring to mental illness. We already administer hormones or other substances that stimulate readjustment of the balance of the hormones in the human body of the subject being treated and, in some instances, it is without their consent.

However, in most instances it is with their consent, it is voluntary and at any time those people suffering that mental illness can take themselves off the program. I used to know many people who have been suffering such conditions. Members would know that my first wife was a psychiatric social worker and was the Chief Social Worker in the Mental Health Services Division in South Australia and in supporting her in her work I had extensive contact with a large number of those people. The nature of that illness is different from physical illness, injury or other pathogenesis, but it is none the less an illness. I am not saying that sexual offenders suffer from an illness. I am saying that they suffer from a stimulus from their brain brought about by the effect of secretions

from their endocrine glands which result in their feeling such urges that they will indulge themselves if they think they can get away with it. This legislation is about those who indulge themselves in sexual contact of one kind or another, which we describe as being deviant, with children.

It is appalling behaviour to the vast majority of society, but paedophiles see it and think of it as being normal and they always have. History is replete with the excesses of paedophiles that sicken me. Anyone who has studied the history of the Egyptians, the Romans or the Greeks in their literature or artefacts left to us from their times can see that such practices were part of what some people in positions of privilege felt they could engage in and get away with. It revolts me utterly, though they were so motivated by the ideas in their brain, stimulated by the chemistry of that brain which had in turn been stimulated by the chemistry of the hormone secreted by the endocrine glands causing the problem.

This measure enables the people who have been convicted of these sexual offences to seek and obtain treatment similar to people who suffer from mental illness. It rearranges the influence of hormones in their bodies so that they are not stimulated in their brain to contemplate such acts. We as a society are greatly relieved of the risk of this aberrant behaviour related to those acts. Unquestionably, we are better off and so are the victims, because they will no longer be at risk of becoming victims. It is not appropriate for us to moralise about civil liberties at this time in the development of our understanding of the sciences of organic chemistry, psychology and psychiatry as a discipline in medicine and how we can beneficially apply it there.

It is quite clear to me that we can justify opposition to this proposition only on the basis of our ignorance (and our happiness to remain ignorant and indifferent) to what would otherwise be possible. There is no invasion of civil liberties proposed in this measure: there is only benefit. As someone who has suffered at the hands of sadists, it strikes me that for some time means have existed by which we could have stopped this aberrant behaviour—different from that of sadists but coming from the same quarters—20 years ago at least.

It is now up to us to familiarise ourselves with both the morality and the principles that motivate the member for Kaurna in bringing this measure before us, as well as the science which enables her and people who have helped her in drafting it to secure for us the means of treating those who would otherwise be offenders. Indeed, in my judgment the legislation does not go quite far enough in that it does not allow somebody who may fear that they will get involved in offences of this kind against children to put themselves on the program voluntarily until they have committed an offence. They cannot do that: they must wait until they have committed an offence and have it recorded as such before they can go onto the program. The legislation ought to go further and enable anyone who fears that they have a propensity to engage in this behaviour to seek through counselling the means by which they could access the treatment.

All in all, I know that children will be safer if we pass this measure through our Parliament. South Australia will again be able to stand proudly in the international arena of legislators, as we can, given the history of social reforms passed in this Chamber in the past hundred years or so—in education, land titles and women's suffrage. We will again stand proud in the international arena of Chambers committed to producing reform legislation because we did it first, for the right

reasons. I commend the member for Kaurna on what she has done and the courage she has shown in it. In the seat she holds, knowing the risks to which she is exposed politically of having her motives and this measure misrepresented in her electorate. She has shown great courage indeed in bringing it before us.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Foley:

That the regulations under the MFP Development Act 1992 relating to land excluded from core site, gazetted on 17 October and laid on the table of this House on 22 October 1996, be disallowed.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 764.)

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I refer to what I believe to be a ridiculous proposition of the member for Hart, but not only that, and perhaps more importantly, I will rebut some of the remarks made by members about regulations in general and the relationship between Executive Government and the Parliament, where that involves the way in which we as a Parliament over the years have allowed our legislative rights to be in no small measure eroded by delegating the authority to establish legislation as subordinate legislation in regulations.

Members opposite who debated this matter spoke as though they really meant it, as though they believed what they were saying—and I would like to think that they were sincere. However, although I have not been in this place as long as you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I can clearly recall Opposition members arguing exactly the opposite when I put to them the propositions that they were putting to the Chamber earlier this morning about regulations.

In relation to the member for Giles' saying that Ministers for five minutes came into this Chamber as new Ministers and gloated at the power they had over the Parliament through subordinate legislation, it was to my mind akin to throwing stones when you are in a glass house. The member for Giles should not need me to remind him that upon his election to this place, when he chose to resign from the other place and seek election here—

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

Debate adjourned.

OCEANIA SHOOTING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr BASS (Florey): I move:

That this House congratulates the participants of the successful Oceania Shooting Championships held in Adelaide between Friday 31 January and Saturday 8 February 1997, and particularly the South Australians who won medals and reached the minimum qualifying score for the 2000 Olympics selection and participation in future World Championships.

It gives me much pleasure to move this motion. The Oceania Shooting Championships are held every two years. They are held in Australia for two years and then in New Zealand for two years, alternating between the two countries. This year it was Australia's turn, and Adelaide was the venue. A total of 391 competitors and 127 officials from 14 countries were involved, with over 62 events. More than 150 workers were involved in the organisation to ensure that all the competitions ran smoothly.

Only five Oceania countries—Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, New Caledonia and Western Samoa—officially compete. However, as is normal with the Oceania Shooting Championships, there are invited countries that send competitors so that they can be involved in high standard competitive shooting. On this occasion, Malaysia, Japan, Korea, the United States of America, South Africa and Chinese Taipei were the non-Oceania countries that sent competitors to participate. As well as the 39 able-bodied competitors, the Oceania championships also included wheelchair athletes, who competed in what is known as demonstration sports.

I presented medals on three occasions and attended the wind-up dinner, and I was amazed at the large number of young competitors involved from all the countries. The competition had 47 team officials and 45 jurors, who I am pleased to say were not called on to take part in the competition. The competition was held, and there was no argument over who had won; the jurors were there merely as observers. The competition attracted 533 known visitors to Adelaide, for a minimum period of 10 days. It cost \$300 000 to organise the games, and that is excluding air fares, car and bus hire, meals, and so on. I am told by people with a better understanding of economics than I that \$300 000 to organise the games equates to an injection into the South Australian economy of approximately \$3 million. Notwithstanding that this was not a big championship compared to some of the competitions that are held, it was still profitable to the South Australian economy.

Of the South Australians who competed in the Australian team, 41 medals were won by South Australian people during the competition which, as I said, involved 62 different events. During this competition, 81 Olympic qualifying scores were shot. This simply indicates that not only Australian but any other countries' competitors have reached a standard where they are eligible to be selected by their country to shoot at the 2000 Olympics. Of the 81 qualifying scores, 34 were Australians. All medal winners—not only those from South Australia but those from many countries—are to be congratulated.

As I said earlier, I was amazed at the young people who were involved. I was also amazed when I looked at the results of the women's air rifle team competition. The winning team for Australia was Sue Banks, Belinda Muehlberg and Carrie Quigley. What is good about this team is that they are all sisters. Sue Banks was Sue Muehlberg, and Carrie Quigley was also a Muehlberg. They are the three daughters of Sylvia Muehlberg, who was the organising secretary of this meeting. Sylvia has been a competitive shooter. In fact, she was an Olympic shooter, a gold medal winner and a world champion, as was the father of these three young ladies, Morrie, who was also a champion shooter.

It was interesting to note that they won the gold medal, and Carrie, who with 379 had the lowest score of the three sisters, was still three points ahead of the best shot of any other team. Not only did they win the gold medal for Australia but also they won it well. The competition was organised by Sylvia Muehlberg as the organising secretary, and Nick Sullivan who was the Chairperson of the committee and the coordinator of the championships, which they did a magnificent job organising. The venues were spread out from the Wingfield shooting range, to Castambul, to the Black Powder range and up to Monarto, where they shot over long distances. Logistically, much organisation was needed to ensure that everybody could travel to these places. You need

not only the competitors there but also the jury members, the judges and the helpers.

One thing came out of the shooting championships that is worthy of mention. At a rifle competition, one of the New Zealand competitor's rifle malfunctioned after the first shot. The manager of the Australian team who was not competing on that day retrieved his firearm from his vehicle and lent it to the New Zealand competitor. When he gave the gun to the competitor, he said, 'It's the best gun in Australia, and you can use it.' It must have been the best gun in Australia, because the New Zealand competitor won the gold medal. That is an indication of the camaraderie that existed between the competitors. Notwithstanding that the competition was small in comparison with some others, drug testing was conducted, which indicates that it was a very well run competition.

I would like to mention the South Australians who won medals, as follows: pistol—Greg Schultz, Peter Schultz, Karen Hitchcock, Peter Edgecombe, David J. Chapman, David E. Chapman and Chris Shentall; small bore—Debbie Lowe, Ben Mahoney (junior), Belinda Muehlberg, Adam Pascoe, Carrie Quigley, Andrew Warren and Sue Banks; muzzle loading—John Humberstone (current world champion), Steve Nicholas, Bill McCarthy, Graham Cutting, Kim Atkinson, Jeff Labrum, Lawrie Rees, Alan Vaisham, Tim Rogers, David McCarthy (junior), Jessica Atkinson (junior), Michael Barnett (junior), Frank Garie and Brian Morris; running target—Brenton Pollard; international scoped rifle—Gary Owen and Rod Frisby; shotgun (trap)—C. Bentley, B. Byrnes (junior); shotgun (skeet)—R. Dower; shotgun (Australian trap)—Sue Byrnes, and the team of C. Bentley, D. Lymn and R. Walsh; full bore—D. Freebairn; and in the disabled competition—Geoff McCormick and Nunzio Sapio.

These people are to be congratulated for not only their fine effort in representing Australia but also the firearm fraternity. During the championships, there were no problems whatsoever with behaviour. The dinner held on the Monday night at the Hotel Adelaide was well attended, and the member for Playford and the Deputy Premier (Hon. G.A. Ingerson) joined me as guests. I must also pass comment on the United States team, which was invited to attend. That team was comprised of juniors aged between 18 and 20. Their behaviour at the shooting competition and the dinner was excellent as was the behaviour of all those who attended. I congratulate the South Australian committee on its conduct of these championships, and I especially congratulate Nick Sullivan and Sylvia Muehlberg.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUTOMOTIVE TARIFFS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I move:

That this House commends the Premier for his support of the South Australian motor vehicle and component industry through his stand on tariffs; and urges all members of the Senate and the House of Representatives to reject the draft report of the Australian Productivity Commission.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion. I do so above all else as a South Australian, not as the member for Hartley or as a member of the Liberal Party, but because I am concerned about South Australia and the future of the automobile and component industry and its associated jobs. I commend the Premier for his stand on this issue. As can be seen from the many articles that have been in the press, the

Premier has relentlessly represented the State on this issue, even at times when he has come in conflict with Federal Liberal members, because representing South Australia and its future should be of prime importance to all of us, regardless of our political Party. The *Sunday Mail* article by Mike Duffy sums up the problems we are facing. He states:

Imported vehicles claimed a record 57.8 per cent of the Australian car market during January. This result will shock local car makers and the component suppliers. And it will shroud the homes of tens of thousands of South Australian car workers with insecurity and depression. It will flash an ugly message around the world that Australia is an easy target for cheap imports—and not an ideal location to build cars in the future.

What would have been a living nightmare a decade or so ago, when 80 per cent of the car industry was reserved by quotas for local car makers, now is reality. Importers dominate the Aussie car market. The broader picture is even gloomier. The Hyundai Excel outsold the Ford Falcon for the first time—grim news for SA component makers and their workers who rely on contracts from the two Victorian-based car giants.

That article puts in perspective what we are looking at. We should not be dominated by economic theory or policies that can cost South Australians jobs. Our prime responsibility, as the Premier has stated on many occasions, is to the future of South Australia. I commend the Premier for his stand.

The article in Tuesday's *Advertiser* sums up the Premier's stand. It states, under the headline, 'No cuts for car tariffs, vows Olsen':

The State Government 'will not allow' proposed drastic tariff cuts to Australia's automotive industry, the Premier Mr Olsen has told Japanese business leaders. Mr Olsen made the pledge when he launched a \$41 million joint venture company between Bridgestone Australia and Japanese component giant Toyoda Gosei in Adelaide yesterday. The Premier told Toyoda Gosei executives that the joint venture to manufacture car components at Bridgestone's Edwards-town plant was a sound investment for the future.

Last year I moved a motion congratulating the Prime Minister on giving ministerial responsibility to four South Australian members. It was a proud moment for South Australia because we have representation at such high level in the Federal Government. I urge not only those Cabinet Ministers but all Federal members, regardless of Party, to put South Australia first because in a Federation our prime responsibility is to represent our State. Senators, regardless of Parties, were put there by the founders of the Constitution specifically for that purpose. In this case it is important to remember the detrimental effects on South Australia that would result if the Productivity Commission's report was to be adopted.

Regardless of the political point of view, the effects would be detrimental to South Australian jobs. I congratulate those Federal members who have already spoken out, in particular the Federal member for Sturt.

Mr Foley: What's his name?

Mr SCALZI: Christopher Pyne, a close friend and colleague who represents his electorate well, and the State electorate of Hartley is part of his electorate. The Premier has an impeccable record. On 4 February, in answer to a question from the member for Reynell, he clearly outlined the effect it would have on 17 000 jobs and 44 000 jobs in the second and third tiers. I have attended many functions with and on behalf of the Premier, and the same message is out there: South Australia must come first. He has not shifted from the main game, and this is one of the most important issues that South Australia is facing. He has not been sidetracked by other issues; he is putting South Australia first. I urge all State and Federal members, regardless of Party affiliation, to put South Australia first and to oppose the tariff cuts.

At times, some members refer to the 'level playing field' and say that we should promote free trade—which is most important—so that car prices, etc., will come down. To a certain extent that is true, but no political Party or Government should be completely dominated by economic theory. Economic theory should be subservient to political goals. Economic theory is a method not an end in itself. If chasing an economic theory puts at risk the community wellbeing, that economic theory must be adjusted to suit the political goals and the community wellbeing of our society.

I commend the Premier for putting South Australia first and protecting the motor vehicle and component industries. There is no such thing as an economic level playing field; there is no such thing as a totally free market: that is as ridiculous as believing that all State enterprises will solve all problems of a community. It does not work. As I have said, economics is a method not an end in itself. If we took that theory to its ultimate logic, Australia should not be producing many of the things that it now produces. We would produce only things native to Australia—flora and fauna—because that is what we produce best. However, over the years we have had changes to the economy and adapted to European goods and services. We are great exporters of those primary goods, and we do that more efficiently than the more traditional producers would have done at the time if that economic theory had been applied.

Indeed, there is no such thing as the actual reduction of tariffs in many countries. Some of our competitors have tariffs of 200 per cent. It is ridiculous for us to chase that theory at the expense of jobs in South Australia. It would be nice if everyone played the same game, but the reality is that they do not. We must not be fooled into joining in the game and scoring our own goals, because that is what we would be doing: scoring our own goals, putting South Australian jobs and the State's future at risk. Sir Thomas Playford, who was one of the biggest supporters of the motor vehicle industry in South Australia and who started it all off, would have said the same thing. He would have examined the situation to see what was best for South Australia and said, 'We have had some efficiency.'

The Button plan brought about some important reforms and they were necessary, but enough is enough. South Australian jobs and the future of South Australians come first.' Sir Thomas Playford would have urged all South Australian members of Parliament, regardless of Party, to put South Australia first. An article in the *News Weekly*, dated 8 February 1997 and headed 'Cutting tariffs is one thing: cutting our throats is another', states:

'The Productivity Commission's recommendation for a continuing reduction in tariffs is based on absurd logic', says former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser. 'In regard to the automotive industry, among our trading partners—including self-styled free traders like the USA—the levying of tariffs of up to 200 per cent plus stiff import restrictions are the order of the day.'

That clearly outlines the approach we should take. The *Sunday Mail* of 26 January 1997 quoted former Industry Minister Button as follows:

It was never my intention to force tariffs below 15 per cent.

Former Senator Button is the person who introduced reforms that were necessary, and no-one doubts that those reforms were necessary: there was over-protection in the past, but now we are going too far. Former Senator Button further said:

The Federal Government should leave the question of tariffs well alone at a time crucial reinvestment decisions are being made by overseas shareholders of local car companies.

The *Sunday Mail* article further states:

Mr Button, now retired from politics, said every country in South-East Asia wanted its own automotive industry. Mr Button said that sales tax should be reduced. 'It is absurd that a fifth of the price of a vehicle should be sales tax.' In 1984 Senator Button rocked the industry with a plan to steadily reduce tariffs from 57.5 to 15 per cent by the year 2000.

Former Senator Button, a person of experience, is telling us that this is not the time to reduce tariffs. If we really want to reduce the price of motor vehicles, as the Premier has often said, we should tackle the Federal tax system which adds a further \$5 000 to the price of a Magna and a Commodore. Many components make up the cost: we should not look only at tariffs. Importing 57.5 per cent of our motor vehicles shows that we are heading down the wrong path.

The system must serve man, not man the system. Economic theories should be subservient to political goals and community wellbeing. We have a 9.2 per cent unemployment rate, with a huge youth unemployment rate—and that problem has not occurred in the past three years but has been ongoing—and by not protecting the industries that could provide jobs for South Australians we, as members of Parliament, would be acting irresponsibly. I urge all Federal members of Parliament—and I include the Labor members, although I do not have many newspaper headlines relating to them—to support this motion and support South Australia. I commend the motion to the House.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I support the motion. I do so because of the dependence of the electorate of Kaurna on a viable motor vehicle industry—not only the motor vehicle industry *per se* but all the other industries, such as Walker Australia and the major industries located within the southern area as a result of the motor vehicle industry. I also support the motion because of the absolute dependence that industry has in relation not only to the car manufacturing industry but to all the small associated businesses that require a viable and sustained car industry around them to make their business within the southern area successful.

It is essential that the car industry be maintained. A knowledge of sustainability is also essential to give that needed confidence to the entire retail and building market within the electorate. The quick and devastating response that was felt by the motor vehicle industry was very evident after the reaction to the Keating increase in motor vehicle sales tax. In reply to that, there was an immediate cancellation of a number of vehicle purchases within the electorate of Kaurna. This feeds back down the whole line of job industry.

Industries the size of the car manufacturing industry need to be able to make decisions to invest many years ahead and to gear up for new models. Therefore, a long term surety is an absolute essential. If a reduction of tariffs occurs, the industry needs time to adjust to those changed market conditions. No-one in the industry objects to competition within a free market, that is, deregulation, but they do object to it if it is not conducted on a level playing field in relation to their competition, particularly overseas partners. The Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries argues that domestic markets would be disadvantaged by the removal of tariffs too quickly. Obviously this is already a huge pressure on the local market, as vehicle imports are destined to grow as tariffs are lowered. The local market is competing with high protection from its competitive neighbours.

Mitsubishi has shown that it can compete with the best in the world by producing a car here and exporting it to the

world's car capital, America. One question is how much more competitive it can become in relation to decreasing costs further and how the car industry can continue to do this with decreased tariffs, especially under the current sales tax regime. Mitsubishi had an export figure of \$195 million in 1995. The growth potential for export from Australia to countries in Asia, such as China, as they gear up to move from cycle and motorbike power to cars, is immense. The size of exports is limited only by the capacity to produce and, most importantly, the capacity to compete with those other European and Asian countries which have a greater tariff regime than does Australia currently. It must be as easy to export Mitsubishi products from Australia to Korea as it is to import Daewoo and Kia to Australia. Clearly, this is not the current situation with tariff reductions, because the skew is even further towards overseas countries. This is over and above the importance of those exports to all the associated manufacturing goods and to our balance of payments.

Employment in Australia, South Australia and, most importantly, my electorate is the absolute key issue currently before Federal and State Governments, and those are the key issues that Federal and State Governments should work towards solving. Governments can do a range of things to set a climate for investment and job growth. I question whether this is the time to be lowering tariffs and putting current job growth in the car industry at risk.

Last year, Mitsubishi employed an extra 700 employees, which has not been matched by very many other industries throughout Australia. This job growth opportunity has a significant effect on electorates such as Kaurna, especially since we recently experienced the closure of Noarlunga Metro Meat, which immediately put 500 people out of work. This is what I referred to earlier about the need for stability. People will not spend, invest in homes, furniture or establishment costs unless they feel that they have secure positions in the work force. To a large extent it is Government that can influence that feeling of security by dictating sound, responsible policies which are maintained and not changed at the whim of Government.

Built into this is also the added Government burden which would be felt through the Department of Social Security, as those people would become unemployed and then added to the unemployment list. The industry needs a firm base on which to grow and a long-term strategic plan on which to work. In South Australia the importance of the car industry to employment is demonstrated by the number of employees, approximately 14 000, some 15 per cent of the State's manufacturing sector. Many small companies exist in my colleague the member for Reynell's electorate at Lonsdale and she has been and continues to be a strong advocate of their survival. Whether these businesses are small family affairs or larger it is essential that they all be maintained, and preferably expanded, and it behoves every member in this place to support them in their stand.

Investment growth in the industry is expected to reach \$1.9 billion in 1997, which is not insignificant. I feel confident that the local market for local vehicles would grow rapidly with decreased sales tax to add significantly to the sales expected from exports. The expectation is based on economics as per current policy, that as tariffs decrease the sales of exports will increase but local markets will fall.

Kaurna has a high level of 10 to 29-year-olds; in fact 29 per cent of our population falls into that age group, so job growth and job security are massively important for that section of the electorate. The highest job categories are

tradespeople and labourers/factory workers, representing 34 per cent of the work force in Kaurna, so the extent of reliance in my electorate alone on the car industry and related industries is easily identifiable. This Government's initiatives of increased youth employment such as the recent Job Shop launched by the Hon. Dorothy Kotz in my electorate will obviously target those successful industries to take on the trained youth. This initiative will not work if there is uncertainty in the industry about its continuation; so there is a much wider context of the consideration of the tariff issue.

Recent investments by Mitsubishi at Lonsdale have had major positive effects in the southern areas and have been adequately canvassed by the member for Reynell. The effect of the already reduced tariffs from the beginning of 1987 to the present date have seen imports rise from 18 per cent to 47 per cent. There is no reason to assume that as tariffs fall further this trend will not continue.

Competition within the local industry has reached top levels, as evidenced by the export of Mitsubishi cars to America. Naturally, decreased tariffs will force inefficient companies out, but I contend that decreasing tariffs too quickly or too far will also force out our efficient manufacturers because of level of competition from other countries. We do not have the level playing field that everyone keeps talking about. My fear is that in my electorate there will not be another growth industry to take up the unemployed that will be displaced by the decrease in the motor industry. Wine and tourism will be growth industries in the south but there is not capacity for expansion at either the rate or the volume to take up those numbers, the result of devastating unemployment.

Recent improvements in Mitsubishi have been enormous, and as just one example I can put on record the report made at my recent environment forum by Mr John Schultz, who detailed waste minimisation strategies, which saved the company money, made production more efficient and improved the effect on the environment. I would like to join my colleagues the members for Reynell, Mawson and Hartley in calling on the Federal Government to consider very carefully the effects of the recommendations of the Industry Commission Inquiry and to reject those recommendations.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That this House advise the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission that its policy for naming State districts should give priority to city, town and district names ahead of the names of deceased South Australians.

This motion is the same as one that lapsed in 1995 after the member for Unley had indicated to the House his Party's conditional support. My remarks in support of the original motion appear in *Hansard* of 24 August 1994, and the speeches from the members for Unley and Price concurring with the motion appear in *Hansard* of 13 October 1994.

For many years the State districts that make up the House of Assembly were named for the cities, towns and regions each district covered. Our electorates had names such as Mount Gambier, Hindmarsh, Albert Park, Mitcham and Millicent. Whenever these electorates were mentioned in debate, or on election night, one could picture in the mind's eye the place or the member: I would think of the Blue Lake and Harold Allison; Port Road just over the Torrens and the late Cyril Hutchens; the 1930s bungalows along the Grange

railway past the Woodville junction and 'Hollywood' Hamilton; the jacaranda-lined streets and Robin Millhouse on his bike; or the pine forests and saw mills and Des Corcoran.

What did members think on election night when the commentators announced that Lee had fallen to the Liberals; that the swing to the Opposition in Fisher was monumental; that the Liberals were under performing in Wright but would win it; that the Democrats had pushed Labor into third place in Waite; that big Steve was biting his nails in Colton over the independent challenge; that Elder was changing Parties; and that Ivan was back in Custance? I suspect the only thing members thought when they heard those electorate names was, 'Where is that seat now?' If, like me, that is what members thought, imagine what voters who do not follow politics much except at election time were thinking. Voters would not have had that thought as the results came in for Norwood, Unley and Adelaide.

The Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission policy of naming State districts after prominent, worthy but deceased South Australians stops the people from imagining the system of representation we have devised for them. Abstract electorate names, as I call them, do not tell voters how they are represented in Parliament. Many prominent and worthy people are commemorated by city, suburb and district names that should, according to my motion, be picked up by the Commission. This would have the dual advantage of remembering worthies and allowing the voters to know and relate to their electorate. However, the priority should be for the latter instead of the former where both cannot be achieved. If my electorate of Spence or the Peake electorate were named for Governor Hindmarsh (the first Governor of our State and a man who first subdivided the local area), instead of being named for a nineteenth century Scottish Australian suffragette who had no connection with the area, or an early twentieth century Liberal MP who had no connection with the area, what would be lost?

The Federal Parliament has long since applied abstract names to most of its Federal divisions. About the only way one could tell a Federal division from a State district was to notice that a Federal division is named after a deceased worthy unrelated to the locale and a State district is named after the biggest suburb or town in the area. For reasons I have explained, that test will no longer work. I would have thought, if we wanted to differentiate the State Parliament from the Federal Parliament and take a distinct place in the Federation, we would try to distinguish our electorates from Federal electorates.

When I first doorknocked in my constituency I used to say, 'Hello, Mick Atkinson is my name; I am the candidate for Spence' and the householder would say, 'What is Spence? Where is it?' They probably thought I was an elder in a previously unknown sect related to the Jehovah's Witnesses or the Mormons. Now I am older and wiser I say, 'Hello, Mick Atkinson is my name; I am the member for the Croydon and Woodville area' and the householder says, 'So, you are the local MP then.'

Members should remember that Spence was in the first wave of abstract electorate names in 1969. The voters have had nine elections to get used to the name through election propaganda, posters, newspaper guides and how-to-vote cards. After 27 years the name has made no impression: Spence voters think of themselves as being in the Federal electorates of Port Adelaide, Adelaide or Hindmarsh and in the City of Hindmarsh-Woodville. I give thanks that the

Federal electorates in my part of South Australia are some of the few in the country with local names.

It must be quite an exciting game in the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission to be a party to the unpublicised machinations in connection with conferring abstract names on electorates. I suspect it goes something like this: 'Let us call an electorate, any electorate, after Ruby Hammond because she was a politically correct contemporary Aboriginal woman. Let us call a Barossa Valley seat after a German winemaker; and, not to forget the Anglo wrinklies, why do we not call one of the northern suburbs electorates we never visit and cannot visualise after Meals on Wheels founder, Doris Taylor? We must name at least one electorate after an Aboriginal nation, even if voters cannot pronounce it and do not know what it is.'

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr Lewis: No, we have not got an electorate named 'Dago'.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Ridley interjects. I would not agree with that interjection, nor was it particularly helpful. But was it not a tragedy—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What was the interjection?

Mr ATKINSON: I am not sure that I want to repeat it. Could we not visualise the member for the seat, and the seat, when the member for Ridley was the member for Murray-Mallee? What a good, colourful, sensible name it was. Then he became the member for Ridley, and nobody knows where it is or what it is about, and they cannot visualise the member. After the next election, when he will be the member for Hammond, ditto! Let us go back to Murray-Mallee—that is what I say.

Those members who are worried that a change of name for their electorate may force them to spend thousands of dollars replacing their corflute posters should not worry. An inexpensive run of stickers or a stencil and a can of spray paint will do the trick. Or they could go what I did at the last election, and that is just drop the electorate name from the corflute poster because, if it is an abstract electorate name, it is meaningless to voters anyway. My new poster reads, 'Michael Atkinson, your local MP', and, since I do not display them in Springfield or Loxton, they do not lead to any confusion. The earliest the name change could take effect is in four years, so members would have plenty of time to run down stocks of stationery with the old name. The Commission might change the name of members' State districts anyway, even if this motion does not pass.

It is my wish that the House pass this motion, and I hope that the Electoral District Boundaries Commission shall take notice of it during its next deliberations in 1998. I do not ask the commission to apply this motion to every State district. Some districts are so big and differentiated that no local name will do the trick. The vast expanses in the north-west of the State now encompassed by the State district named after the explorer Giles are best left with that name, rather than Whyalla, a city that forms only part of the electorate. But to stop calling Unley by that name, because Goodwood and Kings Park are also suburbs in the electorate, is churlish; and to persist in calling my electorate Spence after 27 years of failure is to have contempt for my constituents who would be better able to imagine their little patch, their member and their input into the Parliament if the electorate bore a local name.

Mr SCALZI secured the adjournment of the debate.

MITSUBISHI

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That this House congratulates Mitsubishi Motors Australia on the outstanding national success of the Verada and all of the Mitsubishi work force who made it possible for the Mitsubishi Magna Verada to be named the 1996 *Wheels* Car of the Year.

'Australia expects—Mitsubishi delivers' is the front page headline of the February edition of *Wheels*, a cover page that I hope to see framed and hanging in the main reception areas of the Mitsubishi Lonsdale and Tonsley plants. A magnificent achievement once again for Mitsubishi and an even greater achievement for the workers of the two southern car plants and the affiliated industries that work with Mitsubishi.

Mitsubishi's Magna/Verada is the 1996 *Wheels* Car of the Year. *Wheels* magazine highlights the fact that this Magna redefines that mainstream Australian family sedan. It is a car designed to compete with Lexus, Honda and BMW but is priced to compete against Falcon and Commodore. Judges in this award noted that Mitsubishi has been able to cut costs without compromising the integrity of the basic vehicle concept, and it was this refinement and, of course, the Verada's capabilities that made it a convincing winner.

When we talk about the Magna, we are talking about a motor car that has changed Australian automotive history. More than a decade after the launch of the Magna, its impact is still rippling through the car industry both here and overseas. It was 1985 that the Mitsubishi Magna, the original Magna, was first named Car of the Year. In quoting Angus Mackenzie, the original 1985 Magna made more than one Japanese manufacturer understand the need to build cars to suit market requirements. Magna was perhaps even more of a paradigm shift for the product planners here in Adelaide's Mitsubishi headquarters, who barely a year earlier had been churning out barge-like, six cylinder, 1960s designed Valiants.

We should also commend Mitsubishi's forward thinking. They may say in the car industry that necessity proved to be the mother of invention, but I believe that vision, drive and the challenge of being up there with the best churns that competitive initiative. Members may recall that it was not that long ago, on the basis of an export program, that Mitsubishi Japan approved the \$500 million investment program proposed by the Adelaide-based arm of its operations. It is the success of this export program that some say will determine the future of Mitsubishi Motors Australia.

The year 1996 saw the smallest list of contenders competing for the prestigious Car of the Year award. However, what the field lacked in quantity was made up in quality. Of the 13 contenders, five were from Japan and three were from Germany, including one that was built in the United Kingdom. There was also a contender from Korea and France, plus a hybrid Magna. For the first time, US built cars made the list of contenders courtesy of Ford's Taurus and Chrysler's Neon.

Car of the Year is about direct car-to-car comparison. It is about evaluating each contender against the award's six criteria, and it became evident while evaluations were being carried out that Mitsubishi Motors Australia had created a middle of the road family sedan without losing much of the original luxury car DNA. I should also add that value for money is what tipped the Car of the Year 1996 award so overwhelmingly in favour of the Magna, which gained a primary vote from 10 of the 11 judges. This gave the Magna

the most convincing win since 1992, when the Mazda 626-Ford Telstar twin scooped the pool.

The *Wheels* Car of the Year award was conceived in 1963 and, whilst the basic concept has remained unchanged since its inception, the process of selecting the *Wheels* Car of the Year has evolved dramatically over the decades. Until the mid 1970s, the award was open only to cars made in Australia. The judging panel was expanded in 1987, bringing in selected specialists beyond that of car magazine writers and road testers. In 1993, testing was opened up to include the testing of every eligible new vehicle.

In the early days, the judging process generally entailed taking a short list of likely contenders on an extended drive program. However, since 1993, using Holden's Lang Lang and Linfox's Anglesea proving grounds, assessment is made on the basis of objective, consistent vehicle assessment. For instance, last year *Wheels* instigated a real world road loop on which each judge could drive each contender under the same conditions. As with the introduction of the proving grounds, the idea was to ensure maximum objectivity in the judging process, and it was in pursuit of this objectivity that a decision was made to change the test regime on the final day of judging at Anglesea.

The judging panel was divided into teams which spent the morning evaluating each contender as a group. The cars were all driven by the same driver with a full complement of passengers, allowing feedback on passenger comfort, seating, noise performance and structural rigidity. The afternoon was spent in classroom mode, with judges reviewing presentations from experts in respective fields, with constant reference to the Car of the Year criteria. I have referred to those criteria, namely: value for money; engineering excellence; advancement in design; performance of intended function; utilisation of resources; and safety.

Mitsubishi Motors Australia builds third generation Magnas which are sold against the Lexus ES300 and the Honda Legend in the US. Just 10 years ago we would have laughed at the idea of Australia exporting prestige cars, but Mitsubishi Motors Australia has changed that and its work force is doing it. For that and many more reasons, it is appropriate that the Mitsubishi Magna Verada, the car that in 1996 had a clean sweep winning all State motoring awards, deserved being named the *Wheels* 1996 Car of the Year.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EUTHANASIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

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 over-ride any such law in any of the Territories in the Commonwealth of Australia.

(Continued from 7 November. Page 494.)

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I thank members for their contributions to the debate.

Motion carried.

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

MULTICULTURALISM

A petition signed by 64 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.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. D.C. Brown)—

Aboriginal Affairs, State Department of—Report, 1995-96.

MY WAY FINANCIAL SERVICES

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I lay on the table a ministerial statement about My Way Financial Services made earlier today by the Attorney-General in another place.

BELAIR RAIL LINE

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Minister for Industrial Affairs): I lay on the table a ministerial statement about the Belair railway line made earlier today by the Minister for Transport in another place.

HEALTH, COUNTRY

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In the House yesterday an honourable member asserted that the establishment of regional health administrations has resulted in a cut to funding for patient care and threatened the closure of small country hospitals. In my answer to that question I explained that no country hospital in South Australia is threatened with closure because, unlike the previous Labor Government, this Government has made a commitment to the continuation of all country hospitals. I would like briefly to respond to the other issue—that regional administration has resulted in a cut to funding for patient care. Regional levies are being applied to country health budgets. All of this money is being retained within the regions and is being applied to regional administration, reserves and initiatives in accord with decisions being taken at the regional level. It is important to realise that regionalisation involves three distinct but related objectives. First, regionalisation drives a process of administrative rationalisation. There is devolution of administrative responsibility from the Health Commission to the regions.

As far as health units are concerned, they are being provided with a range of administrative support services at the regional level, examples of which include consolidated regional financial functions, budgeting, cash flow monitoring and financial reporting. The regional administration will also provide regional level purchasing, which will provide savings to units in reduced costs for goods and services. Further, the regional structure encourages amalgamations and joint administrative arrangements between health units within the regions. For example, the Wakefield region has applied the 2.5 per cent levy to all its hospitals, including Balaklava and Riverton. However, only 1 per cent of the levy will go to

administration: the remaining 1.5 per cent will be applied to regional initiatives. It is the Government's intention that in the medium term there will be a reduction in overall administrative costs in each region.

Secondly, regionalisation involves service improvement. For many years, rural health services have been characterised by the presence of over 100 health provider agencies which includes 60 separate incorporated hospitals. Inevitably, this fragmentation of health providers has not been conducive to the effective integration and coordination of services at the local and regional level, and has resulted in a number of inefficiencies in the delivery of health services. Regionalisation provides an opportunity to streamline the provision of all health services within each of the seven country regions, now established, and to improve both the range of services, as well as access locally. The new arrangements also provide the potential for better planning by each local regional health service board for their regional population, and for the more efficient and effective delivery of services through economies of scale and better integration at the local level.

Further, there will be funding applied to new services at the regional level. To continue using Wakefield region as an example, 1.5 percentage points of the 2.5 per cent levy in the Wakefield region is being applied to regional initiatives by the regional board. The region is awaiting initiative bids which will be assessed by the region to provide services in the region. The majority of the regional levy will go straight back into services for patients.

That leads me to the third and last key element of regionalisation, which entails involving people more in decisions that affect their health. This Government is committed to community involvement in health care provision. The regions are not so much administrative structures as teams of dedicated community people meeting together as regional boards working hard for their communities and their regions to ensure that their health services are the very best they can be. The Government is also giving tangible expression to its commitment to country health through increasing resources to country health. In 1996-97, more than \$14 million in extra health dollars will be spent in South Australia's regional districts. In all, \$198.2 million will be spent, compared with the 1995-96 figure of \$184 million. Each regional service received an increase; for example, the Wakefield region had a 1996 budget with an increase of \$2.6 million. Regionalisation has long been called for by people in rural and remote South Australia. The former Government managed to produce only words about regionalisation. This Government is proud that we have put regionalisation in place and will work with communities to ensure that it meets its key objectives.

VARDON, Ms S.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Most members of this House will be aware by now of the selection of Sue Vardon, one of the State's most successful and dynamic public servants, to head the recently established Commonwealth Service Delivery Agency in Canberra. This agency will consolidate services of the retired, families, the unemployed, carers and widows, the short-term incapacitated and people with disabilities, and

it is expected that, once this agency has been established, Sue will become the Chief Executive.

Ms Vardon was initially recruited to the South Australian Public Service by an earlier Minister for Community Welfare, Greg Crafter, when she was attracted from New South Wales to take over the role of Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare in 1985, and I applaud the then Minister's foresight. As Director-General for Community Welfare, Ms Vardon set about restructuring the department and has been credited with raising the profile of the important area of child protection. In 1992, Ms Vardon was appointed as Chief Executive Officer of the Office of Public Sector Reform and Government Management Board and in 1993 as the Commissioner for Public Employment and Chief Executive Officer, Office of Government Management. These positions provided her with a platform to initiate reform within the public sector, which she did with great effect whilst promoting a bias for 'Yes'.

When this Government came to office in 1993, Ms Vardon was asked to take over the role of Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services—possibly the hardest departmental head position in South Australia, and I speak from experience. Ms Vardon assumed this role with the same intensity and enthusiasm for change as she has shown throughout her career, and it is to her credit that this department is now at the forefront of correctional administration in Australia and the Pacific. By the careful selection of key personnel empowered to make decisions and the continual encouragement of departmental staff at all levels to seek world's best practice, South Australia now enjoys the most cost-effective prison systems in Australia.

In recognition of her efforts, Sue was named the inaugural Telstra Businesswoman of the Year in June 1995, after winning the South Australian and national awards for the public sector category, which is a fitting reward for one who has so many personal achievements to her name and where South Australia has benefited overall. Although I have had the opportunity to work with Ms Vardon only for a few months in my new portfolio, I have come to appreciate her skills and total dedication. Her loss will affect not only those in the community who continually demand a cost effective Public Service which is accountable to the community but also those who champion the cause of social development and prison reform.

I know that many members on both sides of the House share my views of Ms Vardon and her achievements, and I would personally like to place on the record the appreciation of the Government for what has been a distinguished Public Service career and wish her every success in her chosen Federal career.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on questions, I point out that if members ask their questions and continue to interject they might not get the opportunity to ask another question.

QUESTION TIME

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I take note of that comment, Sir. My question is directed to the Premier.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is out of order.

Mr FOLEY: What action will the Premier now take against United Water International for its failure to achieve its non-negotiable contractual commitment to achieve \$38 million in exports in South Australia in the first year of the water contract? The Premier, as Infrastructure Minister, told this House on 22 November 1995:

... there will be \$628 million worth of net exports for South Australia over the next 10 years (\$38 million in the first year) non-negotiable.

However, a media report in the *Advertiser* dated 10 February this year states:

Records show United Water and its parent companies, CG and Thames, generated net exports of only \$3.6 million from South Australia in 1996.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I simply invite the member for Hart to read the whole article in the *Advertiser* on Monday, because it is explained in detail. Obviously the member for Hart was not prepared to read the whole article and take it into account; neither is the member for Hart prepared to take on notice the answers and statements I have given to this House *ad infinitum*—I thought he was getting bored with my answers—wherein I indicated time and again that the first year commitment under the contract is \$9 million. United Water has issued orders in excess of \$31 million. That is a statement of fact, and it is confirmed in the *Advertiser* article on Monday.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Premier please provide advice on the implications of the survey results for employment growth trends in South Australia? Today the Australian Bureau of Statistics released its recent labour force survey for January.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to get a question from the member for Norwood about employment and something positive about the economy of South Australia. We have become accustomed to the Opposition's not asking any positive questions, or any questions relating to the future and the economic rejuvenation of South Australia—it is simply too much to ask. But there is some good news today in relation to employment-unemployment levels for South Australia. I would suggest that some of the policies put in place by this Government are starting to have a positive effect within the economy.

I hasten to add that much more needs to be done, that there is no quick fix and that we have a long way to go. From the outset I have readily acknowledged that. The simple fact is that our youth employment package put in place last year, which provided \$30 million to assist small and medium businesses to employ, and the Deposit 5000 scheme of last year that is giving impetus to the building industry—underpinned by the further exemption in the stamp duty rebate for first home buyers—have resulted in building approvals in the month of January increasing to 51.7 per cent, according to the Housing Industry Association.

In the next three to six months that will start to wind its way through the economy. A range of small and medium businesses will benefit and bulk up as a result of those policy initiatives. The Opposition does not want that: it does not want good prospect news, the right signpost, economic rejuvenation or small and medium businesses picking up employment opportunities. The ABS figures show that unemployment fell from 9.6 per cent in December to 9.2 per cent in January—a .4 per cent decrease. Importantly,

youth unemployment fell from 39.6 per cent to 32.5 per cent—a 7.1 per cent fall during January. It is encouraging and we welcome it, but much more needs to be done. The policies that I have talked about will keep accelerating the employment of young people in South Australia.

I mentioned to the House last week that, when I visited Mitsubishi, I was absolutely staggered to see young people employed on its production line. The hundreds of people who have been employed by Mitsubishi in the course of 1996 are young South Australians. That is what is happening. At long last, after 10 years of Labor bankrupting this State and removing South Australia's investment attraction, we are starting to see some investment come back into the manufacturing industry in this State, and that is starting to impact in terms of employment opportunities and a reduction in unemployment.

The latest figures mean that South Australia has a lower level of unemployment than Queensland and Tasmania. Earlier this week statistics showed that ANZ job advertisements rose 3.3 per cent in South Australia for the month of January. Seasonally adjusted, total employment rose by 1 300 people in January. Full-time employment in South Australia rose by 4 400 people in January, which is the highest full-time employment level since July last year. Seasonally adjusted, unemployment fell by 3 100. Clearly, they are positive signs. I would like to take up the theme adopted by the Leader of the Opposition in the House yesterday.

An honourable member: Where is he?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is a very interesting question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Are we to have a third Question Time without any question from the Leader of the Opposition this week? Time will tell.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier is reflecting on an honourable member who is not present. The Premier knows that the Leader of the Opposition is with the Attorney-General fixing a stuff-up with the railway legislation.

The SPEAKER: That is a frivolous, nonsensical point of order. The Deputy Leader has taken it upon himself to give a commentary during Question Time. He has been aided and abetted by the Minister for Housing. If they keep it up, they will be able to continue it on the street.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me pick up one of the Leader of the Opposition's themes in his remarks to the Chamber yesterday. I understand that he has issued a press release saying that the Labor Party's industry policy—I am glad that it has one; and there is not a lot of depth to it as it is only on a single A4 sheet, so it will not go far—will support South Australian industry and that there is none of this support for national and international companies as is the wont of the current Government. Let us look at the statistics. In fact, in 1995-96, of the 587 firms helped in South Australia, 580 were South Australian-based firms. There were only seven or so interstate or overseas companies. If you take the \$23 million in programs with which we underpin these 587 companies, 85.7 per cent of the dollars are going into existing South Australian-based companies.

Once again, the Leader of the Opposition in his statement to this House has totally ignored the facts. In this Chamber we are becoming a little accustomed to that set of circumstances and the presentation, because members opposite are seeking to make up for the fact that they have no policies, no

plan, no vision and no right to lead South Australia in the future.

UNITED WATER

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

The Hon. E.S. Ashenden: Are you the bunny today?

The SPEAKER: I warn the Minister for Local Government for the second time.

Mr FOLEY: No, you are the bunny. My question is directed to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: Why has the Premier claimed that there will be \$628 million in exports from his water privatisation deal when this includes \$160 million in United Water International's profits and dividends that will be sent to England and France?

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: This is an old question. You asked it twice last year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections on my right.

Mr FOLEY: Documents leaked to the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: —which were not tabled by the Premier last week—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport.

Mr FOLEY: With your leave, Sir, I might just start that again. Documents leaked to the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It would appear to the Chair that one or two members need an early minute. If they keep this up, they will be able to get home and do something perhaps more constructive than interjecting. The honourable member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Documents leaked to the Opposition which were not tabled by the Premier outline United Water's economic development proposal. This document shows that \$160 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair's tolerance is evaporating very quickly, members on my right.

Mr FOLEY: Documents leaked to the Opposition which were not tabled by the Premier last week outline United Water's economic development proposal. It shows that \$160 million worth of profits and dividends to be paid to United Water International are included in the calculation of exports supposedly arising from this deal. Explain that, Premier.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: Clearly, members of the Opposition are at the end of the road. They have no new questions. These questions have been asked of me in this Chamber before and have been explained in detail in the select committee. I just refer the member for Hart to the questions that have been asked and the explanations that have been given in the select committee. And he groans, because he knows full well that there is an explanation of that matter before the select committee. What the member for Hart would want to suggest via the media today is that there are massive profits being repatriated to London and Paris. I remind the

House that such a good deal did we get for South Australia that, in its first year of operation, it made a \$1.5 million loss. That is how good this deal is for South Australia. The taxpayers of South Australia are the beneficiaries of this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: It is putting in place an opportunity for some 200 small to medium businesses to have a land bridge to the \$300 billion worth of water and waste water infrastructure opportunities in Asia. I have mentioned in the House previously—and if the member for Hart insists upon repeating questions, I will repeat the answers—that this contract, which is an operation and maintenance contract for the next 15 years, saves the taxpayers of South Australia \$30 000 a week, which equals \$164 million saved over the life of the contract. That is being penned into such services as education and health—supporting South Australians—but, importantly, locked in by separate, unconditional, whole of life guarantees, a minimum \$628 million worth of exports from South Australia with a target of \$1.479 billion. If the performance of the company in the past year is any indication of its future, it will make its target of \$1.479 billion, not the required \$628 million. As we all know, the requirement in the first year was \$9 million.

Orders issued in the first nine months total \$31 million, and despite the fact that we saw the Federal Government cancel the DIF scheme. The DIF scheme had an impact in terms of exports that were on schedule for the calendar year 1996. I know the Opposition does not like it, but this operation and maintenance contract has the capacity to underpin economic development in South Australia and, as the Centre for Economic Studies indicates, to create 1 100 new jobs for this State. Today's unemployment figures show some encouraging signs with more to come and more work to do to ensure that that trend continues in the future. It is being underpinned as we move to manage and stabilise the debt; we are moving on to build economic prospects for small and medium businesses to enable them employ people in the future. Despite what the Opposition says—and the irrelevant sideshows they put on in this place over parliamentary sitting days—this Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will not display material.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: —will not be diverted from the main theme and that is what the taxpayers and the electors of South Australia want: they want jobs, jobs, jobs and they want us to concentrate on rebuilding the economy. That is what the public wants and I will not be diverted by this Opposition into trivia and sideshows. We will keep on with the main game and creating jobs for South Australians.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for Infrastructure please inform the House how many jobs have been created in South Australia as a result of the major reforms that this Government has initiated in the water industry?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is a very important question to be put on the record. As we know, we have now established an international water industry in South Australia but, before we talk about jobs, let us compare the position that prevailed when the Labor Party was in Government. During the final two years of the Labor Government, the EWS lost \$70 million. In the first three years of the Liberal

Government, the profit has been \$199 million with a dividend of \$98 million to the taxpayers of South Australia. That is \$170 million turnaround in three years. Who has benefited? The taxpayers, the education system and the health system—all South Australians—have benefited. It is interesting that we now have this international industry but in South Australia our own department has turned around \$180 million a year—a fantastic change.

Let us now talk about jobs. What has United Water done in terms of jobs? Twenty jobs were created in the establishment of its new headquarters and 50 new jobs are expected from the \$30.8 million worth of international jobs, totalling 70 new jobs just in United Water.

Let us talk now about North West Water, or Riverland Water, which has created 20 new jobs in the establishment of its headquarters, 60 new jobs in the current construction phase at Swan Reach and the Summit storage water filtration plants, and 37 jobs resulting from its contract in Manila. That 15-year contract is worth \$3.2 billion and involves the redevelopment of the water and sewerage system in Manila. All those jobs have come about in the last three years of the Liberal Government. As well as turning around our own SA Water, which has contributed \$99 million to taxpayers' funds, we have created 187 jobs in North West Water and United Water. This will enable us to develop an international water industry so that our young people can get more jobs in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been drawn to my attention that there may have been strangers in the press gallery. I advise all people concerned of the rules and my earlier ruling that that is not permitted. I also remind other sections of the media of the rule that cameras will be turned only onto those members who are addressing the House, not panned around on other members who may be doing other things.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. Why has the \$160 million in United Water profits and dividends from the water privatisation deal been counted as an export from South Australia when the Cabinet subcommittee on water agreed that such profits should not be included in the definition of 'exports' under the contract? Further leaked copies of minutes of a Cabinet subcommittee meeting on water privatisation on 11 October 1995 state, and I quote—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Sorry, Sir, I was interrupted by interjections opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the member for Hart is not easily put off.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart is easily put off.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has already felt the wrath of the Chair, and he knows the consequences.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will note the prompting it has had. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. Leaked copies of minutes

of the Cabinet subcommittee on water privatisation meeting held on 11 October 1995 state:

It was agreed that for the purposes of explaining the export commitments that arise from this contracting initiative, profit estimates would not be included unless a specific explanation was provided.

It was not.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It might be that no explanation was given. The member for Hart has canvassed this issue at length before in this Chamber. In addition, this issue has been canvassed at length before the select committee dealing with this matter. How many times does the member for Hart need to ask the same question? On the basis that repetition is out of order, I refer the member for Hart to all my previous answers.

SAMCOR

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Treasurer inform the House of the final outcome of the sale of the South Australian Meat Corporation (SAMCOR)? Late last year, the Government announced that it was negotiating with a preferred purchaser, Agpro Australia Pty Ltd, for the sale of the Gepps Cross complex, which has been a loss maker for many years.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the member for Custance for his question because he has a particular interest, as do all farmers, in the outcome of the sale of SAMCOR. On 24 January, the final settlement for the sale of SAMCOR to Agpro took place. That was for a sum of \$4.8 million. There was a clear expectation that those works would reopen on 3 February. Unhappily, those works remain closed and I will brief the House accordingly.

I also make the point that the Government's patience with this issue needs to be put on the record again. Despite the fact that the easiest option for the past three years has been to close SAMCOR we did not do so, because of the employment situation and the need for the farming community and the service kill operation and because we believed the enterprise had the potential to reach out into export markets if it was properly owned and managed. We should also put on the record the substantial support this Government has given to SAMCOR over a long period and remember that in 1989 a former Premier of this State announced that unless SAMCOR improved it would be closed down. Despite the warnings and the fact that SAMCOR was in financial difficulty, the Government continued to support it in the hope that it could be sold. I remind the House that we spent \$4.6 million in 1995-96 and some \$3.6 million in 1996-97 supporting SAMCOR until the time of sale.

We also had discussions with the unions and provided an extremely generous redundancy package. That was after representations from members, particularly those on the other side as well as members on this side of the House. So, despite the fact that there was no obligation on Government, we provided a much improved redundancy package. We also put up with the undermining of the Hon. R.R. Roberts during what one would class as one of the more difficult sales, because these works have not been one of the easier assets to sell, given the state of the meat industry today. If members read the reports appearing in the *Australian* and other newspapers about the state of the meat industry and the need for rationalisation, they will recognise the fact that it has been very difficult.

The fact that the works are not open, even though we have what I class as a successful sale, is due to non-agreement among the union movement. I make the plea today that members opposite and whoever else has some influence indicate to their colleagues in the Federal secretariat of the Meat Industry Union that 116 jobs today and more in the future are on the line. We agreed during the negotiation process that employees who would be offered opportunities with the new owner would be employed under overall terms and conditions no less favourable than those existing prior to the sale. On offer are a 6.6 hour working day, guaranteed pay packets, a six-month trial and profit sharing. That gives employees at AGPRO greater confidence than they have ever had in the history of this State. However, the meat industry fraternity seems to be somewhat reluctant to allow the tally system to change.

The negotiations are continuing at this stage. I am hopeful that we will have a positive outcome, but I remind members that the tally system was outdated 20 years ago. Across this country members of that union continue to hold onto the vestiges of redundant systems which affect jobs and the future of this country, affecting also the capacity of this country to export meat in the way that I believe we can achieve on the open market. We have been trying to clean up this mess with some dignity, given where we started and where I hope we will finish. I call on all members who have some power of persuasion with the Federal secretariat of the union to make a few telephone calls, because after what we have been through I do not believe that any member of this House wants to see those works permanently closed. I believe that the farming community deserves a better deal than the one they are getting at the moment. I call on everybody to get in there and ensure that jobs are retained and that the future of meat processing in South Australia is maintained and improved, rather than allowing the current situation to prevail.

WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I direct my question to the Premier—that is, Premier Olsen, not Brown.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. If the honourable member wants to ask his question he had better comply with Standing Orders or I will rule him out of order. He has had more than a fair go. He has not been assisted by the continual barrage of interjections on my right or the commentary by the Deputy Leader.

Mr FOLEY: I apologise, Sir: it was just a bit of double vision.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Despite your previous ruling there are still members of the press in the press box. I would like you to make another ruling.

The SPEAKER: I understand that the honourable member is suggesting that there are people other than authorised personnel in the press box. As the Chair is not in a position to see who is in there, I shall seek assistance in this matter and determine who is there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will continue with his question.

Mr FOLEY: I direct my question to the Premier. What makes up the \$47.4 million to Thames Water for contracting under the United Water export schedule? The export information leaked to the Opposition but not tabled by the Premier

last week outlines that, of the claimed \$628 million in exports, this item to Thames Water for \$47.4 million exists. What is this item?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart has some documentation that was used in the preliminary estimates and discussion phase of the Cabinet subcommittee, and what was indicated—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Do you want me to answer it?

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is warned.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In early 1995 this House was advised that there was a preferred tenderer. On the basis of preferred tenderers the matter would proceed for a six-week period to contract close. During that six-week period a whole range of negotiations were entered into between the Government and the preferred tenderer. In the meantime, we kept at the second level the second most preferred candidate or company, and we proceeded to contract close with United Water. A number of matters changed in that final negotiation phase, of which the member for Hart is fully aware because, subsequent to contract close, a select committee of this Parliament has been meeting, during which time about 800 questions about this contract have been asked in fine detail. Officers have presented uninhibited evidence before the select committee in relation to this contract, and the executive summary of the contract currently being prepared is before the Auditor-General. I had hoped that that contract summary might have been ready earlier this week and, as soon as it is, not only will it go to the select committee but it will be released to the public of South Australia so that they can see the benefits that will accrue to this State over the next 15 years.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House on the major efforts and achievements of this Government in the area of employment?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is indeed a very important one. I note that yesterday the Leader of the Opposition launched into another of his negative tirades using very selective figures to knock the strong achievements of this State and sap community confidence. This seems to be a trend the Leader of the Opposition has sunk into over the past few months, regardless of the fact that under a Liberal Government we have indeed created jobs—in fact, since 1994, 23 700 jobs. Of course, that probably was not mentioned by the Leader, because that happens to be a positive for the State. I note that the Opposition Leader also failed to point out the downward—and I stress ‘downward’—movement in the unemployment figures, and that just happens to be another positive for the State as well.

When the Leader of the Opposition lost his job as Minister, with responsibilities for business and regional development, he handed the Liberal Government an unemployment time bomb of 11.1 per cent in respect of unemployment statistics. We have managed to reduce that absolutely by almost 2 per cent—an improvement of 17.5 per cent. We must remember that this was from one of the worst economic

bases this State has ever seen, and it was created by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in the previous Labor Government.

As the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts left South Australia rotting, 'A State of decay' was the catchcry in South Australia at the time. During 1993, the people of this State not only acknowledged the fact that the catchcry was 'A State of decay' but also they announced it strongly in the defeat of the Labor Government and, therefore, the bringing in of a Liberal Government to address the former Labor Government's mismanagement which occurred over a decade. The Leader of the Opposition was the person in charge of the State's development—the person who left us to rebuild this proud State out of the ashes of the State Bank. We also had a once proud State Bank, with its flagship captain Tim Marcus Clark who just happened to be friend and confidante of the Leader of the Opposition. This is the person who handballed—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Unley.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I know that this is one of the areas to which the Labor Party does not like to listen, but I point out that it was the Leader of the Opposition who handballed the Liberal Government an economic disaster whilst still making promises, even today. That is the amazing thing about the Labor Party. If anyone has the misfortune to see the Labor Party policies that are being presented in this election year, I advise them to look at the area of labour and employment, because it makes quite amusing reading. The Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister that she has adequately answered the question and is now going into a general commentary. I suggest that the Minister round off her answer.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I relate this answer specifically to the area of employment and training—the area my portfolio covers—which is where the Labor Opposition still claims that it will, if in government, bring in zero unemployment. I suggest that there is quite a large gap between zero unemployment and 11.1 per cent. That is another example of the Leader of the Opposition's credibility gap.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Minister that she wind up her answer, or I will have to withdraw leave.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Thank you, Sir. I remind the House that one point the honourable member forgot to mention was the fact that he used as a negative another positive—the fact that we have a marvellous growth in exports in this State, a growth of 23 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

WATER OUTSOURCING DOCUMENTS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Premier, as Infrastructure Minister, tell the House on 17 October 1995:

Thames Water and CGE have agreed that United Water will exclusively bid on their behalf for contracts in the lucrative Asian markets of Indonesia, the Philippines, India, Vietnam, Papua New Guinea, the South Pacific and designated provinces of China.

Clearly, this was not true. One of the documents leaked to the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. The member for Hart will proceed with his brief explanation.

Mr FOLEY: One of the documents leaked to the Opposition and not released by the Premier is the Asian Pacific strategic agreement between Thames, CGE and United Water, dated 18 September 1995. Clause 2.1, entitled 'Agreement not to compete with UWI', states:

United Water International has exclusive rights only where CGE and Thames would have already tendered for the contract jointly. CGE and Thames individually remain free to compete against United Water International.

Explain that!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I simply ask the member for Hart to read the transcripts of evidence of the select committee, a select committee constituted by this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart is not getting the sorts of answers he wants and, when he does, he becomes emotive and uncontrolled in the Chamber. Hundreds of questions have been answered on this contract. The contract summary will be released as soon as the Auditor-General ticks it off. It underpins what we have claimed to be the benefits for South Australians, and that will be demonstrated by the Auditor-General's sign off without fear of equivocation at all. This line of questioning today clearly shows that members opposite have run out of ideas. They have asked these questions—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If the Leader of the Opposition has documents, that is fine, but it is not helping the Opposition with its line of questioning today. These questions have been asked *ad nauseam*, and I will not repeat my answers.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second time for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs able to inform the House of what opportunities the State Government has created under its industrial relations system to make it easier for small businesses facing trade difficulties to protect the jobs of their employees and the viability of their business? It was recently reported in the national media that industry media groups are asking the Australian Industrial Relations Commission to assist employers facing economic difficulties in varying their industrial relations obligations.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I pick up the last point of the member for Kaurna, that is, that the South Australian Government appeared before the national wage case and argued very strongly that, where a company, particularly a smaller company, could argue that it was facing drastic financial economic conditions, it should not have to impose a wage rise. It reflects what is now regarded as the most flexible enterprise agreement system in this State for the whole of Australia. I highlight under the legislation that we got through the Parliament that, if a small enterprise is facing dramatic and poor economic conditions, it is able to go to the Industrial Commission or the Enterprise Agreement Commissioner and argue for flexibility to reduce the cost of labour.

In fact, that has been done, and it shows how this Government, using the industrial relations system, is able to help

these small enterprises keep people in the jobs they have. It has been done twice very effectively, in particular in one case, where that enterprise, as a result of a reduction in the cost of labour and greater productivity, was able to not only survive but grow. It is now negotiating a second enterprise agreement, with the specific objective of passing on increased benefits to the workers. There is a classic case of the sort of flexibility that takes account of the real world in industrial relations.

The thing we should note is that it was the Labor Party in this Parliament that opposed that flexibility. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition acknowledges across the House that he opposed it. Those people in those enterprises who now have a job would not have had a job if it were not for the legislation introduced by this Liberal Government.

All the Labor Party has introduced for small businesses in South Australia are higher costs, higher taxation and increased bankruptcy. This Liberal Government has put flexibility into the industrial relations system, particularly through enterprise agreements, and particularly allowing those enterprise agreements to change with the changed economic circumstances.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Treasurer in his capacity as a member of the Water Outsourcing Subcommittee of Cabinet. Following the failure of United Water International and the Government to honour their promise to sell the present foreign owned shares in the company from the current 95 per cent down to the promised 40 per cent, is the Treasurer still of the view that Australianisation of United Water is unlikely? In the minutes of a leaked minute of a meeting of the Cabinet subcommittee looking into the water contract dated 8 December 1995, the Treasurer expresses the concern that the sale of shares in United Water would be delayed until there was a profit from United Water International's operations. The Treasurer said:

In the event that there was a real profit, there was a question as to whether CG and Thames Water would wish to sell down equity in the company.

The SPEAKER: Does the Treasurer care to answer?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am happy to answer the question, Sir. The Cabinet subcommittee canvassed the various problems that could arise under the contract. I would assume that, if the honourable member has the minutes, he would find a number of questions either seeking information or expressing some concern to ensure that the final contract was the best that we could deliver. That was my job, and I think I carried it out. Everyone should be aware by now that we have a very good contract negotiated by the Premier of this State. It should be put on the record that, in terms of level of difficulty, achieving a level of equity in what might not have been an appropriate market is what I reflected upon at the time.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HEALTH COMMISSION TRAINING INITIATIVES

Dr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Health please provide details of training initiatives being implemented by the South Australian Health Commission to provide greater opportunities for young South Australians?

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Minister that he is not to give an excessive answer.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Sir, I will choose not to take offence at that.

The SPEAKER: The Minister knows that he does not have an alternative other than brevity.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Sir, so frequently I must correct the facts for the Opposition. However, the Liberal Government is absolutely committed to creating jobs and, after 11 years of Labor at the State level and 13 years of Labor at the Federal level, obviously it will take some time, but the winds of change are clearly blowing. We know that to maximise the employment impact of economic growth we need to have a flexible work force as work practices change and one that is well trained. The Health Commission, through its many health units, is one of the largest employers in South Australia.

In accord with the Government's priorities, the commission is active in providing training and employment opportunities for young people, with positions being offered for dental, laboratory and clerical assistants. Since 1993 the commission, through close cooperation with the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education, has offered almost 500 traineeships. The commission is regarded as one of the leading Government agencies in providing traineeships, and very importantly going on to produce employment. Throughout the Government, about 55 per cent of trainees obtain employment after the 12-month scheme finishes but, within the commission, there is a 70 per cent success rate of trainees gaining employment.

It is a very positive feature that of those 500 young trainees 70 per cent have gained employment within the health system. Recently it was my pleasure to announce that the Adelaide Rams Rugby League Club will follow in the footsteps of a number of AFL teams in joining forces with the Government to find employment traineeships for junior players, and 15 Rams junior players will receive Health Commission traineeships at various health units throughout the system. The partnership is clearly aimed at developing other skills for the younger players, that is, skills for life away from the football field. The Health Commission is certainly playing its part in providing employment opportunities for young South Australians. Sir, was that short enough?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That was approximately three minutes, for the benefit of the Minister.

HEALTHSCOPE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. How much has been claimed by Healthscope as additional payment under the Modbury Hospital contract for 1995-96? A memo dated Wednesday 5 February 1997 and signed by Healthscope's General Manager at the Modbury Hospital states:

Healthscope is currently negotiating with the commission to determine whether it will reimburse the hospital for additional costs it occurred in 1995-96.

On 15 October 1996 the Minister told the House that savings to the Government under the Modbury contract for 1995-96 amounted to \$3.7 million compared to what it would have cost under casemix.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was commenting.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I do not have a copy of the memo in front of me but, from memory, the honourable member has selectively quoted from it. The memo, in other parts, states that a lot of extra work was being done. If the member for Elizabeth read out the whole memo it would say that there had been an increase in the work done. Obviously, if that is being done, some discussions will take place about how it will be paid for; that is always the case.

YOUNG OFFENDERS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services.

Mr Clarke: What's it like not to be part of the inner sanctum?

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Sitting on the Government's side, very good, as against being on your side and destroying the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member ask his question.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I am happy to be an ankle because that means I am—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be ruled out of order unless he asks his question.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Will the Minister for Family and Community Services inform the House about any success in the rehabilitation of young offenders from the Cavan Training Centre? At some meetings on law and order I have recently attended some people have indicated that they feel that all young offenders should be locked up and the key thrown away. However, others have asked questions such as, 'Are job opportunities being created—new opportunities to give young offenders a chance to fully rehabilitate themselves and become a benefit to the community and to develop themselves personally in a better manner?'

Mr Foley: How much comment was involved in that question?

The SPEAKER: About the same amount of comment as in the member for Hart's question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Mawson for his continued interest in the portfolios for which I have responsibility. We can have no greater goal, so far as our responsibilities with respect to family and community services, than providing rehabilitation to ensure that those offenders released from detention become contributing members of our society. What is happening at Cavan is an excellent example, an exceptional result and reflects the ability of the team at Cavan to be available to successfully rehabilitate many young people to break the cycle of offending. It is vitally important that that happen otherwise, when young offenders move out of youth detention, they are more likely to be placed in other forms of detention throughout their latter life.

Most of these young people who have been employed were placed in the motor industry or related employment. Several have been placed in hospitality areas, and at least two have won traineeships and two have found horticultural jobs. I am particularly pleased to inform the House that I have just received figures showing that, in the 12 months between January 1996 and January 1997, some 23 youths were placed in employment directly upon leaving the Cavan training centre. As I said earlier, that is quite a record.

It is important to realise that most of the youths sentenced to Cavan were formerly long-term unemployed. It is accurate

to say that for some young people there is a definite link to unemployment and, of course, to the cycle of offending. That is why efforts such as the Government's youth employment strategy are to be applauded, because it will also help the very small number of young people in the community who are at risk of offending.

I place on record my appreciation of the workers at Cavan and Magill—the two detention centres in South Australia for juveniles—who have been proactive in breaking this cycle of offending. The fact that 23 youngsters have come out of detention and found full-time jobs is excellent. In conclusion, this brings significant benefits to the State. Apart from the benefits of employment, it leads to a safer society, provides opportunities for young people and reduces the end costs in having to deal with youngsters who find themselves on the wrong side of the law.

HEALTHSCOPE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Does the Minister for Health agree with the Chief Executive of the South Australian Health Commission that Healthscope has no grounds to claim additional amounts under the Modbury Hospital contract for 1995-96, and does this illustrate the Minister's previous claim that he out-negotiated the private sector?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already started to comment. The Chair has been particularly lenient today. The Chair will be very quick off the mark in a moment. I point out to the honourable member that, with respect to brief explanations, she does not have a good track record in accepting the Chair's guidance.

Ms STEVENS: On Monday, the Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Health Commission told the Modbury Hospital select committee that Healthscope did not have approval for extra work and that what the hospital did in 1995-96 was 'around the amount originally contracted for' and that he 'did not expect it to get any additional payment for the past year's work'.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am not sure what the question is about. The member for Elizabeth may be confused, or perhaps she is definitely trying to be confused. The simple fact is that there is a contract, and Modbury Hospital is informing us that it has done more cases. I would have thought that that was a very positive factor for the people in the north-east. One dilemma is that in asking this question the member for Elizabeth has acknowledged that Healthscope is doing a lot more operations and a good job at Modbury. In fact, that puts the lie to all the questions from the member for Elizabeth over the past year or so which have said that Healthscope has been quietly running Modbury Hospital into the ground. She has just admitted that it has done more operations there. If that is what the private sector has done—and the people of the north-eastern suburbs have benefited—so be it.

UNCLE TOM'S CHICKEN SMALLGOODS

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Primary Industries provide the House with details of a new small-goods processing plant now operating at Wingfield? I understand that the Minister recently visited this Wingfield plant and that it has created a number of new jobs and additional export opportunities for South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the honourable member for the clarity of the question and for his interest. Yesterday

I had great pleasure in opening a new \$3 million factory, Uncle Tom's Chicken Smallgoods, at Wingfield. The factory represents a tremendous achievement for Tom Christopoulous, who left Greece as a young man of 18 years who could not speak English. In the past 34 years, through sheer hard work and despite quite a few setbacks, Tom has achieved a lot of success, and he has established a successful chicken processing business. This latest addition, the smallgoods factory, represents a substantial investment in value-adding to primary industries and in jobs in the northern suburbs, which members opposite should be particularly interested in rather than some of the other issues that are currently occupying their minds.

The factory has been purpose-built with innovative design technology to meet strict hygiene and quality standards, including export requirements. The Uncle Tom's factory was fully commissioned just before Christmas. With a current turnover of 12 tonnes a week, it already employs 17 people: as I said, that is a bonus for employment in that area. The plant has also been designed to allow for future expansion on the site, which we hope to see. Whilst presently most of the product is sold locally, already some is sold interstate. Exports are on the family's agenda, and in talking to them I discovered that they have many great ideas for new chicken and beef products.

In 1991, the Christopoulous company built a new poultry processing plant at Wingfield and changed its name to the Adelaide Poultry Service, which still operates nearby and which supplies all freshly processed poultry for the smallgoods operation. The new factory has boosted production at the company's slaughter division to meet the expanded demand, with 60 000 chickens being slaughtered each week. A further 60 people are employed in the slaughter division. It was terrific to spend time yesterday with Tom and his family and to experience their enthusiasm to create new products, an export focus and more jobs in a suburb which some people should be looking after. Here we have another example of a small business which is adding value to our primary produce and which is delivering much needed jobs to South Australia. The focus of this House should be on the ability to succeed and to create jobs. Like Tom Christopoulous, let us get on with the main game, that is, jobs for South Australians.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Croydon Primary School would not be closing if it were in a State electorate necessary to the Liberal Government's majority. The Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Robert Lucas, would not have had the political recklessness—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood.

Mr ATKINSON: —to close an eastern suburbs school with 218 pupils, the biggest enrolments in its cluster—

There being a disturbance in the Speaker's gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There will be no coverage of those interjec-

tions. I suggest to everyone present that the proceedings of this Parliament are available for the public to view, not to participate. The Chair does not want to have to take stern measures. I therefore suggest to all present that they take note of what I have said; I will not repeat it again. I remind the media that no disturbances in the gallery can be shown as it is contrary to the agreement their stations have signed with the House.

Mr ATKINSON: It also has the support of its pupils' parents, a child-parent centre and play group feeding new pupils into the school, a dental clinic, and a record of successfully integrating 90 pupils of a non-English speaking background. At the time of the closure announcement last year, Croydon Primary School had 218 enrolments. That our local community has sent 183 children to Croydon this year, despite the Liberal Government's insistence on its closure at the end of 1997, shows the determination and faith of the parents of children in Croydon, Ridleyton, West Croydon and the western suburbs generally.

It is common after school closures are announced for parents to withdraw their children from the doomed school and send them to a school with an assured future. Mr Lucas does not scare Croydon, nor does he demoralise us. Nor does the Liberal Government's making Croydon the only school in the State from which the media is banned deter us. You will not shut us up. The odds on a Labor win at this year's general election may be generous, but if Labor is elected—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: —one of the first things we will do in our first week of office is to keep Croydon Primary School open. If Croydon, with 218 enrolments, is targeted for closure, I ask parents and school children in State schools with fewer pupils or about the same number of pupils what their future may be if the Olsen Liberal Government is re-elected and has four years in which to make unpopular decisions? What about Goodwood with 221 pupils; Paradise, 196; Hillcrest, 151; Holden Hill North, 139; Richmond, 129; Newton, 117; and Parkside, 108?

This issue is bigger than the closure of just one primary school. Let me give some other examples of the contempt the Liberal Government has for the western suburbs. It demolished Tenterden House, one of Adelaide's oldest colonial mansions because, being in the west, it was not deserving of heritage protection.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: It closed Barton Road to stop western suburbs people driving their cars and riding their bikes past the mansion of the Minister for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that all members just calm themselves down a bit. It is not necessary to unduly raise the temperature here to make a point.

Mr ATKINSON: Taken together, the closure of Croydon Park Primary School and Croydon Primary School mean that a swath of metropolitan Adelaide is without a system of free, secular State education. The Minister has closed three schools in my electorate in the past six months. It is clear that this Government expects many of the parents of children at these three schools to avail themselves of the Catholic education system. For more than 100 years, Australian Catholics have paid to educate their children in church schools so that they would be taught the Mass and the beliefs and values of the church. My children and the Minister's go to Catholic schools

for that reason. For a century or more, Australian Catholics fought for a contribution from the State towards the education of their children in church schools. Only through the Democratic Labor Party's influence in the Senate was State aid to Catholic schools chiselled out of the Commonwealth.

However, Australian Catholics who fought for State aid never expected that the Catholic education system would assume the principal responsibility for educating Australian children in any State capital. The Minister's policy of shifting children in my area from the State education system, which is funded from State revenue, to schools run by the Catholic Education Office, funded by the Commonwealth, is another of this Government's cost shifting games. Little does the school community of St Margaret Mary's Parish School at Croydon Park know that it is part of a policy experiment that is wrong for the children, wrong for budgetary transparency and, yes, wrong for Catholic schools.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: We will fight the closure of Croydon Primary School and, if we do not succeed in changing the Government of this State to save the school, we will be waiting for the Liberals' Mrs Trish Worth at the next Federal election. In the west we have long memories, because we must.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is being most unhelpful. And he can hide behind the column if he wishes. I want the temperature of the House to calm down a bit, because some of the comments and conduct are no credit to anyone.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I have no intention of ranting and raving and providing emotive hype just for the sake of a scene and a public declaration that a local member has been desperate to perform for his electorate and obviously has been inadequate in delivering fair and reasonable representation. I commend a Riverland event that took place last Saturday night in my electorate, the Riverland and Mallee Apprentice of the Year presentation awards, which I was pleased both to support financially and to participate in on the night. I note that it is the fifteenth continuous year that these awards have been made, and I gather that they are one of a kind in country South Australia.

The awards are organised by the Rotary Club of Renmark and strongly supported, as the major sponsor, by the Commonwealth Bank. I want to place on record my thanks and congratulations to all those involved with this award, because it is a very appropriate and worthy way of recognising young people in the community in terms of their contribution to their vocation and their attitude to and success in their training. I want to put on the record specifically my thanks and congratulations to the Riverland businesses that were involved. They represented companies both large and small from across the whole spectrum of employers in the region, whether they be from the horticultural industries, tourism, the hospitality industry or even the manufacturing or service industry.

I thank those employers for their involvement in these awards, first, as I have indicated, because it is a great way of recognising the achievement and performance of our young people. Secondly and probably more importantly, because they have been able to employ them and assist them in their training, these companies have played an important role in ensuring that these young people gain useful reward and an

update of their skills, particularly in terms of capitalising on the growing Riverland economy but more in terms of young people and the businesses in the area being trained to world standard and being able to compete in terms of world skilling in international competition. They allow our young people to have this opportunity and effectively increase the number of trainees and the range of skills.

In thanking the trainees I also want to put on record my congratulations to the apprentice of the year, Mr Tom Bawden, an apprentice with Rosenthal's World of Motoring in Berri, and to the runner up, Ms Jane Schiller, an apprentice hairdresser with Cindy's Hair and Beauty in Waikerie. I also place on the record that the trainee of the year award was won by Ms Hayley Powell, a clerical and administrative trainee with the Big River Tourism and Marketing Board.

Besides having great TAFE facilities in the Riverland, we are also fortunate to have some of the best other training programs operating throughout the State. I want to mention a couple, as I did on the night. For example, we have the Kickstart program, which last year spent something like \$112 000 and this year will spend the same. It assisted 224 unemployed people in the Riverland. Of those, about 200 were placed in jobs. We also have a range of other programs, for example Rivskills, a skill share program. At the moment it is employing 20 cellar hands who are getting a range of employment training to equip them for various positions throughout the whole vineyard and wine producing industry.

This event clearly illustrated, and I understand local people appreciated, that at the moment employment and training throughout South Australia and even in my area is not only a responsibility of Government but also a joint cooperative program with involvement from business, from the community, from employers and from the education sector. That is why the recently announced \$30 million employment and training strategy by this Government works in conjunction with all these other groups in the community that I have noted. It also illustrates that by working together we can bring about useful and gainful additional employment in this State.

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to an issue of concern in the Salisbury area of my electorate. Recently, a delegation of people came to my electorate office in Salisbury and presented me with a copy of a petition, which states:

We would like you to read and sign this petition with your name and address, for the purpose of making the responsible parties, eg, Salisbury council and Highways Department. These parties are responsible to the road user's. We want to see traffic lights installed at the corner of Waterloo Corner Road and Port Wakefield Road, because of the fatal road accident's which have accrued there and the one as recent as 10 October 1996. These type's of accidents will keep happening until light's are installed. Thank you for taking the time to read and sign this petition.

The people who came to see me were very sincere and concerned about a series of accidents. Indeed, this local stretch of Port Wakefield Road last year claimed its ninth road crash victim in about five years, and real concern was expressed in the local Messenger Press paper that the State Government had yet to begin a long-awaited safety study. Last year on 10 October a 60 year old Fulham Gardens man was killed in a crash at the junction of Port Wakefield and Waterloo Corner Roads.

As I say, that death brings to nine the number of people killed in that area since 1990. It follows warnings earlier in the year from the Salisbury council and also from a Paralowie man in the electorate of Taylor whose parents were killed at the same site as that of the more recent crash.

Certainly, there were real concerns locally that the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) had promised a traffic study more than two years ago, but had not delivered. The council said that 'access routes to Port Wakefield Road should be reduced and traffic lights installed at those remaining'.

I know that the member for Taylor has raised this issue. The honourable member wrote on 17 September 1996 about concerns for safety improvements on Port Wakefield Road between Salisbury Highway and Waterloo Corner Road. Obviously, this affects the constituents of the member for Taylor as well as my own constituents. I certainly would like to see some concern and some action from the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. Instead of having pictures in the paper of her driving buses, let her drive out to this area, meet with local residents and look at the situation before another death occurs on this stretch of road.

On 3 October 1996 the City of Salisbury again wrote to the Department of Transport stating that a letter indicating the above had been sent to the Minister for Transport and that a request to meet with her was also made so that these issues could be resolved. A series of letters have been sent. I refer to a letter dated 10 October 1996 from Stephen Hains, City Manager, to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, as follows:

As you are no doubt aware the section of Port Wakefield Road within this municipality continues to exhibit a very poor traffic safety record.

The letter again brings to her attention her undertaking to the Mayor, David Plumridge, that she would initiate a study to address the traffic safety aspects on Port Wakefield Road between Gepps Cross and Waterloo Corner Road, seek the imposition of a 90km/h maximum speed as an interim measure along the built-up sections of Port Wakefield Road and implement a series of other measures as well. It is absolutely important that something be done about this matter.

I have a draft preliminary investigation brief from the Department of Transport which talks about the need to take action but which also talks about not wasting money. My message again is: let us put lives first. I hope that the Minister (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) will listen to local concerns about accidents, take notice of the petition, meet with local residents and also meet with members of the Salisbury council personally so that we can avoid a tenth death along this stretch of road.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I wish that the previous Government had put money towards that intersection. Something needed to be done with that intersection 25 years ago when I lived in Gawler. Every member in this House understands that it was the Keating Labor Government that introduced the Federal legislation to ensure Vodafone could erect towers wherever it wanted, and I stress that Labor did this without any consultation with local government or the community. On 5 May 1993, Mr O'Keefe, who was the Labor Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Transport and Communications, introduced this Bill into Federal Parliament and said:

The purpose of this Bill is to extend to the three public mobile carriers the benefit of land access powers to enter privately owned

land in order to inspect, evaluate and install or construct telecommunication facilities for the provision of general telecommunication services. The companies which hold licences are Telstra, Optus and Vodafone. The Government has decided to extend to these three public carriers powers to enter land and do things necessary to the land for purposes connected with the supply of mobile telecommunication services.

I repeat, this Bill involved no community consultation at all by the Federal Labor Government. The proposed date of commencement was 15 March 1994. Coincidentally, this is the same legislation enabling telecommunication companies *carte blanche* to string overhead cables all over our skylines until July 1997, once again without any public consultation by the Federal Labor Government.

Labor sold out the community's right and did not ask their opinion about any of these pieces of legislation. In contrast to Labor's blatant disregard of the community's wishes, Mr Abbott, the Liberal member for Warringah, moved:

That this House expresses concern about the exemptions and privileges now enjoyed by the telecommunication carriers and calls on the Government to make the erection of mobile phone base stations subject to the consent of local councils.

Mr Abbott warned that everyone in suburban Australia would have a telephone tower near them, and we are now beginning to see that this is absolutely correct. Now Labor candidates suddenly are reacting to Australia wanting to regain control of their own backyards.

I am at a loss to understand why the Federal Government in passing this legislation did not take advice from the CSIRO. I refer to a letter the CSIRO sent to the Federal Government, as follows:

We concluded that there was insufficient scientific evidence at the time to make any sound scientific judgment about the safety thresholds.

So, if we do not know and do not have final evidence, we should be extremely careful about the location of these mobile telephone towers.

The member for Adelaide, Ms Worth, asked what steps the Government was taking to ensure that carriers behave responsibly under the Telecommunications Act. The answer indicated that carriers were asked by a code of conduct to establish a consultation process with Government authorities and local councils. Rather than establishing a consultation process, I put on record the tone of the letters the councils are receiving from the consultants. A letter from Hassells to the Willunga district council states:

Council's formal approval is not required. The code states that local councils and relevant authorities should be consulted.

A recent letter from the Noarlunga City Council to local residents states:

Council, however, cannot refuse the development or enforce conditions.

I raise these issues because the Labor candidate within my area has now decided to jump on the political bandwagon—forgotten the fact that he is a Labor candidate—and has decided to call a public meeting to publicly protest about the construction of a Vodafone tower in Moana Heights. The public meeting is being held at the home of Mr Ray Martin at 25 Watcombe Street, Moana Heights. People are being asked to fill in a survey form if they cannot attend the meeting and, of course, naturally provide their name, address and telephone number for his files. The only problem is that they are being gyped because they are not being offered a \$450 voucher to fill in this survey.

The reason for raising all these issues is to put on the public record the fact that it was the Federal Labor Government that introduced the legislation which gives local councils, the State Government and the community of South Australia no say at all in the location of the Vodafone towers, and it is the Federal Labor Government that stands condemned for that legislation and the overhead cable legislation. It is about time some of the State Labor candidates owned up to the fact that they are Labor candidates and when they get into this place they sign a pledge to never vote against their Government whether it be Federal or State.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I am very pleased to follow that speech because I find it very interesting. In essence, it is true: the former Labor Government did move that legislation involving mobile phone towers as well as the overhead cabling, but the member for Kaurna seems to forget that it is her Party in power, both State and federally. These two Governments have their hands on the reins and they are in a position to do something about it, but they have sat on their hands in the face of community opposition and done nothing. It is a matter of great distress to the local government community in this State that the Minister in South Australia has not committed to pressuring his Federal colleagues to introduce legislation at the end of June, when the telecommunications arrangements end, that give the power to local councils to decide about overhead cabling. He and his Federal colleagues have refused to do that. So, when they have the opportunity at the end of June this year nothing will happen.

Labor candidates who are working hard in those marginal seats and other non-marginal seats have every right to take the community protest to the State and Federal Liberal Governments. I agree absolutely that that decision should be changed. I point out that members in this place are no longer candidates. Government members cannot whinge about Government decisions, because their colleagues are in Government federally. They are in a position to do something about it and, if nothing is done, it is the fault of Liberal Governments.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is interrupting his own member.

Ms HURLEY: I am happy to have a few intelligent interjections for a change, Sir. Speaking of Liberal Government failures, I have one in my own electorate to which I draw attention again, and that concerns the handling of asbestos at the Smithfield Plains Primary School. In response to the shadow Minister for Education—

Mr Evans interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Exactly, and we dealt with it properly. In response to the shadow Minister for Education in another place, the Hon. Rob Lucas said:

Contrary to established practice and policy, the asbestos register at Smithfield Plains Primary School was not checked to ascertain if asbestos materials were present and, as a result, the asbestos backed vinyl was removed and disposed of as normal building waste.

During the 10-year period that the Labor Government was in power, asbestos registers were carefully built up in schools and other public buildings around the State. Procedures were put in place for dealing with that asbestos if it needed to be removed. They were very stringent procedures, and contractors who carried out that removal were licensed under very stringent regulations and that licensing was monitored constantly. Members of private industry who were involved

were under strict control, and officers of SACON, now Services SA, monitored that situation rigorously.

In the past couple of years, there have been a number of incidents in schools around this State where asbestos has not been removed properly. I understand that the asbestos management unit of Services SA is about to be privatised so there will be no independent authority to monitor this situation, which is already in a shambles. The Minister admits that established practice and policy was not followed. As a result, children, parents and teachers connected with the Smithfield Plains Primary School were exposed to asbestos for nearly four months before it was properly cleaned up.

That is an absolute outrage, given that the register was properly in place in the main office block of that school. I understand that the firemen who attended the building followed the proper procedures but, from then on, when the Education Department took control of the matter, it fell apart. Again, the Minister denies this.

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

Mr BROKESHIRE (Mawson): Today is an important day in the history of part of my electorate. It is a sad day but, in other ways, it is a day of celebration because, along with many people from the McLaren Vale and McLaren Flat district, I attended the funeral of Mr Edge Dennis. Mr Dennis was a credit to South Australia and to his district. Edge Dennis was one of the founding members of the Southern Vales branch of the Liberal Party and, when I look at the books that go back to the early 1900s, it gives me much pride as the member for Mawson to represent people such as Edge Dennis.

In the Second World War, Edge had a successful career as commander of an aircraft in the Royal Australian Air Force and he was a strong member of the RSL until his death. He was one of the earliest settlers in the McLaren Vale district, and families such as the Dennis family, the Kays and the Osborns have developed a good strong direction for the district.

Edge Dennis was one of the first people to develop wine exports interstate and, later, overseas and I encourage all members of this House to purchase Dennis or Daringa wines to see what fantastic quality they are, particularly the full-bodied reds. He was a leader in his field and committed to agriculture and business in general. He had a good economic base and understanding, and he did his family and his district proud in the way in which he initiated that economic development opportunity for them.

Like a lot of good, sound Liberal people who are committed to this State, Edge Dennis was also a man who had a high community spirit. For many years he was Secretary and then Chairman of the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital. One of the first occasions on which I had a serious talk to Edge Dennis was about five years ago when he opened renovations to a particular section of the hospital. I introduced myself to him after he made his speech and, in a few minutes, he gave me a solid lecture on the importance of the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital to the area.

I will never forget what he told me, and I am pleased that I have been able to continue the commitment that I made to him, namely, that if I became the local member, I would make sure that the good work that he had done for that hospital would continue. I encourage future members of the board to look back on what Edge Dennis and people like him have done for the hospital so they remain committed to the

task of further developing the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital.

Edge Dennis impressed me in the way in which he was so well groomed, so friendly and, consequently, so highly respected by the whole community. It was made clear today that there has been strong support for and appreciation of all that Edge Dennis did for our district, and I know that his wife Susan, one of his sons, Peter, other family members and grandchildren can be proud when they reflect on what Edge Dennis did for his family and all of us in the district.

As we in McLaren Vale and all the south see further development and opportunities being capitalised on, with growth in the wine industry, etc., and when we look at all those talented winemakers of whom Edge Dennis's son Peter is one, we can feel comfortable that the hard work they did when they came back from the Second World War—planting sultanas, pome fruits and currants—was all for a very good purpose. They had it a lot harder than wine grape growers have it today.

We have a great future in the south and I look forward to carrying on the work that people such as Edge Dennis have done for that area. If we continue to capitalise on the commitment that he had to people, community spirit and the opportunities that he saw in this great country—particularly our State, where he chose to settle with his wife Sue—that augurs well for the future.

LAND ACQUISITION (RIGHT OF REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): 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 current process for acquiring land compulsorily pursuant to the *Land Acquisition Act 1969* (the Act) is as follows:

- each person who has an interest in the land is served with a notice advising of the intention to acquire the land;
- within 30 days of service of the notice, each person with an interest in the land may require an explanation of the reasons for the acquisition with reasonable details of the proposed scheme;
- within 30 days of service of the notice, a person with an interest in the land may request the Authority not to proceed, request an alteration in the boundaries of the land or request that any part of the land not be acquired;
- the above request may only be made on the grounds that the acquisition of the land would seriously impair an area of scenic beauty, destroy or adversely affect a site of architectural, historical or scientific interest, affect the conservation of flora or fauna or adversely prejudice any other public interest;
- the request must be considered within 14 days of its receipt and a notice served upon the person who made the request, indicating whether it has been acceded to or refused.

This Bill seeks to address a concern relating to a lack of a review mechanism for land owners in relation to a proposed land acquisition by Government and Local Government bodies.

Following the matter being brought to my attention, it was considered in the following context:

- a review of the broader policy decision in relation to a particular Government project is not an issue for consideration by an independent review as this is a matter for Government and the Government is accountable to Parliament for its decision;

- a particular issue may be the subject of a review on the grounds already provided for in section 12 of the Act. Should there also be an additional ground of whether it is necessary to acquire a particular parcel of land for the purpose of the undertaking?;
- whether the Act should include a provision to prevent an objector from arguing the merits of the policy of the relevant project.

This Bill provides that the person who requests a review of a decision must apply in writing to the Minister within 7 days of being served with a notice indicating that a request pursuant to section 12 of the Act has been refused. On receipt of the application for a review, the Minister will conduct the review or appoint a suitable person to conduct the review on behalf of the Minister.

The Bill provides that the person conducting the review, either the Minister or a person on the Minister's behalf, may conduct the review in such manner as he or she thinks fit. If the review is conducted by a person on the Minister's behalf, the reviewer will not make a recommendation in relation to the matter, but will simply put the information before the Minister for his or her consideration.

A review, by either the Minister or an individual appointed by the Minister, must be completed within 14 days. These tight timeframes are to ensure that the review of a decision is kept as time-efficient as possible.

On completion of the review, it is up to the Minister to confirm, vary or reverse the decision of the Authority. The decision made on review, or the manner in which the review is conducted, cannot be further reviewed by a court or tribunal. This provision has been inserted to ensure that the decision of the Minister on review is not further challenged. This provision will ensure a finality to the process and ensure that decisions of an Authority are not the subject of a protracted and lengthy review process.

The parties who will be able to request the review will only be those whose land is subject to acquisition. The purpose of the procedure is to provide greater justice to those persons and to ensure that, if the objections which they make have any substance, those objections are properly considered by the Minister, notwithstanding the advice from the relevant Government agency. The purpose is not to permit special interest groups to have an opportunity to challenge undertakings otherwise than by means of existing structures such as Parliament.

It is the Government's view that this Bill will balance the rights of parties the subject of a compulsory land acquisition, by either the Government, or Local Government, with the ability of a Government to pursue particular projects for which the acquisition of land is necessary.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2:

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 12—Right to object

This clause adds another ground on which a person who has an interest in land subject to acquisition may object to the acquisition, namely, that the whole or a part of the land is not necessary for the purposes of the undertaking to which the acquisition relates.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 12A

This clause inserts a new section in the Act that gives an objector the right to have a refusal of his or her objection to a proposed land acquisition reviewed by the Minister who is responsible for the Act that empowers the acquisition. An application must be made within 7 days of the objector being notified that his or her objection has been refused. The review will be conducted within a 14 day period by the Minister or by a person appointed by the Minister to conduct the review on the Minister's behalf. The final decision will be made by the Minister. There is to be no right of appeal or review in relation to the Minister's decision or in relation to the way in which the review was conducted.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN (DIRECTORS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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

A quorum having been formed:

SUPERANNUATION (EMPLOYEE MOBILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act 1988. 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.

This Bill seeks to make a minor amendment to the Superannuation Act 1988.

The amendment proposed will be of benefit to those persons who transfer to employment in the Public Service from employment with either the police force or ETSA Corporation, where they were already a member of the superannuation scheme established by that employer as at 3 May 1994. The Bill proposes that those persons be able to make application, and be accepted by the South Australian Superannuation Board, as members of the lump sum scheme that was closed to new entrants as from 4 May 1994.

The Government has decided to seek to have this amendment made to the legislation in order to ensure that persons who seek to transfer employment within the public sector are not disadvantaged with respect to superannuation, where they had already made a decision to be a member of the employer's superannuation arrangements.

In particular, this amendment will assist those persons who have been transferred to the public service as a consequence of their area of employment being transferred from either the police force or the ETSA Corporation.

The Bill provides that persons to whom the provisions apply, must make application to be accepted into the closed lump sum scheme under these special provisions, within 3 months of the date of transfer. A transitional provision will allow those persons who have transferred between 3 February 1994 and the date of the commencement of the Amendment Act, to make application within 3 months of the commencement of the Act.

The Public Service Association has been consulted in relation to the Bill and has indicated its support for the Bill.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 22—Entry of contributors to the scheme

Clause 2 amends section 22 of the principal Act. Subsection (15) gives an employee three months after the new employment has commenced to apply for membership of the closed scheme. Subsection (16) gives a person whose employment commenced before the commencement of the amending Act three months after the commencement of that Act to apply for membership. This transitional provision applies for the benefit of a person whose employment commenced at any time on or after 3 February 1994 but before the commencement of the amending Act. It ensures that employees whose employment commenced within three months before 4 May 1994 have a full 3 months in which to apply for membership of the scheme.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Superannuation Act 1990. 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.

This Bill seeks to make three technical amendments to the Police Superannuation Act 1990, which establishes and maintains the two closed superannuation schemes for police officers.

The amendments are minor in nature and deal with the provisions of the closed pension scheme, known in the Act as the 'old scheme'. The proposed amendments are required to ensure that members of the closed schemes are treated in a fair and equitable manner.

One of the amendments seeks to provide an option for members of the pension scheme to elect to preserve their accrued pension if they resign and are aged between 50 and 55 years. Under the existing provisions of the Act, persons resigning between these ages have the ability to take their accrued benefits only in the form of a lump sum. The effect of the proposed amendment to the definitions section of the Act will ensure that any person resigning before the age of 55 years, will be able to preserve their accrued benefit, and apply to take the pension on attaining the age of 55 years. In terms of the existing legislation, persons who resign before the age of 50 years, have the ability to preserve their accrued pension benefit. This amendment will principally assist those persons taking a voluntary separation package under the age of 55 years.

The second and third amendments proposed in the Bill, seek to restore two benefits that applied under the repealed Act. The restoration of these provisions is necessary to ensure that where certain and unexpected circumstances eventuate, the spouse and dependent children of a member who retired under the repealed Act are able to have access to options that they were expecting to be available on the member's death. The first of these amendments proposes to reinstate an option available under the repealed Act, under which a spouse who is automatically entitled to a pension and lump sum on the death of a member pensioner, may elect to exchange the lump sum for an increased pension. The option is only attractive to a spouse in certain circumstances, because the pension provided by the exchange is not indexed for the movement in the Consumer Price Index.

The third amendment seeks to make an amendment to the Transitional Provisions in Schedule 1, by ensuring that a child's pension resulting from the death of a member pensioner who commenced pension under the repealed Act, is not less than the level of pension payable to another child who commenced pension under the repealed Police Pensions Act.

By the very nature of the proposed amendments in sections 6 and 7 of the Bill, they will only be of benefit to persons in the particular circumstances on which the provisions are based. Furthermore, to ensure that persons affected by these provisions are not disadvantaged, it is proposed that the provisions be effective as from 1 July 1996.

The Police Association and the Police Commissioner have been consulted in relation to these proposed amendments, and they have advised that they fully support the amendments.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of clauses 6 and 7 of the Bill from 1 July 1996.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

Clause 3 amends the interpretative provision of the principal Act to provide that a member who leaves employment voluntarily between the ages of 50 and 55 and who is not taken to have retired will be taken to have resigned. This will enable the member to preserve his or her benefits under the principal Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 25—Termination of employment on invalidity

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 31—Invalidity pension

Clauses 4 and 5 are consequential.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 32—Pensions payable on contributor's death

Clause 7: Amendment of Schedule 1—Transitional Provisions
Clauses 6 and 7 solve the technical transitional problems already discussed.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 786.)

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I think it is well known that the Opposition is strongly supportive of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. Indeed,

there has been a very important level of bipartisanship on this issue. That is the way it should be, and I am sure the Premier would be the first to acknowledge that. Indeed, in the past year I have met with the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory—I flew to Darwin to meet with him on this issue—business and union leaders, the Leader of the Opposition in the Northern Territory and also Barry Coulter, who is the Minister responsible for this area. I acknowledge that Barry Coulter has consistently and persistently briefed me on this issue and has done so in Adelaide on a number of occasions.

I have tried to garner some support around the nation for this project, whose time has come. In the middle of last year I met with the Prime Minister, John Howard, and strongly urged upon him the importance of a commitment from the Federal Government to give this railway line the go ahead. One of the ideas that I was trying to put to the Prime Minister last year was that the rail link be designated as a national project to mark Australia's centenary of Federation in 2001.

I then met with Kim Beazley, the Federal Leader of the Opposition, to talk to him and shadow Ministers about the project, and I know he is very strongly supportive. I then met with all State and Territory Labor leaders in respect of the national significance of this project. I did so because we will not win this project if it remains simply a South Australian and Northern Territory dream. That is why it is important to secure bipartisan national support to convince the Federal Government that this project would be of massive benefit to Australia as a whole. We have to convince the Howard Government that this project is now economically viable and would give Australia a unique export corridor right into Asia.

Recent estimates show that the Alice Springs to Darwin line has the potential to generate at least 1 million tonnes of freight each way. This would also be a substantial boost to business around Spencer Gulf. The construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line would revive jobs around Spencer Gulf, and obviously all our undertakings should be centred particularly on job creation. It is interesting that 410 kilometres of railway would require 155 000 tonnes of steel rails; 2.3 million sleepers, comprised of either 170 000 tonnes of steel or 240 000 cubic metres of pre-stressed concrete; the construction of 120 new bridges; 3 500 tonnes of structural steel; and 100 000 cubic metres of reinforced concrete. That is obviously very important; merely in terms of the production of steel and concrete the railway would have a major impact on Whyalla and Port Augusta. Some 1 000 jobs would be created in South Australia during the construction of this railway line.

So, the rail link gives Australia the chance to benefit from the whirlwind economic growth of our Asian neighbours by providing a fast and efficient export corridor into Asia. The rail link would also have a colossal impact on reviving the South Australian economy, which is so depressed at the moment, and in particular would have a major impact on the high unemployment areas around Spencer Gulf. We must continually try to educate our Federal colleagues—MHRs and senators—about the benefits of this northern railway link. Too often it is referred to as a South Australian and Northern Territory project. We have to remember that it was promised earlier this century as part of the deal for the hand-over of the Northern Territory from the South Australian to the Commonwealth jurisdiction. It has been a long time coming. Certainly, just after Federation, the Commonwealth approached the South Australian Government and Parliament and offered a deal.

That deal was, 'You give us the Northern Territory and we will build a north-south railway link,' just as there was to be an east-west railway link as part of the deal to get Western Australia to join the Commonwealth of Australia. They honoured that commitment but did not honour the commitment after South Australia gave up Alice Springs and Darwin, and other points north. I believe that, by using the symbolic importance of 2001 as the centenary of Federation, it is befitting in terms of a symbol for a new century and a new millennium. It would be a potent symbol of nation building, similar to the Snowy River scheme after the Second World War.

The latest study shows that the railway would deliver a big boost to exports to Asia, giving South Australian and other exporters a new gateway to Asia, and it would see exports from other States come through South Australia. A campaign is being run by the Northern Territory Government for statehood, and we should support that bid. I am pleased that they are not asking for a full quota of senators, because that would be ludicrous. Their proposal is quite sensible—that this railway link should be a bridge to statehood and that it should be part of the 2001 constitutional rearrangements of the Australian constitution. The Northern Territory should become a State, and this railway line should be part of the reality of statehood—a bridge to statehood in an area that has massive opportunities to expand.

It is interesting to note that it will create employment for 2 000 people in the four year construction phase, and that it will employ 200 permanently after that. I have mentioned that it will generate massive orders for steel from Whyalla and concrete from Port Augusta. However, one aspect that has not been mentioned is that the Alice Springs to Darwin railway would also have major environmental benefits. By taking freight off the roads, it would stop the emission of 100 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide a year and save an estimated 2 000 million litres of fuel over 50 years. In about August last year, the surveyors finished pegging the line, and not only has land acquisition for the railway corridor begun but it is almost completed. All that is needed now is a green light from John Howard, and I am pleased that negotiations are continuing in that respect.

The Alice Springs to Darwin rail link is now economically viable. That has been proven in a series of new studies following the study undertaken by my good friend Neville Wran. That study showed that the time had come, that it was a question of not 'if' but 'when'. Since then, new studies showing the enhanced viability of the project have been recognised by Neville Wran as adding to the study that he brought down. It is now viable, and a \$200 million or \$300 million commitment from the Commonwealth Government would give the private sector, the State and Territory Governments the kick start needed for this giant project.

When I met with Chief Minister Shane Stone and Opposition leader Maggie Hicky in the Northern Territory, I was certainly impressed by the bipartisanship that applied in the Northern Territory. I was able to brief the business and union leaders in Darwin about the two-way benefits of the rail link to both South Australia and the Northern Territory. It is also important that we all recognise the importance of the symbolism of 2001 and now lobby heavily our Federal colleagues on all sides of the House in terms of the project's benefits to the nation and not only to South Australia and the Northern Territory.

One area I am concerned about is Daewoo. I met with Dr Peter Lim, the former Chief Executive of Daewoo. In

November last year I went to Sydney for meetings with him about that company's commitment. I was disappointed at his response. It seemed that he was concerned about legislative action being taken in the South Australian and Northern Territory Parliaments at the insistence of both Governments. He indicated then that it may cause Daewoo to pull out of the project if it went into a competitive tendering position. He basically indicated to me that Daewoo felt that it had put in the groundwork, had put millions of dollars of spade work into this issue and that it felt that not being a preferred tenderer or the preferred developer and going into a competitive tender position meant that it had basically been taken for a ride.

Shortly after that, Dr Lim was replaced as Chief Executive. I understand that there is now a new Chief Executive of Daewoo. I hope that Daewoo is still on track in terms of its commitment to this project. I understand that it is in a wait and see mode: it wants to see what this Parliament does; and it wants to see what happens in terms of the announcement of competitive tenders. Certainly, it is important that this Parliament makes a symbolic statement of support for this project. The Government, supported by the Opposition, has pledged support of \$100 million in terms of South Australia's commitment to the project. The Northern Territory has also committed \$100 million. I understand that some of that is in kind support in terms of its harbour facilities which I have looked at.

It is important that this Parliament make some expression of South Australia's will in terms of supporting the project. It is also important that the Northern Territory and South Australian Parliaments send representatives to see Mr Howard later this month, and support the position adopted by the Premier, the former Premier and me. I am pleased to say on this occasion that I am happy to join the Premier in meeting with John Howard later this month. I am sure that he will accept the offer in the spirit that it is given, and that we can stand side by side in supporting this project. I am sure that the Northern Territory, which has absolutely underpinned and believes in bipartisanship, would welcome that. Indeed, if we were to become partisan about this project, if we were to oppose this project, it could not occur because, quite frankly, people in Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia would seize on any division, and so would our opponents with the numbers in the Federal Parliament, to make sure this project continued to remain a dream.

I am somewhat concerned by amendments flagged today. We have been supportive all the way along, and I find it extraordinary that was I told some time ago that this Bill was needed in order to put a cap on any liabilities of the South Australian Government in terms of a blow out, and that was part of my briefing from both the South Australian Government and the Northern Territory Government. That was the major purpose of this Bill. Just recently, we have seen amendments which show that the capping of the liability has been removed, and that concerns me. I certainly do not want to be negative but questions need to be asked and answered. At the start of Question Time, I met with the Attorney-General, who I felt was most helpful in explaining some of the reasons for the changes. The amendments to the Bill are not just slight modifications; they are absolutely counter to the purpose of the Bill.

Certainly in this House we are prepared to support the passage of the Bill today so that the opponents of this railway line cannot say that there are any divisions. I went to our shadow Cabinet and our Caucus with the Bill and it had

unanimous support but, of course, what we are debating today with respect to these amendments runs absolutely counter to the proposition that the Government said was vitally important to get through the Parliament. I would like to ask a number of questions in Committee in a positive and constructive way, and I know the Premier will take that on board. I will probably need another briefing from the Attorney-General before the Bill passes to the Upper House so that we can iron out some issues and perhaps reach some compromises.

Part of that process too will be the need for continuing bipartisanship, and I know that the Premier will be delighted for me to accompany him on his visit to John Howard at the end of this month. Certainly, that commitment will also help to ease the passage of the Bill in terms of reaching those compromises in the Upper House.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay. I certainly want to commend the Opposition's strong, total and unswerving support for this project. We have lobbied the private sector, we have lobbied the Federal Government and the Federal Opposition, we have lobbied other State Governments and Oppositions around the country, and we have spoken to businesses and unions. I have spoken to my good friend Shane Stone and we will continue to lobby hard, in a bipartisan way, in order to achieve a go ahead for this railway line.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I totally support this Bill, which will enable the completion of a project that has stalled since the Oodnadatta to Alice Springs section was completed back in 1929. I believe this Bill puts into practice this Government's determination to enact its vision for growth and development for South Australia. Earlier in this place today, when endorsing the report of the Public Works Committee regarding the extension of the Adelaide Airport runway, I reiterated the types of development, and particularly infrastructure, that is occurring around this State. I will not list them again, but certainly the Southern Expressway, the water filtration plants and the Wilpena development easily come to mind.

The then Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development reported to this House in July 1995 that this Government, through the Economic Development Authority, was working in conjunction with the Northern Territory Government's Department of Industry and Development assessing the Wran committee's report on the viability of an Alice Springs to Darwin railway link. That report highlighted the predicted costs and freight needed to make this railway viable and used figures current as at 1994. In supporting this massive project, I acknowledge the editorial comment dated 14 November 1996 which followed that agreement and which said:

The figures must add up. The railway must pay its way. It would be a folly to spend greater than \$1 billion and then subsidise it with ratepayers' money.

I note that the freight rates and, more particularly, the volumes of freight between Adelaide and Darwin for 1994-95 increased—and these figures were recorded by the ABS—by about 20 per cent. I also note that the *Financial Review* of 14 November 1996 indicated that the railway would primarily carry freight, and it was the joint South Australian-Northern Territory working committee's assessment that rail traffic had increased base rate projections from 785 000 tonnes per annum to 1.2 billion tonnes.

I note that the Northern Territory's economic growth exceeded the prediction at that time of 3 per cent. We are all generally aware that Darwin's port capacity is currently under a massive multimillion dollar expansion with the new facilities being close to completion. We are also aware that in recent years there has been a substantial increase in the presence of the defence forces in the Northern Territory. Both mining output and agricultural output continues to grow substantially in the Northern Territory. The signs are very clear and forthright in the Northern Territory, as they are in South Australia, that the likely demand is increasing and is ahead of the projections that have already been assessed in terms of what might make a viable project.

Given the recent information available to us, I strongly endorse this agreement signed on 13 November 1996 between the South Australian and Northern Territory Governments effectively to formally cooperate in developing this rail link between Adelaide and Darwin. The \$100 million investment in this project by this Government together with the same injection by the Northern Territory Government will enable the establishment of a managing authority to facilitate construction of the rail link. It will thus be devolving responsibility to this corporate body, the AustralAsia Railway Corporation.

This includes raising additional funds required for this \$1 billion development and conducting the necessary negotiations with land owners and the Commonwealth. The authority will be responsible for developing a proposal worthy of consideration for an infrastructure bond licence, which would permit the use of concessionary infrastructure bonds to private interests. This will enable this important project to progress and thus, I believe, effectively allow investors to be formally sourced. I am confident that if the figures continue to add up we will achieve the required investment, whether it be from overseas or otherwise.

It is estimated that the outcome for South Australia in construction activity would be worth \$500 million, and undoubtedly this would be a welcome boost not only to the State but also to our northern regional centres, because the project will involve 155 000 tonnes of steel, 2.37 million concrete sleepers, 122 bridges and about 2 000 construction jobs.

A similar \$500 million increase is predicted in terms of South Australia's trade and manufacturing industries. I briefly mention the obvious benefit that would flow through to my constituents as Riverland exporters. The completion of this project would create a very effective and vastly improved transport link for overseas markets, particularly those in Asia. I will not go on at length, but members would be well aware of the very specific growth in fresh, high quality produce from the Riverland, which is matching the almost exponential growth in demand from our Asian importers. The producers in my electorate are well aware how important this transport infrastructure will be to the development of their industries.

I note that the current time for transport for that form of fresh produce out of Adelaide, for example, to Nagoya in Japan is about 21 days. The Adelaide to Darwin railway link, together with the fast sea transport available from Darwin, would reduce that time period to about six days. That rail link means that our quality products will arrive at their destinations in optimum condition to meet market demands. If the figures add up, as I have indicated, and the projections are met, there will be a significant cost saving for those producers and their export industries operating out of this State.

I will not continue at length, but I want to underline my support for this project and for the great progress that has been made by this Government, the Premier and the Cabinet in terms of their endorsement and conviction to see this project proceed as quickly as possible through the introduction of this Bill. I support the Bill.

Mr VENNING (Custance): This is an extremely important debate. At last we may see action on a project that has been before us for 60 years. It is another project that this Government has had to bring to fruition. We have seen many things which affect this State and which have been talked about for many years being done, particularly in my electorate: filtered water to the Barossa, the Morgan to Burra Road, the Southern Expressway and the tunnel from the Devil's Elbow. These are so many things that this Government can be proud of. I hope that this project will be yet another. As I said, this debate is most important. We are discussing a project that has been on the national agenda for over 60 years. As the Leader said, when the Federal Government divided the Northern Territory from South Australia many years ago, it agreed to build the rail link between Adelaide and Darwin. The problem was that it did not say when.

On 6 August 1929 we saw the first train, the Ghan, pull into Alice Springs. We also saw construction of the narrow gauge line south from Darwin to Larrimah. That narrow gauge line was not viable: it did not have a destination, and after a few years it fell into disuse. This was a promised national project, and it was never finalised or delivered. It got as far as Alice Springs. Why was it not finished, particularly when one realises that in recent years the line to Alice Springs was upgraded to a high standard? With all the recent floods we have had, I believe that the line is still intact—a far cry from the old Ghan line.

I was privileged to address the Annual General Meeting of the Northern Territory Country Liberal Party in Alice Springs in August 1995 with respect to this subject. I was pleased to speak, in support of the Hon. Barry Coulter, Northern Territory Minister for Railways, to a motion which was carried unanimously at the time. I inspected the rail terminal at Alice Springs and the proposed route. I spoke to the surveyors who were doing preliminary work, I viewed the old alignment from Larrimah to Darwin and, finally, I saw the massive infrastructure being built for the new Port Darwin and the super port, which will be privately owned and run and which should by all accounts be world efficient.

I also saw 100 metres of rail line built on one of the causeways at the port. Curiously, it had neither a beginning nor an end, and I could not understand why it was there. I asked the question, but I cannot recall why it was there: it was either a political or an insurance reason. I think that that piece of rail line is the only one the Northern Territory Minister for Railways has to worry about. It was very significant that that short piece of rail line was built on the causeway at Port Darwin.

I know that concern has been raised about legal liability. The amendments we shall move will deal with this issue, actively capping our risk and safeguarding South Australian taxpayers. As much as we want this railway line, we cannot expose the South Australian population or anyone in huge debt to a project which could—and I certainly hope it does not—run into financial difficulties. I trust that the amendments—and I know that the Premier is leading the debate—will ensure that we get this right. We have willing investors, one being the Daewoo Corporation of Korea. The member for

Ridley would nod in recognition. It is a huge corporation which has a lot of investments in Australia, and we welcome that.

The Governments of South Australia and the Northern Territory have each promised \$100 million, with the Daewoo Corporation promising approximately \$500 million. This leaves the Federal Government with \$250 million to fill the gap, and we hope that it will come on stream shortly. We know what the Wran report said in relation to this project, but it was a political exercise, the terms of reference being couched in such a way that Mr Wran could not come out in direct support of the project. I deemed it a political exercise by the opponents of the project. We all know who the opponents are, that is, the Eastern States, which would like to see Darwin linked via Mount Isa. That is ridiculous, particularly when one considers that there is already a railway line to Alice Springs. I did not give the Wran report much credence but, in the end, even it recommended that this link be built: but, again, it did not say when.

At a meeting I attended in Adelaide about 18 months ago the Prime Minister, when Leader of the Opposition, said that the railway line should be built. He would not say it publicly, but certainly it should be built—and it will be built. I hope that the Prime Minister will say that this nonsense has gone on for long enough and that the project will proceed. The Federal Government should support the Northern Territory and South Australian Governments, with private investments, finally to finish it.

I also note the points raised by the Leader today. Obviously, he used Barry Coulter's speaking notes, as am I. I pay tribute to the Hon. Barry Coulter, Minister for Northern Territory Railways, because he has been absolutely single-minded in his support for this project; he has been selling it everywhere. I have no doubt that he influenced the Leader of the Opposition. Anyone who listened certainly got the message: I know that I did.

The important points need to be highlighted again. The project will use 3 500 tonnes of structural steel, and we know that that will come from Whyalla as there is no other source near the project. It will require 100 000 cubic metres of reinforced concrete. We already have the Port Augusta infrastructure in this regard, but it would have to be multiplied several times to cope with the need. The project will employ 2 000 people during the construction period over four years, and 250 people will then be required to maintain the railway after that.

The external benefits will be numerous. In international competition, we will see improved Australian competitiveness, enhancements to Australia-Asia trade and an improved balance of payments. We can appreciate that, because we know what the economies of the Asian countries are doing. By constructing this line we shall tap ourselves into their economies and their successes. With respect to resource saving, there will be the promotion of self-sufficiency in the north, particularly in the north of our State, where there are vast areas and where one of the major problems is access. Certainly, this will make a huge difference, particularly when people need access via the top end of the country. Singapore will become so close, in fact closer to Darwin than are Perth, Sydney or Melbourne. There will be lower road costs. This is my favourite argument in support of the construction of the line. We will have a railway extending from Melbourne in the south right through to Darwin. It will get traffic off our roads and, at the same time, save a lot of fuel. With respect to

quality of life, there will be jobs for Australians, a better environment and a fairer Australia.

In the defence area, it is rather obvious that we shall have a much stronger defence capability, because we shall be able to move heavy armaments up and down the country so much more quickly. Obviously, Darwin is the spearhead against any adversarial foe—and any foe would have to come from the north because there is not much to the south. It is a big country, and we do have huge coastlines. We shall be able to move armaments quickly and directly up the middle of our country to our northern city. I am amazed that for that reason alone this railway was not constructed in the 1940s.

The project will involve 14 million cubic metres of earth works—that is a huge amount of dirt—and the upgrading of 160 existing bridges and culverts, together with the construction of 80 new bridges. On the way up there I did note that some of this work is already being done. The construction of buildings and workshops will cost over \$40 million. The rail project will require the manufacture of 155 000 tonnes of steel rails, 9.2 million spring steel fasteners and 2.3 million sleepers using either 170 000 tonnes of steel or 240 000 cubic metres of prestressed concrete. Whatever is used, we are in a fantastic position to maximise our opportunities through either steel from Whyalla or cement from Port Augusta. The project will require 15 kilometres of concrete culvert pipe and 2 million cubic metres of ballast.

It will be a standard gauge railway, approximately 1 410 kilometres long, with a design speed of 110 km/h. It is estimated that it will cost about \$947 million. As I said, they were 1994 figures and I have no doubt that, by the time the project is finished, it will have cost at least \$1 000 million. I gather that that cost will be spread over four years. This concept will succeed because it will be a one company operation, privately run, ensuring a seamless, integrated service. It will have dedicated, long-term customers operating under long-term contracts.

There will be a single origin destination for the very fast freight vessel from the port of Darwin to Japan, to which the member for Chaffey alluded. This will be basically a wave piercing catamaran, a huge vessel able to travel at 40 knots. There will be a large proportion of highly rated refrigerated freight. As exporters of so much meat, that is a fantastic outlook for us, particularly for beef from the northern parts of our State. There will be a low south-bound container weight bonus on the very fast freight vessel, which will be of great financial benefit. Also, there will be a reduction in container leasing duration, with a rate premium for the fast service. All in all, it is tying in extremely well.

A great opportunity is created by the whole project and will be enhanced by the development of this very fast freight vessel out of the port of Darwin. Hopefully, that port will be efficient, because it will be privately owned. I hope—and it is a forlorn hope—that that port being so efficient will show the other ports of Australia what can be done when you really want to use world-class efficiencies. Also, the successful introduction of the road-rail vehicle in Australia will add effectiveness and flexibility. We have now seen these operating in South Australia for three or four years, and they are successful. But I am afraid there are not enough of them to be able to harness the efficiencies that would be there if we were able to have whole turnaround trains of them.

The completion of the standard gauge rail link between Adelaide and Melbourne a few years ago will make this a one-gauge railway line from Melbourne to Darwin, non-stop. At last we will see access to Government rail track by private

operators, which has been talked about for years. We have had to see a new project implemented to bring that about. Construction of a new container port in Darwin is well under way and should be getting very close to completion. The member for Chaffey noted, and I wish to stress again, the differences in travel time. At present, from Adelaide to Nagoya by sea conventionally takes 21 days. With this fast catamaran and the railway line it will be six days: less than one-third of the time. The time from Melbourne to Nagoya is currently 19 days, so that would be cut to seven; and Sydney to Nagoya, where the volume traffic would be, currently is 17 days (and I gave the member for Chaffey the wrong information there), so we come from 17 down to eight days, a reduction of nine days.

The benefits here are obvious to anyone who wishes to peruse the figures, and this will benefit South Australia tremendously. New equipment will need to be acquired and built for this project, and much of this I am sure will be tendered for and built in South Australia, particularly the roadrailers, which are already being built here. We will require 150 more, which will cost \$9 million in one year. An extra 150 bogies will be required at \$3.8 million; two more towing frames, \$500 000; locomotives, four initially, \$12.5 million; two port cranes, \$10 million; one very fast freight vessel initially, which will cost \$50 million, and a second one will cost \$63 million. That initially is an expenditure of \$85 million which will total \$160 million by the time they get the second ship running. So, it is a success story, and we have been talking about this for so many years.

At the Darwin end the link to Nagoya in Japan will be via the new fast vessel, a cargo-carrying catamaran. Its overall length will be 160 metres with a beam of 33 metres and capacity to carry 350 containers with a total weight of 3 500 tonnes. Service speed is an incredible 40 knots. Members can imagine 3 500 tonnes travelling at 40 knots. This ship has tremendous power of 100 000 kilowatts, and we will see a revolution in trade between Australia and South-East Asia. There will be a regular service, initially weekly, increasing to daily within seven years. The service will be very fast. As I said, it will be five days from Sydney to Singapore.

It is a service that will be very competitive with sea rates, and much cheaper than air. It will be a reliable service, with one company operating the wave piercers, with terminals for rail and road. The concept is very well founded to provide very fast, competitive freight services connecting Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide to Nagoya in Japan, in future expanding with the demand to include Korea, Hong Kong, Bangkok, Singapore, Malaysia and other South-East Asian ports. It will open up opportunities in the north of South Australia for our mining, beef and tourism industries. This is a vital project and long overdue.

The project has many environmental benefits. It will reduce the freight traffic around the Great Barrier Reef. It will generate significant fuel savings and ease the burden on the Stuart Highway, resulting in a much safer, better maintained highway for the ever-increasing tourist traffic and also for our Northern Territory friends. The northern railway has been without doubt the most scrutinised infrastructure project by the Commonwealth in a long time. Nowhere else has the Government expected the level of scrutiny or performance that it has required of this project. It is and has always been a question of national political will. I believe that we are doing our best to bend that will in our favour.

I hope that this debate today will add at least some small weight to the load of logic and evidence in support of this

project. This is one of the most important debates we have had in this House for decades. I appreciate the support of the Opposition and the team approach by the Northern Territory. Our hope is that the Federal Government will come alongside and cooperate with us, so that we can all be involved in a project that I am sure will benefit Australia greatly. Certainly, as we go to the year 2000 and beyond, this project is a must. I support this Bill.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Although I will be very brief, I have some concerns, not so much with the legislation but with the concept of the Alice Springs-Darwin rail link. On several occasions over the years I have expressed concern and opposed this proposal in this House because of the devastating effect it would have on my electorate, particularly the port of Adelaide. I believe that, if this rail link is completed, the port of Adelaide will be virtually finished. I cannot see that ships coming from the Asian region would come down to Port Adelaide when they could go straight into Darwin, load and unload their cargo and rail the freight down to Adelaide and the rest of Australia. Being the strongest possible supporter of Port Adelaide and my constituents who are employed in the shipping industry and associated industries in Port Adelaide, I have some concerns.

It is a dilemma for me. I just cannot see that Port Adelaide will survive at all if this rail link comes into operation. However, the rail link would be expected to provide, on figures given, a benefit to the local State economy of approximately \$1 billion in terms of freight coming in and out of the State and through the State, and in terms of construction work and jobs during the construction stages of the project. I know that this is only enabling legislation and I doubt whether in my lifetime I will see the rail link built. Nevertheless, I need to express these concerns in support of my constituents and the people employed in the shipping industry in Port Adelaide.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr De LAINE: As the Deputy Leader says, it has been around since 1911, so I will believe it when I see it. However, as I say, the downside is the detrimental effect it would have on Port Adelaide. However, in a broader sense, the vast benefits it would have economically to the State and to Australia in general would far outweigh that. I have felt duty bound to express my concerns as far as local industry is concerned.

I support the Bill but, if and when the rail link is completed—and if I am still in this place, which I doubt—I will certainly push for any persons who lose their jobs in the shipping industry in Port Adelaide to be given alternative employment within the rail industry in South Australia to compensate for that loss of jobs. I support the Bill, but with those provisos and concerns that it will be very detrimental to Port Adelaide.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I support the Bill because of the immediate economic benefits—potentially the \$1 billion that it will mean for South Australia—and because it will bring into effect something that should have been done decades ago. A direct link to Asia through Darwin would take much of South Australia's freight that now goes through the Eastern State seaports. The consequent lower costs would be of direct benefit to South Australia's businesses. This State could be the food bowl for Asia. My own electorate of Flinders would be the source of much of this food in grain and fish products. A more direct link with the market will

ensure fresher produce to the consumer and more markets and better prices for our producers.

South Australia's white goods and car manufacturing industries would also have an advantage in accessing Australian markets through Darwin via the rail link. Australia has often been held to ransom in the business world because of two factors: one is the tyranny of distance; and the other is that, as an island nation, Australia relies on sea and air transport to get anything to the overseas markets. Rail has the potential to be faster and safer than road, with the human factor in long distance haulage affecting service. We have recently had a most unfortunate incident in this State and the consequences that this can cause with an extremely bad trucking accident.

We must capitalise on our advantages. In marketing we must fit in with what the client is looking for, rather than expecting the customer to fit in with what is being done. With Alice Springs connected to Darwin by rail we could target overseas tourism markets with a 'See Australia by rail campaign', thus bringing revenue into this State. Our proximity to the Asian region makes this a particularly exciting possibility. A tourism promotion to cross the Australian continent from north to south by rail would tie in easily with the international airport at Darwin. Specific purpose tourism trains could be scheduled to stop at locations of significant interest to the tourist.

Package tours could use rail as a base with passengers stopping off *en route* at Alice Springs to take in Uluru. South Australia would have a number of possibilities. Some that come to mind are: Coober Pedy for opal mining; Tarcoola or Port Augusta to take in Eyre Peninsula with its whales at the head of the Bight, tuna farms, aquaculture, wineries, alternative farming such as quandongs and emus and the biggest known black jade mine in the world; Pimba for a visit to Woomera; Roxby Downs; and possibly the arid botanic gardens at Port Augusta. Adelaide would provide city attractions to complete a crossing of the Australian continent that would be exciting, memorable and, above all, attractive to tourists because it is different.

It is pleasing to see an increasing concern and interest in environmental issues, and I believe this will bring a renewed urgency to use rail as a method of transportation. Periodically, the argument recurs that we must make the most economical and efficient use of our fossil fuel resources. Motor vehicles and the construction of roads are massive consumers of these resources and also of scarce funds that can be more constructively deployed elsewhere in the State. The Alice Springs to Darwin rail link is a visionary enterprise. The people of South Australia have often shown vision and enterprise above the average, and it is, therefore, not surprising that this State has acted to make the provision of the north-south rail link across the nation a reality. It has been said that if the Snowy Mountain Scheme were proposed today it would not get off the ground: that is a sad reflection on a general lack of will to build for the future.

The South Australian Liberal Government has put us in a position to build for the future. It has acted with prudence and acumen to bring the State out of the worst financial crisis facing it since the economic depression of the 1930s. We have endured the pain of cuts in all areas and departments. I commend the relevant Ministers and my colleagues for the pragmatic and compassionate handling of the State's finances, which will see this State Government balance the budget. The Liberal Government has brought us to a place where we can now look forward with confidence and hope.

It is said that there is a time for everything; this is the time for the completion of the Darwin to Alice Springs railway. I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My remarks will be short in recognition of the contributions that have already been made by others preceding me. Whilst it would have been interesting to rattle off, as did the member for Custance, the number of bridges and other interesting statistics about the materials to be manufactured and used in the construction of the track, it is not necessary for me to repeat what he said, but maybe to vary some of the information the honourable member gave, in that much of it is opinion, such as the length of time taken for the journey from Adelaide through Darwin to Nagoya. Currently, it averages in the order of 21 days in conventional steaming to get out of Adelaide and into the port of Nagoya or Seoul.

It may take only 17 days to get to Hong Kong, or thereabouts, and less than that, according to whether it is Manilla, Bangkok, Singapore or Jakarta along the way. But the fact remains that the journey will be shorter, and accordingly a greater quantity of perishables can be taken along this trade route. The reason why we at present in South Australia are so greatly disadvantaged is that we cannot make as much use of our natural resources as will be possible once this railway line is built. The natural resources about which I am talking are our clean, sound soils, our clean water and our excellent climate for the production of horticultural crops and other intensive animal industries and protein vegetable crops of one kind or another. With this link between Adelaide and Darwin, that now becomes possible.

We will have an incentive to expand our irrigation capacity by making far more efficient use of available water to produce the kinds of things to which the members for Custance, Chaffey and Flinders have referred in their remarks, and in so doing generate an enormous increase in the number of jobs. This will happen because the population in the east Asia markets is expanding dramatically, coupled with the fact that the prosperity of the people who live there is expanding dramatically as they have fast-tracked the development of their economies, learning from the mistakes of the Western democracies in developing their economies in that way and enhancing their levels of consumption. That is the type of consumption about which I am talking. The greater diversity of material that will be available to them as foodstuffs coming from this area, cleaner than some sites in their countries, will ensure that the jobs of which I speak will be part of the future for South Australia.

We are better placed with our climate than is Victoria or New South Wales to supply those markets. We are six months out of season with the northern hemisphere, and when it cannot produce these crops we can. More particularly, we will do it more efficiently not only because we have a greater number of hours of sunshine during the production cycle than the Eastern States have with their cloudy climate but we will become much closer to those markets than the horticultural producing areas of Victoria and New South Wales. So, we have the triple advantage: low disease, high quality soil and water and closer proximity to the markets.

Having made those points, I refer members to the tables which I incorporated in *Hansard* two days ago. This rail link enhances the efficiency with which we can shift freight out of south-eastern Australia into the east Asia region, as well as to the Indian subcontinent, which is a huge market—if for no-one else then at least for their tourists—for the same

commodities we will be producing in south-eastern Australia. That includes what is called the Persian Gulf and the tourist resorts there, right through Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. Altogether then, those of us speaking on this measure today see enormous potential.

I make the point that the transport technology we can use should also include, and almost certainly will include, fuel tenders towed by the motors. The fuel tender in the train, as a permanent feature, can contain compressed natural gas, not only because it is just as efficient as diesel and probably more so if the locomotive is explicitly built for the use of compressed natural gas but it is also more efficient because it will not attract the current levels of taxation which are applied on diesel.

Diesel fuel supplies are fast running down in Australia. We do not have the crude reserves in Bass Strait or onshore in the Cooper Basin and other places to sustain the use of that fuel, and it will become a significant import for us if we continue to rely on it. The greater number of vehicles that we can get to use compressed natural gas, the better. It will be cheaper for them and it will be better for our balance of payments as a country.

Compressed natural gas will be readily available to the locos travelling on this route because it will pass by the Palm Valley gas deposits and is now near to Port Bonython holding area for refuelling. It might as well carry its own fuel as a train. There is no necessity for it to do otherwise. We will probably also ship fuel along this line for a good many other users along the way.

The Incat catamaran design, which is an Australian copyright, is the kind of design to which other members have referred for the fast freight ferry vessels that will ply the trade links between Harbor East in Darwin and the markets of the Indian subcontinent and east Asia. They travel very efficiently in terms of fuel consumption by comparison with the heavy, mono-hull vessels used at present. In fact, they will be able to reach great speeds in excess of 40 knots. We do not have to limit the speed to 40 knots because, if we wish, we can design these vessels to travel at 50 knots. That would put us in Nagoya and Seoul in five days, which would give us an enormous advantage because that type of freight travel is much cheaper than air freight.

Let me answer the member for Price's concerns about Port Adelaide. It will enhance not reduce Port Adelaide because it will expand the State's population and economy and make it possible for us to go into the manufacture of a far greater range of non-perishable goods, which will still need to have the very efficient port facilities provided by the people in Port Adelaide. The people who work there and the corporations which operate at the port have established a reputation in very recent times for outstanding efficiency. It is the No. 1 port in Australia, and that is why we will be able to attract manufacturers here of those goods, which can be exported, once manufactured, from Port Adelaide to the world's markets through that port. I am not in the least worried about that.

By building this railway we will create more jobs, stop population drift and thereby reduce the overheads inherent in the public sector on the administration of the population at large. We will increase the efficiency by increasing the scale of operations, thereby reducing the unit cost per unit service output.

When looking at that catamaran, we do not have to restrict ourselves to engines which are merely 100 000 kilowatts. They can be expanded to a far greater power output than that. As I have already said, we are on the brink of the use of the

rotary valve motor, which will lift efficiency of the same size and weight of motor by at least 17 per cent and maybe as much as 40 per cent. This is also a South Australian patent. I think that the times ahead for us in the transport industry and the way it will facilitate the development of food and other semi-perishables that we can produce are very exciting indeed.

I share the same measure of confidence that the Leader of the Opposition has spoken about, that other members have mentioned today and about which the Premier spoke when he introduced this Bill before Christmas and when he has answered questions about the State's economy both here and in the wider public domain since that time. I am thrilled to be able to stand in support of this measure which sensibly limits the State's liability to \$100 million in 1996 dollar terms and secures for us a commitment to the building of this railway to complete the link between Adelaide and Darwin—indeed, Adelaide and the huge markets of the Indian subcontinent and east Asia.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will not take the time of the House for very long on this matter because the points have already been well canvassed by the Leader of the Opposition and, like him, I am prepared to support the legislation. However, also like the Leader, I have some concerns which will need to be addressed by the Government with respect to the removal of the cap on the liability of the South Australian Government for this legislation before I can be entirely satisfied with it.

I am sorry that the Premier is not present, given that this is his Bill, because, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the bipartisan support of this Parliament towards the completion of this project is well known. There could be no better way to demonstrate it than for the Premier, when he goes to meet the Prime Minister with the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, to invite the Leader of the Opposition to accompany him to show vigorously and in tangible form the total bipartisan support that the completion of this railway line has from the major political Parties in this State.

That would be an act of statesmanship, and I am sure that our Premier is big enough to show such a statesmanlike attitude. I hope that the Premier would not be so crass politically as to seek to use the Alice Springs to Darwin railway for purely selfish Party political purposes in an election year, because this railway line, if built and completed, will outlast all Governments, Liberal and Labor, and certainly any member of this current Parliament.

It will be an act of nation building, such as the Snowy Mountains scheme and the East-West railway line, and it should be something that unites the people of this State. It has united the political Parties which have a common objective for the benefit of this State. We have heard a great deal over recent months from the Premier and Government members about how it is necessary for the good of the citizens of this State for the political Parties not to score points off one another but to move forward in the advancement of the interests of all citizens of this State. We are happy to do that and, in this very tangible way, the Premier could invite the Leader of the Opposition to accompany him to Canberra. With the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, hand in hand, so to speak, they could walk into the offices of John Howard and insist that the obligations that the Commonwealth accepted in 1911 with respect to the transfer of the Northern Territory from South Australia to the Commonwealth Government, which was conditional on the completion

of the railway line from Adelaide to Darwin, be enacted and be given reality.

I appeal to the Premier to adopt a statesmanlike approach in this matter, which he has sought to have the Opposition adopt on numerous occasions with respect to his own policies. Now let him show an act of statesmanship about which he berates others. I am confident that the fact that this is an election year will not interfere with the Premier's thinking on this matter with respect to showing that level of statesmanship.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I too support the legislation. I am not sure that legislation is required for this, but the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have nevertheless agreed that it has some value so I will go along with it. I support it, but probably not for the same reasons as do most people in this place. I have seen quite detailed figures on this railway, and the last I saw showed that the project was about \$300 million short of being viable. Perhaps there are later figures and the project is closer to being viable than that. Those in the private and public sectors who have looked at this project have said that there has to be hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' subsidy to make it viable. So, as everyone has decided (and one would argue rationally), they have other priorities than these two rusting rails.

The reason it is not viable is that nobody can see where the freight will come from to make this a profitable operation. The Northern Territory Government has always said—and, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, South Australian Governments have gone along—that this would be a boost to the Northern Territory's economy. I have no doubt that that is the case but, given the way the Northern Territory is funded by taxpayers in the other States, all governments have decided that it is getting plenty as it is and that to provide another \$300 million handout is not a high priority, particularly given that it has only one seat in the House of Representatives.

As regards my own electorate, sure, we will stand and cheer. If somebody is willing to give us a \$300 million subsidy to run a railway line from Darwin to Alice Springs, that will mean that considerable benefits will accrue to the electorate of Giles, and we will say, 'Thank you very much; you couldn't have spent your \$300 million in a better way'. We will accept anything that anybody wishes to give us. As regards extra jobs directly in the electorate, that is a bit problematic. There will be no extra jobs at all in the steel works in Whyalla that will produce this rail. There will be a shift in production for a few weeks to produce the rail and that is about it; but, again, that will be a nice little order for BHP and, if somebody is willing to provide a \$300 million subsidy to give a nice little order for steel rails, we will take it.

I have been involved in debates like this for a long time, and I have always said quite genuinely that I support the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, but I support it because of the nature of the continent of Australia. I do not believe it is unreasonable for a continent of this size to have a north-south railway as well as an east-west railway and a north-south road as well as an east-west road. If you knocked out every road in Australia that did not meet the strict criteria of being viable, there would be very few roads in Australia indeed. We would never pay for many of them in 1 000 years, given the amount of traffic that goes on them. But, Australia being a very large continent with a very small population, if we took the economic rationalist argument to the nth degree, there

would not be a lot of activity in Australia at all. The miners would do all right and we could sell a bit of wheat and wool. I do not think anybody wants the wool these days, but the miners would do a bit and there would be a bit of other activity, but not a great deal. So, there has to be significant State intervention.

I have no hesitation in saying that the \$300 million subsidy that would have to apply for this railway is State intervention, and I believe it is worth it in the building of a nation. But I will not stand up here and say it will do wonderful things for South Australia—it will probably do wonderful things for the Northern Territory—and for the rest of Australia and that this is an answer to all our dreams: it is not. I was surprised to hear the member for Custance say how wonderful it was. The member for Custance is a classic example of the problems of rail. For many years the honourable member has had the opportunity to shift his grain by rail but he has always chosen road, because he cannot afford to use the railway and it is cheaper by road. I agree with him; that is a rational decision that the member for Custance makes, but I am a little uncomfortable when the honourable member comes in here crying about the demise of rail, when he makes the rational decision to use the road instead.

The Hon. E.S. Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It would not matter if there were no unions: it has nothing to do with the unions, and it would not matter if no labour were involved at all. The Minister would not have a clue about very much at all. I have seen him in Parliament for very many years and I have to say that without a doubt he would be one of the least knowledgeable persons I have ever seen in this place. He would not recognise a sensible debating point if it bit him on the nose. The way the Minister handles himself and his portfolio in this Chamber demonstrates very clearly that he would have to be the greatest passenger that we have ever had the misfortune to have in this place in the past two decades. The Minister had a very short parliamentary career the last time he was here—probably longer than his talents warranted—and he will have a very short parliamentary career this time. All I can say is that, having those half a dozen years in Parliament, given the amount of talent he has, he has done very well.

One of the reasons I support this is that it is a job creation program on a grand scale. What Australia needs at the moment are job creation programs on a grand scale. I do not believe that what the Federal Government is doing at the moment will do anything meaningful at all, in saying that it will give three days work of some description (I am not sure what) for a handful of people to get the unemployment figures down. Lots of things can be done in the infrastructure areas of Australia. They can be done only by governments and taxpayers: they will not be done by the private sector because, unless there is a huge amount of taxpayer subsidy in them, by conventional accounting methods they will not be economically viable. I say that this is the time for those huge State projects. I can think of a number of others, but this is one, which at some time in the future will be of economic benefit to Australia. At the moment it will be a very good job creation scheme, along with a few others.

What are the chances of getting this project? We have to be realistic. Unless hundreds of millions of dollars are to be found in the Federal Government's budget to subsidise this project, on purely economic grounds I think the chances are zero. However, not everything is decided on economic grounds: there are also some political considerations. As we approach the year 2000 I have a sneaking feeling that the

Prime Minister, John Howard, is looking for a monument to himself. He is not doing too well at the moment: I have never seen such a scruffy, untidy start to a Government—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, this one's been pretty awful, but I think the Federal Government has surpassed members opposite for scruffiness and untidiness in the first 12 months. I assume that it will eventually iron out a few of its problems. John Howard seems to me to be the type of person who will not make any great impact on this nation of his own volition and arising out of his own personality.

You cannot, with all charity, suggest that John Howard is some kind of visionary who will lead Australia into the next century or the next millennium. I cannot really see John Howard in that role at all. Perhaps I am wrong; maybe he will surprise us. But I do not see him in that great statesperson role—unless he buys it. There is just a chance that he may be trying to buy himself a reputation as a visionary, and this may well be the project that does it. If that is the case, so be it.

If the Prime Minister wants to get himself a name by being the person who built the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, when will he announce it? If this \$300 million worth of taxpayers' money is to be sunk into this project—and I have said that I support it—there may be a big announcement towards the end of the year. I can see it now. I can see John Howard staring into the distance from Alice Springs. I can see the Premier standing there, minus tie, hat shading the eyes—

Mr Foley: Action Man!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—that's right—with the R.M. Williams moleskins on, in the red centre, looking north: 'This is what we have achieved.' All I can say is that it has been done before; it has been done on numerous occasions. But I have a sneaking feeling that this time we may see it again. Depending on the results of the next State election, it just may have a little more substance. I cannot see the Prime Minister of this country, John Howard, getting any kind of lasting memorial at all other than by buying it, and this may be the project. If so, I support it. I support his buying his reputation in this way. I would be disappointed if he did not do it for higher and more noble reasons, but I suspect that that will not be the case.

Nevertheless, I commend the Premier for this legislation. It is reasonably good public relations, although I must say people's views are a little jaundiced on this topic. Nevertheless, the Premier has gone to the trouble to bring it in; it is reasonable public relations for the Premier. I am also pleased to see that the Leader of the Opposition has not taken the economic rationalist road in this and pointed out all the financial problems and all the other projects that could be financed by this \$300 million subsidy. I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has taken the long view and has entered into this in the spirit not of public relations, as the Premier has, but of nation building, which is the reason why I support the project and I support the Bill.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): The Premier may look disappointed that I am going to give a contribution, but I have a real reason to do it, both as the shadow Minister for Industry and Infrastructure and because in my electorate of Hart I have the Outer Harbor transport terminal and the very expensive intermodal interchange. Of course, after the next State election, I will inherit from my colleagues the members for

Taylor and Price the inner Port Adelaide area, as well. From the outset I want to say that I support—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY:—I wouldn't mind it—the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line. However, this needs to be put into context, and my colleague the member for Giles very much did that. It is an important piece of national infrastructure. It has a real role to play in nation building, in putting in place an important piece of infrastructure for our defence industry. It will greatly enhance the transport corridor through to Darwin; there is no question of that. In a modern twenty-first century we should have all points of our nation readily serviced by rail.

It should also be noted that I do not quite have the enthusiasm of some in terms of the expected economic gain from it. It will be important economically, but it must be put in context. I would like the Premier to address, in his reply to the debate, my wanting the Government to maintain a real commitment to Outer Harbor, to the port of Adelaide, centred at the end of Lefevre Peninsula. A lot of money has been invested by both Governments in the port in the intermodal arrangements that have been put in place. Many tens of millions of dollars of public infrastructure have been put in place. It was a very expensive exercise to relieve the previous operators of the port and to put in the Sea-Land group as an important niche port. It is important that the Government maintain a commitment to the port of Adelaide and to ensure that we continue to put resources and a commitment into that port, both through the Ports Corporation and also through supporting Sea-Land.

I am seeking from the Premier a real commitment to ensuring that the port of Adelaide remains a priority of this Government, that the transport hub concept, started under the former Labor Government and continued under this Government, receives a priority, and that the port of Adelaide remains an important niche port for time sensitive goods. We then would support the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link. On behalf of the constituents within my electorate, Premier, please maintain support for the port of Adelaide and a commitment to the Sea-Land operation so that we can ensure, as we embrace with enthusiasm the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, that we maintain a real commitment to the constituents of my electorate and those in neighbouring electorates and to the port of Adelaide. If I can have that assurance from the Premier it will certainly be welcome by the operators, the staff and the people who work in the port of Adelaide.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support this Bill. I do not intend to canvass the material covered by many speakers this afternoon as the points I want to raise have been outlined. The importance of this Bill cannot be underestimated, and it came home to me clearly when I had the opportunity to be in Darwin last year. I met with quite a few members of Parliament, and I had the opportunity to go out to the new port of Darwin which is being built to see the extent of the new port infrastructure. When I was being shown around I asked, 'What is that area there?' They said, 'That's where the rail corridor will go.' I asked, 'Where does that railway come from?' They said, 'It's not here yet, but that will be coming from Alice Springs.' So Darwin is already well and truly prepared for it; it has the infrastructure ready to go in. It is very pleasing to see this Bill before the Parliament, and I fully endorse the various potential benefits that have been identified.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I thank the House and those who contributed in this debate for their support for this measure. It has traditionally had bipartisan support. It is an important measure in the long-term provision of infrastructure for South Australia to reach out into the international marketplace. It will facilitate access to that marketplace whilst at the same time not putting at risk the existing facilities at Outer Harbor and the port of Adelaide, which has developed an exceptionally good reputation in performance as a port over recent years, for which I commend the operators and the work force. The clear intent of the Government is to add to and not to detract from existing infrastructure.

A number of amendments have been put forward by the Government as a result of consultation and negotiation with the Northern Territory Government in reaching a position that would meet the requirements of both. The original Alice Springs to Darwin Railway Bill provided for the authorisation of an agreement between the South Australian and Northern Territory Governments to facilitate the construction of a railway link between Alice Springs and Darwin, and the operation of a railway from Darwin linking into the national rail network at Tarcoola.

In November 1996 the former Premier and Northern Territory Chief Minister signed an inter-governmental agreement between the South Australian and Northern Territory Governments agreeing in principle, subject to certain conditions, the financial contributions to the project to be made by each Government. The conditions set out in the agreement include the State's financial commitment being subject to the commercial viability of the project. The agreement also contemplated that both Governments would participate in a statutory corporation to be established for the purposes of holding title to the rail corridor and facilitating the management of the project. This inter-governmental agreement is set out in the schedule to the Bill.

The cap which was originally in the legislation and which will be removed will be part of the inter-governmental agreement—that is, it will not be part of legislation but part of the inter-governmental agreement—and that responds specifically to a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The Northern Territory Parliament has already passed the Australasia Railway Corporation Act 1996 to provide for the establishment of the Australasia Railway Corporation. This corporation will hold the title to the rail corridor and will facilitate the construction and operation of the railway.

A South Australian representative will be appointed to the corporation on the nomination of the Minister. The Alice Springs to Darwin Railway Bill was introduced for the purposes of ratifying the inter-governmental agreement signed in November 1996, and to authorise the Minister to enter into a formal agreement which is legally enforceable between South Australia, the Northern Territory and other appropriate parties to facilitate the development of a railway link between Alice Springs and Darwin. Since the Bill was initially tabled in the House, further discussions have taken place between the South Australian and Northern Territory Governments regarding the participation by South Australia in the Northern Territory corporation, and in respect of the need for appropriate risk management processes and risk allocation arrangements to be agreed between the two Governments, which is really the point regarding the cap raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Northern Territory has also requested that appropriate arrangements be made for the management of South

Australia's share of administrative and ancillary costs associated with the authorised project. The two Governments have agreed in principle to negotiate a further legally enforceable agreement to deal with these issues. In the course of these discussions, further advice was taken from the Crown Solicitor and Solicitor-General in respect of the need to limit the liability of the State. The advice received is that the original limitations on liability, set out in clauses 6 and 7 of the original Bill, may not be effective. Accordingly, it is proposed that this issue be dealt with in a further legally enforceable agreement between the two Governments.

In general, the Government's amendments bring the terminology used in the Bill in line with the terminology used in the inter-governmental agreement set out in the schedule to the Bill; reflect the Government's intention to negotiate a further legally enforceable agreement for the purposes of establishing appropriate risk management processes and risk allocation arrangements in relation to the authorised project; make appropriate arrangements for the management of South Australia's share of administrative and ancillary costs associated with the authorised project; and give effect to the advice received from the Crown Solicitor and the Solicitor-General. I will give further explanation on the specific amendments in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

New clause 1A—'Commencement.'

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

Page 1, after line 12—Insert new clause as follows:

1A. This Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This amendment brings the legislation into line with most other legislation by leaving the date of operation to be fixed by proclamation. However, it begs the question: why the change from the original Bill, and was this clause omitted by mistake in the original Bill? Is there now some doubt about whether the project will see the light of day in the short or medium term? When is it anticipated that the legislation will be proclaimed, and will that be only after the project has progressed much further with more concrete commitments from the private sector than we have seen from Daewoo, given Mr Peter Lim's advice to me that Daewoo may be considering pulling out?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It gives the South Australian Government the capacity to negotiate a range of inter-governmental agreements with the Northern Territory Government prior to the legislation being effected or operational.

New clause inserted.

Clause 2—'Definition.'

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

Page 1, lines 15 and 16—Leave out definition of 'authorised project' and insert—

'authorised project' means the project defined in clause 1.1 of the preliminary agreement.

'preliminary agreement' means the agreement set out in the schedule to this Act.

The proposed change to the definition of 'authorised project' will bring the definition of the project in the Bill in line with the definition used in the agreement set out in the schedule. The description of the agreement set out in the schedule to the Bill, as a preliminary agreement, reflects the Government's intention to negotiate a further legally enforceable agreement

with the Northern Territory Government, and that agreement will incorporate the cap.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—'Ratification of preliminary agreement.'

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

Page 1, line 18—Leave out 'agreement set out in the schedule to this Act' and insert 'preliminary agreement'.

The description of the agreement in the schedule to the Act as the preliminary agreement reflects the Government's intention to negotiate a further legally enforceable agreement with the Northern Territory.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I note that the agreement is in the name of Dean Craig Brown. Is there any need, therefore, legally to change the name on the agreement?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The agreement will be renegotiated in any event. A number of these amendments give us the capacity to negotiate further the inter-governmental agreement with the Northern Territory, and matters such as that referred by the Leader will be addressed in that process.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Does the change from 'agreement' to 'preliminary agreement' really reflect the true nature of the agreement and, if so, does the Premier anticipate that any further legislation will be brought before the Parliament in the future? I note the wording has gone from 'agreement' to 'preliminary agreement'. Are we getting into a bit of blue sky here?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I would not expect any need for further legislation in this matter, given the extensive negotiations that have taken place between officers of the South Australian and Northern Territory Governments in which a number of the requirements of the respective Governments have been accommodated. I mentioned earlier that the cap will be part of the inter-governmental agreement, and this simply takes us another step in the process.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—'Authorisation of justiciable agreement.'

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

Page 1, lines 20 to 22—Leave out subsection (1) and insert—
(1) The Minister is authorised to enter into a legally enforceable agreement, on behalf of this State, with a Minister of the Crown in right of the Northern Territory to give effect to the preliminary agreement and facilitate implementation of the authorised project.

This amendment also reflects the Government's intention to follow up the agreement set out in the schedule to the Bill with a further legally enforceable agreement between the South Australian and the Northern Territory Governments with a view to establishing an appropriate risk management process and risk allocation arrangements which form an integrated part of the authorised project and appropriate arrangements for the management of South Australia's share of administrative and ancillary costs associated with the authorised project. The proposed amendment authorises the making of further legally enforceable agreements with the Northern Territory.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This change attempts to use what I guess is more user-friendly wording, that is, 'legally enforceable' rather than 'justiciable', and it links in with the term 'preliminary agreement'. For the benefit of the Committee, because 'justiciable' was clearly part of the original concept, will the Premier explain his interpretation of the difference between 'justiciable' and 'legally enforceable'?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: 'Legally enforceable agreement' is readily understood by all parties in any public announcements of the agreement. To put forward that it is a legally enforceable agreement is well understood by parties.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Every lawyer in this State—and presumably anyone challenging the agreement would be utilising lawyers—also knows clearly the definition, as brought down through many centuries of common law, of 'justiciable'. 'Justiciable', to me, means that any points of disagreement can be determined in a court of law by a judge. It seems very odd, and perhaps a weakening of the clause and a weakening of the protections to South Australia, if we see a diminution of 'justiciable' to 'legally enforceable'.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There will be no diminished effect at all.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—'Extent of financial commitment.'

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

Page 1, line 25—Leave out 'justiciable' and insert 'legally enforceable'.

This amendment follows on the change of description as amended in the previous clause. It reflects the Government's intention that the further agreement between South Australia and the Northern Territory is intended to create legally binding obligations on each of the two Governments.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—'Limitation of liability.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The original clause attempted to limit the liability of South Australian taxpayers in relation to this project to \$100 million. Clearly, the \$100 million is what the Premier, the Government, the former Premier and also the State Opposition believe is just, wise and prudent. We are demonstrating that South Australia wants to be part of this project and that it is prepared to put in \$100 million. The Attorney explained to me earlier today at the start of Question Time that this may not be enforceable outside the South Australian jurisdiction. But it still does not answer why it was deemed necessary to include it in the original Bill. Did Shane Stone, Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, or Barry Coulter, the Minister for Transport responsible for this Bill, insist on its removal? It seems to me that it sends the wrong message to South Australia in terms of our State's future liability.

We all want this project to proceed, but if there was some failure by the private sector developers or investors after the investment of \$600 or \$700 million in the project—if one of them were to get into trouble and there were to be legal suits across national boundaries—we do not want the State Government of South Australia able to be sued and its liabilities incurred to rescue the project of many more hundreds of millions of dollars. I am concerned that what we are seeing is perhaps a diminution of the protection of the South Australian taxpayer. I was briefed by the Northern Territory and South Australian Governments that this legislation was principally necessary for two reasons: first, to set up a legal framework for a corporation for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway; and secondly—in fact most emphatically—to put a cap on our \$100 million so that we do not find ourselves exposed as a State to pick up the tabs for others. I am very concerned about this. As I want to support the Bill I am prepared to let it go through in this place, but it is something which will have to be questioned and examined in a more thorough way in the Upper House. Is the Premier also concerned about the greater exposure of liability, and will he give a cast-iron guarantee that the liability of South Australian taxpayers will not exceed \$100 million?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I cannot give a cast-iron guarantee on the \$100 million, because it is anticipated that

some of the establishment and ancillary costs related to the corporation will be separate from the \$100 million. The Government has a very firm and clear commitment that there will be a cap, as I have mentioned on three occasions in this debate, in the intergovernmental agreement. That cap will be \$100 million in 1996 Australian dollar terms and will be the cap that will be incorporated in the intergovernmental agreement.

The Government has a clear commitment to put that in the intergovernmental agreement, and it will be capped at that point. There might be other costs—it might be \$50 000 or \$100 000; I do not know—associated with the establishment of the corporation. We think it is reasonable that they be separate and distinct from the \$100 million. The \$100 million is for the provision of capital for infrastructure. But there will be some establishment costs which will be separate. If the Leader is looking for an indication that there will not be a blank cheque, he has that commitment from the Government.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: All the briefings given to me by Barry Coulter and by the Government—and all the undertakings from this Government—have concerned the need for a legislative cap to protect the South Australian taxpayer. Now we are told that it will not be in legislation to protect the infrastructure funds of \$100 million but that it will be negotiated through an intergovernmental agreement. The whole reason for this legislation was to give the South Australian taxpayer some protection in terms of that \$100 million. I would like to understand what has changed the Premier's mind on this. I understand that as a State we said to the Northern Territory, 'We are partners with you on this, but we will not be silly about it. We are prepared to put in a \$100 million but we are not prepared to expose ourselves. Therefore, we need a cap in legislation from the ground up before the project starts.'

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: One other consideration was to ensure that by legislation we did not impact adversely on the credit rating of South Australia, or on further interest rate costs for South Australia. That is one aspect of the arrangements that have been now put in place.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Is it true that some prospective investors are not prepared to invest if there is a legislative cap on the State's exposure?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, not to my knowledge, nor has it been brought to my attention at all. If you are to legislatively enact contractual arrangements of this nature you might send a message to future investors in South Australia that would not be in the interests of this State.

Clause negatived.

Clause 7—'Statutory corporation.'

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

Page 2, lines 5 to 9—Leave out subclauses (1) and (2) and insert—

(1) The Minister may exercise any powers conferred by the law of the Northern Territory on the South Australian Government or a representative of the South Australian Government related to a statutory corporation established (or to be established) to facilitate or supervise the authorised project or any aspect of the authorised project.

The Government has received advice from the Crown Solicitor and Solicitor-General that seeking to limit the liability of the State in the manner originally contemplated by sections 7(1) and 7(2) may not be effective. Accordingly, they are deleted and the proposed amendment provides a legislative authorisation for the responsible South Australian

Minister to exercise the powers conferred by the Northern Territory legislation.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can understand what the Premier is trying to do here: whenever there are intergovernmental agreements there are things that need to be ironed out, but the major problem here is not what is being inserted, although we need to ask what precedents there are for the conferral of such powers. I would like the Premier to answer whether he has any precedents here in South Australia that he has drawn upon. The two subclauses are being removed, not inserted. The subclauses set out that the statutory corporation set up under Northern Territory legislation is not an instrumentality of the Crown in right of South Australia, and that South Australia incurs no liability in respect of acts or omissions of the statutory corporation.

What worries me is that we might be in a position of allowing the Northern Territory Minister to make commitments on behalf of South Australia. There is a kind of furring of the exposure levels by the removal of those provisions.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: These are matters that I am advised will be the basis of negotiation in the intergovernmental agreement between South Australia and the Northern Territory.

Mr De LAINE: Have any studies been undertaken to assess the likely effect on the port of Adelaide if and when this rail link is completed, in terms of jobs on the wharves, shipping companies and associated industries in Port Adelaide?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I responded to the member for Hart, who posed a similar question in terms of whether the construction of this line will diminish the port of Adelaide. The answer to that is 'No'. As to a study, I am not in possession of any studies to the extent to which the honourable member refers. I am prepared to see whether any Government studies have been undertaken and, should they have been, I will be happy to supply some of that information to the honourable member. Whilst the Shipping Users Group and a number of people have expressed reservations about the Government of South Australia committing to the rail link, I think that in productivity and efficiency gains, to repeat my answer to the member for Hart, the port of Adelaide now is ahead of Sydney and Melbourne in performance.

It is a plus for the management and the work force. With those productivity and efficiency gains they should have been able to secure a future. That of course relates to the quantity of goods that we can get moving through that port to get additional vessels calling in to the port of Adelaide, obviating the need for land transport out of Melbourne or Sydney simply because of the lack of number of vessels calling into the port of Adelaide. They are being addressed in a pretty constructive sort of way by the Shipping Users Group. I will ascertain whether any study has been done, and will be happy to pass on any information.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In order to assist both the Premier and this debate, given the time, there is a number of generic questions I can just put on record that can be addressed in the Upper House. They relate to the general provisions, Sir, so I would like your assistance in this. Basically, the Opposition supports the Bill but seeks some clarification about what assessments have been done of any potential difficulties or liabilities arising from native title issues and environmental issues. I understand that there is still a segment of the track that has not yet been acquired, and we need to get some understanding about where we are in terms of that.

What is the likely length of private operation before it reverts to the public sector? What are the triggers for progress payments—and there is a need for real and meaningful triggers for progress payments? What provisions have been made to ensure any sharing of potential ‘super profits’ with the Northern Territory and South Australian Governments? And what provisions govern the timing of progress payments of up to \$25 million at a time so as not to have an adverse impact on other areas of Government spending here in South Australia? Perhaps those questions could be addressed in another place.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am happy to take those questions on notice and we will address them and respond as best we can prior to passage of the Bill.

Mr De LAINE: Following my previous question, how many additional permanent jobs will be created here in South Australia, particularly near Adelaide, if and when this rail link comes on stream, in terms of transport hub activities?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is a very difficult question to answer, because it depends on the sale of Australian National, Track Australia and arrangements put in place post the Commonwealth Government’s current sale. As you are probably aware, we have had discussions with the Commonwealth in relation to these matters and sought approval from the Prime Minister that South Australia will be consulted prior to the sale.

It depends on the sale of AN and what facilities are left in South Australia and the hubbing nature of rail transport in South Australia. It depends on the Commonwealth Government’s being able to renegotiate with the National Rail

Corporation in terms of track access around Australia, because anyone wanting to buy Australian National would want to have access to all tracks throughout Australia. Those matters will be addressed during the year. Whilst the Commonwealth anticipates that the sale will be concluded by 30 June, I think that is very optimistic. We are negotiating with the Commonwealth, so the subsequent employee numbers post-sale AN and post-construction of the line are too difficult to quantify at this stage.

Mr CLARKE: Will the Premier accept the Leader of the Opposition’s offer to accompany him to Canberra in a statesman like approach and in a bipartisan approach to show the Prime Minister of Australia the unity in this State for the completion of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, and that the Premier will not seek to make crass political capital out of it in an election year by excluding the Leader of the Opposition from such a delegation?

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he was imputing improper motives.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the Prime Minister understands the bipartisan nature of this project in South Australia.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 25 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 February 1997

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

INTERNET

4. **Mr ATKINSON:** Does the Government intend to regulate the Internet by new legislation?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: At the last meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys General (SCAG), the Attorney-General, on behalf of the State Government, reluctantly agreed to defer for a short time the regulation of pornography and violence on on-line information services, such as computer bulletin boards and the Internet.

The Federal Government asked that Attorneys defer consideration of the issue until it had amended the *Australian Broadcasting Act* and developed a Code of Practice in conjunction with industry. The amendment was introduced to the Senate on 25 October 1996.

The Government is concerned about the delay in establishing a framework for self regulation in this important area but has agreed to defer further consideration of a regulatory system until after Attorneys General have met with the Federal Communications Minister, Senator Richard Alston. At the July meeting of SCAG the Attorneys General expressed a desire to meet with Senator Alston as soon as possible on the matters which fall within federal jurisdiction. This meeting has not yet taken place.

The Government supports the principle of self regulation (particularly the development of a Code of Practice in consultation with the industry) but the Government is of the view that it has to be backed up with offence provisions as a last resort for those who fail or refuse to exercise any effective control over material which is publicly available through information services.

For some time there has been particular community concern about the access by minors to offensive material on on-line information services. It is desirable to have a uniform system of regulation across Australia if possible and while Government concedes that any regulation may be difficult to enforce it would send a clear message to the community that transmitting objectionable or unsuitable material for minors is unacceptable.

HEALTH COMMISSION

37. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. What are the terms of reference for the review of the South Australian Health Commission budget being undertaken by Arthur Anderson Pty Ltd?

2. Were tenders or expressions of interest called for this work and, if so, how many consultants responded?

3. When will the report be completed and will it be made public?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. The terms of reference for the review of the South Australian Health Commission (SAHC) budget were 'to comment upon the adequacy of the SAHC recurrent budget allocation for 1996-97 to at least maintain service levels at their 1995-96 levels in an environment in which there are natural increases in the demand for health services and various cost pressures outside SAHC's control.'

2. Arthur Andersen Pty Ltd was engaged by the Department of Premier and Cabinet without calling for expressions of interest as this review was seen as the progression of another study which Arthur Andersen has already been engaged to undertake on behalf of the SA Health Commission.

3. The report is due for completion in the near future and will be considered as part of the formulation by Cabinet of next year's budget. Accordingly, it is not proposed to release this report publicly.