

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 March 1998

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PARLIAMENT, EQUAL REPRESENTATION

A petition signed by 62 residents of South Australia requesting that the House pass legislation ensuring equal representation of men and women in both Houses of Parliament was presented by Mr Conlon.

Petition received.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

A petition signed by 1 456 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the proposed clearway restrictions on Grand Junction Road and to consider alternative options was presented by Mr De Laine.

Petition received.

CAMDEN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 79 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to preserve the current zoning provisions of the Camden Park Primary School was presented by Ms Key.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier, for the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—
Report, 1996-97.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I rise on a matter of privilege under Standing Orders. I tell the House that yesterday, following Question Time, I was threatened by the Minister for Administrative Services and the Minister for Information Services that, unless I withdrew an inquiry I had made to him about the rules, arrangements for and use of cars provided to various members of Parliament from State Fleet, he would have me removed from membership of the Public Works Committee, to which position I was elected by this Chamber and, if a *prima facie* case be found, that a privileges committee be formed to examine it.

The SPEAKER: A matter of privilege takes precedence. The Chair will give careful consideration to the proposition put forward by the member for Hammond and report back to the House at the earliest opportunity.

QUESTION TIME

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's support for a goods and services tax, will the Premier tell the Parliament if the South Australian

Government's proposals for tax reform that he will be taking to the Premiers' Conference later this week contain any proposals for any essential goods and services to be exempt from the GST? Yesterday the Premier would not rule out households having to pay the GST on electricity. Under the current proposed system any basic goods and services are exempt from sales tax such as water, power, petrol, clothes, footwear, education and health care. Does the Premier support a GST on these essential items?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I answered the Leader's question yesterday. He only has to get out *Hansard* and look at it.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Here's the spoiler, the no-policy guy yet again, with no alternative strategy. As I indicated yesterday—and if the Leader wants to repeat questions day after day and cannot find any new question material, that is fine by me because he will get the same answer—at the Premiers' Conference I will be arguing the case for the abolition of a wholesale sales tax that impacts against our motor vehicle industry, in particular, or against manufactured goods going into the international market place, that puts us at disadvantage in this State in accessing and producing steering columns and air-conditioners at Air International at Tea Tree Gully, or which impacts against the supply of rear view mirrors from companies based in the southern suburbs of Adelaide or Castaloy producing mag wheels to be sold to Harley Davidson in the United States—or a range of other goods and services.

The fact is that overseas countries with whom we trade do not have a wholesale sales tax. So, everything that we produce automatically is priced at a disadvantage in the marketplace. If we do not access the marketplace, that impacts against jobs in this State in the manufacturing industry. So we will argue at the Premiers' Conference at the end of the week for the abolition of wholesale sales tax.

The other matter involves payroll tax, which is an impost, a tax for the privilege of paying someone else a wage. We will be consistent with our argument which we have applied for a considerable number of years—the number of which escapes me now. Simply speaking, we have argued against payroll tax which is the largest revenue—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition with his inane—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will come to order.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will not ignore the Chair.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Do you have a policy yet? Just come out with a policy on something.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will not provoke the Leader of the Opposition either.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition during Question Time in Parliament this year has not put forward one positive policy alternative. He is a vacuum as far as having a policy on any issue of importance but one: he says, 'No', and that he will block. He has no policy option other than that. What we are intent on achieving is reform of the taxation system in this country to get a fairer deal and, in doing so, more investment and, therefore, greater job certainty and security.

STATE TAXES

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Premier.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Mawson electorate, wine industry. Will the Premier give the House any indication of what the Commonwealth is likely to offer the States when Premiers meet in Canberra on Thursday and Friday of this week? State and Territory leaders meet in Canberra tomorrow ahead of the Premiers' Conference on Friday. I understand that high on the agenda will be the States' response to the Commonwealth offer on the issue of health and foregone revenue raised by liquor and tobacco as a result of last year's High Court decision.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The State has received the Commonwealth's offer document for financial arrangements for the ensuing year. We are undertaking detailed assessment of the Commonwealth offer, and I hope that will be available late this afternoon or this evening. Effectively, the States are operating with one hand tied behind their back. I think I indicated to the House before, but it is worth reinforcing the point, that the High Court case of *Ha and Hammond v New South Wales* last year removed the right of the States to traditional revenue measures such as income from excise on tobacco, alcohol and petrol. That has put a significant hole in the revenues of the States, and all States are in the same position.

Based on the High Court decision, the Commonwealth indicated to the States last year that it would put in place section 90 safety net arrangements to ensure that no State budget was disadvantaged as a result of the High Court decision.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The reality is that, despite that commitment and offer from the Commonwealth on the excise on tobacco, alcohol and petrol, South Australia will be some \$50 million short this financial year. Despite the commitment of the Commonwealth, without warning, we have had to manage our budget with \$50 million worth of revenue being plucked out without notice.

When we attend the meeting on Friday, the Premiers will be asking the Commonwealth what it will do and what steps and measures it will put in place to ensure that that commitment to the States is honoured and that the \$50 million black hole that has been provided to us, courtesy of the High Court decision, is corrected in subsequent years. We will be certainly fighting for reimbursement to the State of that \$50 million black hole.

In addition, we have already canvassed, and the Minister for Human Services has canvassed, the need for the Medicare agreement which will operate from 1 July next to ensure that there is a substantial increase in the allocation of funding to the States to maintain essential services such as health. To repeat that which the Minister advised the House yesterday, last financial year we put an additional \$77 million into the health system compared with the Commonwealth's \$13 million extra into the health system despite the fact we are seeing a significant—and I think the figure was 7 per cent—contraction of private health insurance in South Australia. They are the sorts of imposts that are being picked up by State Governments around Australia in the provision of essential services for South Australians and people in other States which the Commonwealth to date has ignored. That

will be a key focus of the Premiers' loan council meeting on Thursday and Friday.

Also on the agenda will be, as was mentioned in response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, fundamental taxation reform. I notice that only today we have an ally for fundamental taxation reform in none other than SACOS. What did it say today? SACOS has said:

The current tax system is all over the place. It is a dog's breakfast. There is widespread avoidance, lack of clarity, pure contradictions in areas like the wholesale sales tax. There clearly is a need for reform.

SACOS is calling for reform of the taxation system. There must be and there will be fundamental reform in the taxation system. The only person who does not want taxation reform is the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party in South Australia because they have not thought through the process. They do not know what they believe in, let alone what they want to achieve. We do know, and it is a better deal for South Australia and a better deal for South Australians. It is about ensuring that we get better investment in this State.

I draw attention to media reports today in the *Australian* which indicate that we are out-performing in the last period, December to December I think it was, every other State in Australia in new private sector capital investment. What does private sector capital investment mean in the long run? It means more jobs. Whilst there is a lag time between investment decisions, its application on the ground and the employment of people, clearly we have turned around in terms of remarketing South Australia to get private sector new investment.

So, we will be supporting a broad-based tax mix that eliminates wholesale sales tax, looks at the opportunity to eliminate FID and BAD, and puts in place fundamental taxation reform, and we have an ally in no less than SACOS to achieve that objective.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's answer to my previous question, in which he would not guarantee exemptions from a goods and services tax for essential goods and services, does the Premier's GST proposal that he will be putting to the Premiers' Conference on Friday contain any measures to compensate battlers for the increased cost of clothes, shoes, power, gas, water, education, petrol and trips to the doctor under a GST, or is this Government's new support for a GST both a policy-free zone as well as an honesty-free zone for South Australians, who listened to what the Premier said before the election?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is now starting to drift into comment.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Once again, the Leader of the Opposition wants to be selective in approaching this issue. It is an important issue, and yet the Leader of the Opposition is simply engaging in one-upmanship and political point scoring without putting on the agenda, putting on the table or explaining to South Australians the Labor Party's policy in South Australia. It is a vacuum, and empty vessels make the most noise. I understand when the member for Kaurna sits there silently looking down on the front bench—as well he might—as the Leader in waiting, looking at the policy-free zone of the Labor Party. It is getting no credibility in the broader community, but it adopts a policy of opposing

everything and simply saying 'No' without the fortitude to put an alternative policy option on the table.

We will be achieving a tax mix for South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition overlooks the fact that the Federal Government is committed to reductions in income tax imposts. He overlooks that and is selective in considering the impact on individuals, disposable income, standard of living and security for the future. He does not want to consider the whole package and look at how people will be advantaged in a restructuring of the taxation system by reducing the income tax impost on individuals, small and medium businesses and companies in Australia. That is what a fundamental reform of the taxation system is. It is not the reform of bits of it in isolation, as the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe, but a package of measures to bring about substantial improvement for individuals in our economy.

ASIAN ECONOMY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Premier comment on the impact on this State of the financial crisis in Asia and the strategies being adopted in response? The Leader of the Opposition released an economic discussion paper recently in which he claimed that the Asian situation was being used as a scapegoat.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, this is a cobbled-together amalgam of opinions that were put out by the Leader of the Opposition. Let us just put it in its appropriate context. The Asian financial crisis will have some impact in South Australia. The reason for our taking measures and maintaining effort in Asia is to indicate, as did the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development yesterday, that we do not treat the Asian marketplace as a fair weather friend and that we want to build long-term, meaningful business and trade relationships with Asia that will assist us in the longer term. That means staying in the tough times as well as the good times, and South Australia will maintain its effort in the Asian marketplace.

Some of the facts of the matter are that in the most recent financial year more than 40 per cent of this State's merchandise exports, worth about \$2 billion, went to East Asia. Five of our top eight export destinations are in that region. Most overseas students studying in South Australia come from East Asia, and international students are worth about \$200 million annually to this State's economy. Interestingly, despite the downturn in the Asian marketplace, student interest in South Australia has in fact increased.

That is a very encouraging sign and I put to you that, with the cost of European education and the currency movement in most of the East Asian countries and the US, coming to Australia is a more economic proposition and this is being reflected in the number of students coming here. About 20 per cent of our international tourist arrivals in South Australia are from Asia and tourism generates about \$1 billion in export earnings for the State annually. About one-fifth of the stock of foreign investment in Australia is from East Asia.

It is important to recognise that East Asia is a key component of our economy now and in the future. The world's consumer market is in the East Asian region. Despite their financial difficulties, half the world's population is resident within five hours flying time from Hong Kong. We are on the borders of the mass consumer markets of the world. Therein lie great opportunities for South Australia, provided we target them properly and effectively. Recently

the Deputy Premier and Government officers held here a briefing for companies doing business in the Asian marketplace to give timely advice and assistance and to facilitate those companies with contracts that they currently have in place to ensure they are protected.

The State's offices in Asia have been asked to intensify their reporting, the purpose being to keep regular contact through Austrade and Commonwealth agencies with a view to passing that information onto South Australian based companies. We are stepping up our efforts to attract investment and, with Asia looking riskier to some, investment diversion to competitor destinations such as South Australia can be brought about. Therein lies an opportunity for us as a result of the circumstances in Asia.

As I mentioned, we are also maintaining our contacts in Asia. We must show decision makers that we have that long-term commitment to the marketplace and, at the same time, we are looking to develop alternative markets. Even prior to recent events, there were major and rapidly growing non-Asian markets for the State that were being successfully targeted. South Australia's global exports have grown by 31 per cent in the past two fiscal years, a bigger increase than in any two-year period since 1988. For a number of years markets in Asia have been our fastest growing. The performance is a tribute to this State's entrepreneurs and shows what they can achieve with the removal of the dead hand that we saw in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This is interesting. In the most recent years, for example—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You can see the seat of power is that one over there, where the member for Kaurina sits. One by one in Question Time they all gravitate to talk to the member for Kaurina, Mr Hill. He must really enjoy the attention he is getting.

Further, 193 companies took part in trade missions organised by the Government, directly generating more than \$30 million of exports. That is our focus. That is important for the State and we will continue to do that.

FIREARMS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier stand by his commitments made at the weekend that the State's gun laws will not be watered down and that firearms laws will not be amended? The Premier was reported on the front page of the *Sunday Mail* under the heading 'Olsen pledge: gun laws stay'. Yesterday, the Premier told the Liberal Party room that this story was incorrect and that he had been misquoted. Who is telling the truth about gun laws—you or the *Sunday Mail*?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, Mike, you've got it wrong yet again. I did not say that yesterday to the Party room. My position in relation to achieving uniform gun laws in Australia, consistent with the Prime Minister's quest, is unchanged.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You're wrong.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises, following his discussions with

Mr Bill Gates, the head of Microsoft, outline possible IT investment opportunities for South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am not surprised at the mirth on the benches opposite, because this has the potential to be a major economic development opportunity for South Australia. Of course, the Labor Party Opposition, looking at its own prospects, clearly does not want that for South Australia whereas the Government does. There were a number of opportunities for me to discuss the information economy with Mr Gates, both at a meeting with State Premiers and IT Ministers on Monday evening, and at a private meeting yesterday. In particular, I talked about the opportunities for an electronic commerce initiative, recognising that electronic commerce will be the way of the future and, indeed, if the South Australian economy can be locked into and turned onto the opportunities for electronic commerce, we have the potential to be Australian and world leaders and to generate lots of opportunities for our business in this region.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the Premier notes, the *Melbourne Age* identified those. Those members who have not read the *Melbourne Age* ought to have a look at it, particularly an article which Mr Gates wrote and which lauds the efforts of South Australia. I also spoke with him about a Microsoft computing platform for Government to enable this Government to be more efficient, both internally and in its interrelations with the citizens of South Australia. The most exciting aspect was potentially to explore the opportunities for a major world leading test bed site for South Australia in one of the initiatives in which Microsoft is particularly skilled, because Adelaide is approximately the right size for that. A number of the infrastructure components are already present, and we certainly have the will of the Government to foster this initiative.

It is particularly interesting to note that, since public comment was made about this matter yesterday, we have had a number of South Australian firms ringing us indicating their interest in the process, asking, 'How can we make this happen in South Australia?' The firms know the value of this for the South Australian economy: it is just a pity that the Labor Opposition does not. The IT area offers enormous opportunities for young people, with a diverse range of career opportunities staring them in the face. Clearly, we have made initiatives as a Government to build closer links between the universities and other institutions of higher learning and information technology industries, because there is a world-wide shortage of skilled information technology workers. This Government aims to fill that void and, in so doing, to produce opportunities for young South Australians to take up advantages offered by the potential collaboration with Microsoft and a number of other South Australian companies.

Clearly, we have opportunities to push the lure of the South Australian lifestyle, our technology expertise and so on to continue to get companies such as Microsoft, EDS, Fujitsu, Motorola, AAPT, etc., and that certainly will stimulate a number of smaller start-up companies in the immediate information technology area, software companies, multimedia companies, and so on. Of course, that will all help to dovetail into the exciting initiative of the Internet data centre, which was opened about two months ago. It is a collaboration between Kerry Packer, Microsoft and EDS—three of the major companies in Australia. The outcome of

the meeting was particularly optimistic in a number of areas but, as I indicated, if we are able to nail the initiative which would see Microsoft trialing a number of things in what it regards as the future of information technology, the opportunities are limitless.

DAVID JONES BUILDING

Mr HILL (Kaurana): My question is directed to the Acting Minister for Environment and Heritage. When did the Minister become aware that an application had been lodged with the Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs to heritage list the David Jones building in Rundle Mall, and why has it taken five weeks for that information to be conveyed to the management of David Jones? Radio station 5AA today carried a news report that David Jones management found out on Friday last week that an application to heritage list their Rundle Mall store had been made some five weeks ago. The management was reported to be furious as it will now have to notify some 36 companies which have expressed interest in purchasing the site, thus slowing down its development.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I have been advised that any member of the public is entitled to nominate any building for heritage listing. The nomination (and this was an independent nomination) is then independently assessed by the State Heritage Authority. The Minister for Environment and Heritage is not involved in this initial process as it must be an independent assessment under the Act. The Minister has advised me that she cannot and will not preempt any decision. At this point in time, there is no indication as to whether or not the authority will accept or reject the nomination. It is expected that the nomination process will be completed by mid-April.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As I made very clear, it is an independent assessment in which the Minister has no opportunity to get involved.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Administrative and Information Services further inform the House of the latest developments in the IT industry in South Australia? As the Minister indicated, the State's IT industry was the subject of a major feature in the *Melbourne Age* newspaper yesterday, highlighting that Adelaide has arguably the highest concentration of IT innovation of any Australian city within its CBD.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the honourable member for her question. She certainly is one of the more IT literate members of the Parliament and I am aware of her continuing interest in this important area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: There are other members around me championing the cause also, and it is terrific to see. I only wish that same championing of the cause came from the other side of the Chamber as well. It is fair to say that not everyone in this Chamber would agree with everything that is said or done in Victoria, particularly when it relates to football or motor racing but, to give credit where credit is due, the Information Technology supplement in the *Melbourne Age* is an extremely good supplement. It is a very good read for any member or any person who has even a passing interest in information technology.

That particular supplement appraised the industry situation in South Australia and gave South Australia a glowing thumbs up, particularly with respect to the contractual direction this Government has taken and the way in which it has awarded its contracts for Government business and used those contracts as an avenue to encourage significant players in the information technology industry to locate here in South Australia. This is a deserved recognition for the industry in this State, for the hard work it has undertaken in establishing a stronger presence, in growing to a greater strength, in delivering services and helping Adelaide become recognised as an information technology hub. These things could not have come about if it were not for the IT 2000 Vision pioneered by the now Minister for Human Services in this State, and also if it were not for the way in which Government contracts have been awarded.

I think it is relevant to point to the way in which IT leaders have reflected on the direction the industry is now taking. For example, EDS's Alan Bradshaw, who is Project Manager for the new Internet data centre that the Minister for Government Enterprises has just mentioned, highlights the benefits of Adelaide's position as a spur off the Sydney to Melbourne Telecom traffic route. He says that it is an ideal choice for the recently announced Nine MSN data centre site because it can feed demand for data to the two major population centres without the Hume Highway congestion.

Mr Frank Arrigo, the Technical Director of Nine MSN, says that another factor that lured MSN to Adelaide was the Advanced Windows, NT-based WEB hosting services at Ngapartji. He says that Microsoft has been impressed by Ngapartji's work to the extent that it has sent half a dozen separate technical teams from the United States to study its implementation.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member opposite continues to interject. He interjected before that Bill Gates might have needed to find a map of Australia to find South Australia on it. For the education and benefit of the honourable member, the data centre that has been established means that Microsoft has a presence now in Seattle, London, Tokyo and Adelaide. I am sure that Bill Gates does not need a map to find Adelaide. He knows well where it is and he has invested his money wisely. The honourable member might care to read and educate himself so that he can talk with knowledge rather than interject as a rabble across the Chamber.

To continue, Ngapartji can be particularly proud of the record that it has achieved. It is also worth highlighting what other companies have said about our record. The Managing Director of DMr Group Australia, Alan Baxter, says that DMr chose Adelaide for its operations because it has a strong local IT skills base, provided by excellent tertiary education and by the existing industry. Equally important is that the establishment and maintenance costs of businesses in Adelaide are 15 to 20 per cent less than in the Eastern States. All the companies I have mentioned have been lured here not only through those benefits but through the way in which Government has awarded its information technology contracts. I look forward to the Opposition's publicly acknowledging and lauding the benefits that this has brought to South Australia.

ADELAIDE OVAL ACCIDENT

Ms KEY (Hanson): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Following the collapse of an Adelaide Oval lighting tower yesterday, can the Minister now guarantee the safety of all patrons attending tonight's concert and future Rams and SANFL games at Adelaide Oval, and will the Government secure agreement from Bob Boorman, from Baulderstone Hornibrook, for a full safety audit involving the Institute of Engineers as well as the Government's Safety Inspectorate of the design, engineering and construction of a retractable lighting system at Adelaide Oval? Bob Boorman is quoted today on the radio as saying that he does not know what caused the problem yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister, it is difficult for the Chair to give a ruling on comment when those on my right shout to such an extent that they drown out the person asking the question. The Minister for Government Enterprises.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As this is a serious matter, I am surprised that the honourable member was laughing when she asked the question. We are expecting the results of an independent report in the near future. I have been briefed informally on that and, as soon as the results are available, we will be making them public.

HOSPITALS, PUBLIC

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Why does the Health Commission insist that the public hospital system in South Australia be subsidised by the WorkCover Corporation and, through that subsidy, work against further employment in this State? An employer in my electorate has raised a matter in which an account was furnished to him for an amount of \$907 from his local hospital following a visit by one of his employees who suspected they may have been bitten by a red-back spider. This visit resulted in a two-hour stay in the hospital under observation, which confirmed that no treatment was necessary. Subsequent to that story in the *Advertiser* on 9 March the CEO of WorkCover Corporation, Mr Keith Brown, wrote a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* stating:

The South Australian Health Commission has instructed all public hospitals to charge patients presenting with what appears to be an injury compensatable under the workers rehabilitation and compensation scheme at the present gazetted flat rate fee. We have no option other than to pay this fee where a claim is made, even though we know that it is more than is being charged to private patients.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, I am aware of the case raised by the honourable member as I read about it in the *Sunday Mail* or the *Advertiser*. The issue has also been raised by one or two other people. I make very clear to the honourable member that there is no subsidisation of the public hospital system in South Australia by WorkCover or any other patient who goes in as a claimant. I make that clear because a number of people have tried to suggest that at various times but it is not the case at all. I know that my former colleague would uphold that position very strongly indeed as I have discussed the issue with him on several occasions. There are certain aspects here that only the doctor who treated the patient could answer, and some of those matters should be taken up with the doctor: for example, why was the person apparently admitted as an inpatient rather than as an outpatient? I invite him to do that because he, through the employer concerned, who would have access to that

doctor because of the WorkCover claim, can check on that sort of information.

I point out to the House, as this matter has been raised by a number of members, that fees for WorkCover claims in a public hospital come under the diagnostic related group fee structure, which as a formal regulation of Cabinet goes through the Parliament. There is a legitimate question to be raised as to whether there should be a review for part-day admissions or short-stay admissions into accident and emergency departments. I am willing to review that. The matter was raised by at least two other members of this House late last year. I have already asked the Health Commission to specifically review the DRG as it relates to a part-day admission in intensive care or emergency and accident departments of a public hospital. Otherwise, to get a satisfactory answer here, the honourable member needs to talk to the doctor and, in terms of the relationship or size of the review for such a short stay in hospital, I will come back to him with an answer.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Minister for Employment explain her welcoming of the ABS labour force figures for February 1998 as 'positive' given that they show an increase in youth unemployment to 34.4 per cent and a loss of 8 100 full-time jobs—the equivalent of losing all of GMH, Bridgestone and John Martin's workers?

The Hon. J. HALL: I want to talk about the employment figures in South Australia, because I am concerned about the misinterpretation that is put on these figures, particularly by the former Deputy Leader. Before I tell the House what the Government is doing to create more employment in this State, I want to take the opportunity to say what it will not do. One of the things that it will not do is to lose over \$3 billion of taxpayers' money. The former Deputy Leader might be interested to know that that action helped about 30 000 South Australians to lose their job—and I have not noticed the former Deputy Leader apologising at any stage for that. This Government is not and never will be as irresponsible as the Labor Party, which allowed unemployment in South Australia to climb to almost 12.5 per cent when it was in office in 1992.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members are wasting their own Question Time.

HEALTH PLUS

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House of any benefits arising from the recent Health Plus trials which will assist South Australians with chronic illnesses?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Health Plus is one of the most exciting initiatives taking place in South Australia as far as health care is concerned. I give full credit to my predecessor sitting beside me who initiated Health Plus in this State and obtained the support of the Federal Government to back Health Plus in this State to a far greater extent on size basis than any other State of Australia. In fact, we are getting more money from Health Plus than any other State—many millions of dollars more than most States of Australia including the larger States.

Health Plus links chronically ill patients closely with the care provided by a general practitioner. About 4 700 volunteers will take part in the trial of Health Plus, as well as

400 general practitioners, who will develop a care plan with each patient who has a chronic illness. One of the key features of someone with a chronic illness is that, invariably, they go from one health provider to another: it might be the general practitioner today and a specialist tomorrow, or a nursing service the day after, or a hospital admission the day after that.

When one looks at the cost of health care, it is people with chronic illnesses (such as, diabetes, asthma, chronic heart disease and chronic respiratory disorders) who cost the most in terms of dollars. Under this initiative, four specific programs will be set up in South Australia: the first will be in the southern metropolitan area and will involve aged care and those with respiratory problems, chronic pain, anxiety and depression; the second will be in the western metropolitan region and will involve people with respiratory problems and diabetes; the third will be in the central State-wide area for people with heart conditions; and the fourth will be in the Eyre Peninsula region for people with diabetes and chronic and complex health needs.

The important thing is that, as a result of this health care plan, people with chronic disabilities will have a better understanding of their illness, the factors that contribute to an acute problem which may involve a hospital admission, and the type of treatment they should have. The information that they have been given and their care plan will be made available to all other health providers who work with that patient. So, for the first time there will be a level of coordination, integration and exchange of information that has not been available in terms of health care in Australia.

Members will see why this is an exciting initiative. We are dealing with a group of people who make the biggest demands on the health system in terms of hospital care (based on days). We think that these people will end up receiving far better treatment and will have a far healthier lifestyle. It is an important initiative. There are still some vacancies: 3 000 people have volunteered so far, and we are looking for 4 700. If members of Parliament or the public wish to put forward volunteers for the trial, we welcome that as part of this exciting initiative for Health Plus in South Australia.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Given the Minister for Employment's answer to my first question, does she believe that her own Treasurer was wrong when on 12 March he said:

The Government's strategy at this stage does not seem to have the runs on the board in terms of significantly reducing the unemployment rate in South Australia.

The Hon. J. HALL: I again remind the former Deputy Leader—and I am pleased to inform the House—that, contrary to the perceptions that are often painted by the Labor Party and others, about 90 per cent of young South Australians are actively participating in employment or training. That means that the majority of the remainder are genuinely seeking full-time employment in this State. The member for Ross Smith ought to remember some of those facts.

REGENCY INSTITUTE OF TAFE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training advise the House on details of the additional teaching and learning accommodation to be provided at the Regency Institute of TAFE and the details of

the contract for the international restaurant management course that he signed last week at the institute?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: This Government is strongly committed to training. It recognises that training is an essential component for our young people in the economic growth and prosperity of South Australia and to enable those young people to gain employment. I am pleased to announce that funding of \$1.5 million will be spent on the recreation hall at the Regency Institute of TAFE to convert it into a conference centre, additional classrooms and areas which will be able to host both national and international conferences. Regency TAFE is renowned in Australia. Last year, it won the Training Provider of the Year award in an Australia-wide competition. This demonstrates our increasing confidence in providing training for young people, not only Australian young people but others from all over the world.

In addition to the \$1.5 million, as the member for Hartley said, last week I signed a contract with Monsieur André Contreau, the President of La Cordon Bleu, for an 18-month postgraduate course in restaurant management. In Adelaide, 100 students will undertake this course. The first intake will commence on 7 July, and students will come from all over the world—from Cordon Bleu courses in New York, London, Paris, and other parts of Europe—to study at the Regency Institute of TAFE in South Australia. This is the only restaurant management course run by La Cordon Bleu in the world, and it is a considerable coup for South Australia.

The benefits for South Australia will come not only from those students who live here for the duration of their course but from their parents who visit, and when those students complete their course they will go back to their country and tell others what a wonderful place is Adelaide South Australia. It reaffirms that the Regency Institute is amongst the world's best. Here we have La Cordon Bleu recognising that the Regency Institute in South Australia provides training commensurate with anywhere else in the world. I recognise the input of the staff, in particular, in negotiating the contract. It is a win for South Australia, and it will put South Australia and the Regency Institute on the map world-wide.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Is the Minister for Employment aware that a drop in the participation rate is the key indicator of a loss of confidence in the jobs market and that South Australia's participation rate fell to its lowest point in a decade last month? According to ABS data, if South Australia's participation rate had not fallen last month, the unemployment rate in this State would now be 10.5 per cent and, if South Australia's participation rate matched the national rate, our unemployment rate would be 13.5 per cent.

The Hon. J. HALL: The member for Ross Smith is well aware that the participation rate in South Australia over the past two decades has not varied between 58 per cent and 62 per cent.

HONEYMOON URANIUM PROJECT

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Minister for Natural Resources assure the House that environmental factors were thoroughly investigated before approval was granted for the Honeymoon uranium project?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I can confirm that this week I have signed off the declaration of environmental factors for the Honeymoon project, which is in the Lake Frome region

in the north of South Australia. This means that Southern Cross will be able to commence trials using the *in situ* leaching method. There is no doubt that Honeymoon will supply significant benefits to South Australia. Southern Cross will employ between 40 and 50 people directly at Honeymoon, if the project proves to be a viable commercial operation and passes all the tests, and indirect jobs will employ a further 150 people. If the trial is a success, the anticipated cost of erecting a commercial plant is in excess of \$20 million and, as the member would know from similar projects, much of that money will spin off into the local economy with jobs, materials and wages for contractors. The value of the export production which could come from this mine could be as high as \$40 million per year, similar to that estimated for the Beverley uranium mine if that gets the go-ahead after the trial.

Through royalties, the State Government will receive up to \$1 million *per annum* subject to the uranium price and the efficiency of production. It needs to be remembered that these trials will allow Southern Cross and the Government to gain valuable data for the environmental impact statement, which is a requirement under both State and Federal legislation; and, of course, the EIS process allows for full public consultation.

Projects such as those involving uranium are subject to a wide range of stringent State and Commonwealth Acts and codes of practice as well as specific conditions placed on each of the projects to ensure that best practices are maintained for environmental safety. State Government agencies monitor all aspects of the project to ensure that they comply with the legislative requirements. The full project will be allowed to proceed only if this Government is confident that the environmental impact will be as minimal as possible, and *in situ* leaching was developed with this purpose in mind.

I have decided, after consultation with Southern Cross, to release publicly the declaration of environmental factors in an effort to assure the public that, despite anti-uranium activists' repeated criticism, activities at Honeymoon, like Beverley, are considered safe and environmentally responsible. The Conservation Foundation, in particular, has falsely claimed that these projects are shrouded in secrecy. The truth is that the Government has met every request for information from both the foundation and the media. Whenever the foundation has been given information about the project, it has deliberately taken extracts totally out of context as the basis for scare campaigns in the media.

The foundation has even stooped to the level of creating division in local communities in the Far North by spreading misinformation about the trial. Having lost the bigger debate on uranium, the foundation is rapidly losing credibility and is becoming a group of extremists who will bend facts to suit their own needs and use other groups without compassion. The foundation's agenda also ignores the whole greenhouse debate and the global move to nuclear power as one alternative to burning fossil fuels.

We have nothing to hide in the process at either Beverley or Honeymoon. Therefore, the Government has decided to release all correspondence pertaining to the declaration of environmental factors for both the Honeymoon and Beverley projects to ensure that there is nothing secret. We are releasing all documents to enable the public and the media to see for themselves the thorough investigation which preceded these trials, and I call on the Conservation Foundation to stop bending the truth and work with the rest of the community to ensure that we have sustainable development in South Australia.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Does the Minister for Employment's departmental briefing on the ABS employment and unemployment figures for February agree with the assessment by the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Youth Affairs that there is a 'general lack of confidence in the State's job market' and, if not, on what grounds? The February report by DEEYA states:

In South Australia, total employment fell for the fifth consecutive month while the State's number of jobless rose for the sixth month in succession. The February trend of unemployment (71 900 persons) is the highest level in South Australia in the past three years. A further decline in the South Australian participation rate emphasises the general lack of confidence that currently exists in the South Australian jobs market.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

The Hon. J. HALL: I find the breathtaking hypocrisy of the member for Ross Smith hard to take. I think it might be interesting if we just pursued the Labor Party's record. It is generally considered—

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing Order 98 requires the Minister to answer the substance of the question. The question directly asks: do the Minister's briefing notes correspond with that of the Commonwealth Department of Education and Employment with respect to employment levels in this State?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, but I remind members of Standing Order 98 which provides:

In answering a question, Ministers should reply to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.

That Standing Order is fairly specific, but it does allow the Minister to provide facts and information to the House.

The Hon. J. HALL: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will come to order.

The Hon. J. HALL: I will share with the House some of the material that the Labor Party is not keen to hear. The sum of \$1 million is generally thought to equate to 20 jobs and it is meant to be a conservative estimate. I acknowledge that this figure varies from industry sector to industry sector but, as the Premier and others have reminded us over some weeks now, we are still paying \$2 million interest a day on the debt incurred by the Labor Party. It might be useful to do a calculation on just what that means. If you take 365 days at \$2 million a day, guess what? That equates to 40 jobs per day, which is approximately 14 000 jobs per year. If you multiply that over four years, that is more than 50 000 jobs that the Labor Party has cost us.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister has completed her reply.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Employment advise the House of the progress being made by the Government to establish a small business training incentive program?

The Hon. J. HALL: As part of our employment policy, which was released during the State election campaign, the Government promised to provide financial incentives of up to \$4 000 to encourage small businesses in South Australia

to take on an additional 1 000 trainees or apprentices between the ages of 15 and 24. As part of that package, nearly \$13 million in employment initiatives has been approved by Cabinet and \$4.2 million for the establishment of the small business employment incentive scheme, and this took place in December last year. Trainees or apprentices must be new or additional staff, and the small business must also commit to a full contract of training and to employ the trainee or apprentice for at least 12 months after their training has been completed.

It is one of the success story employment programs of this Government, and it is important to note that 40 per cent of the grants are being targeted to regional South Australia. The grants are made in addition to all other grants for training subsidies offered by the Federal Government, and the Government is providing not just financial assistance but also practical support to those small businesses that are participating in the program. The Government began taking expressions of interest in January, and I am delighted to inform the House, and in particular the member for Goyder, that by 23 February the register for expressions of interest for both the regional and metropolitan targets was filled. Employment SA is also maintaining a reserve list of businesses that are interested in the proposal and incentives in the future. So, more than 1 000 expressions of interest in taking on new trainees and apprentices took place in less than two months. I think that this is an outstanding, successful initiative of this Government.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the sixth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: I bring up the seventh report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I lay on the table the ministerial statement made earlier today by the Treasurer in another place.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I refer today to a matter that is rather important to my constituents, particularly in the Globe Derby and Bolivar regions, namely, the issue of mosquitoes. I have brought up this matter in this House several times over the past few seasons and each time it has been met with either merriment or ridicule on the part of the Liberal Government. It is now getting to the stage within my electorate where the public health nuisance and irritation of these mosquitoes is making life unbearable for my constituents and for the horses

and other livestock in the region. It is beyond a joke and the Government can no longer not take any action.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms WHITE: If the Deputy Premier is suggesting that his Government did create the problem, I would ask him how he will solve it. This has gone beyond a joke. Not only are the mosquitos a nuisance but also they are trapped in this area in hordes—in their thousands. The number of mosquitos in the area is ten times the usual quantity, and they are the species of mosquito that can carry Ross River virus. In fact, over the past 10 years there have been several cases of Ross River virus in that region. The area contains a particularly potent mix of poultry, horses, dogs, pets, salt marshes, wetlands and humans, and these are the circumstances in the Bolivar and Globe Derby area where a serious public health issue is developing. I have raised this matter several times, but the former Health Minister laughed in the House when I did so. The current Health Minister says he will do something about it, but he is not solving the problem. What is called for is a comprehensive eradication program for mosquitoes.

A few weeks ago I wrote to the Health Minister asking him to accept a delegation of residents to let him know how serious this problem is to them. The Minister's office continually, even today, tells me that the Minister cannot give me an answer on this. All the Minister has done is call a meeting of the Torrens and Environs Mosquito Control Committee that meets and has been meeting regularly for the past number of years. I understand from my sources that what has come out of that meeting is indecision yet again, and the Minister will still not approve an effective eradication program. It has been done in Queensland and Western Australia for years. In Queensland they spray and fog 10 times a year. The current Minister's answer to my public calls and my raising this issue of public health for my constituents is to do one aerial spray. What is called for is a continuous adulticide-larvicide program that comprehensively treats the mosquito situation and brings it under control.

I have explained the potent mix of animals, humans and poultry in the area. Even if the virus is not currently in the area, there are hundreds of horses in those suburbs and they travel regularly around the State: they only have to pick up the virus somewhere else and it will be right throughout the area. Several reported cases have been documented by the Health Commission in those suburbs over the past 10 years. The virus potential is there, still the Minister refuses to act; still the Minister and the council sit on their hands and nothing is being done. I call on the Minister today to accept a delegation from local residents and hear from them, and to get off his hands and fix the problem. What is so hard? Are we saying that in this State we cannot fix a mosquito problem? People fix it in other States. They have the commitment to look after their residents; why is this Liberal Government deciding—

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

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to talk on behalf of child-care centres and child-care workers. In doing so, I remind the House that I have an interest in child-care centres through a family child-care business. It seems that, if I do not get up in the House and remind members about child-care needs, no-one else will.

First, we need to understand the nature of child-care structures in this State. They consist of long day care centres, which are licensed and accredited and which now, with the

removal of subsidies to the community base sector, receive no funding; kindergartens, which are Government funded but which are not licensed or accredited; family day care, which is not licensed or accredited; and other forms of care, including preschools in private schools and various forms of child care in gymnasiums, bowling clubs and the like. On top of that is informal care, which is totally beyond the arm of any sort of quality control. We have outside school hours care, which occurs in either schools, outside school hours services or long day care centres. Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the clock.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The problem has been fixed.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: We have some problems with child care in Australia and I do not need to tell members that. Some services are not means tested. Some funding is not getting to children or families but is being consumed by the system. There has been a lack of planning and there is a degree of over-regulation and a number of restrictive trade practices. The key to all this is affordability, affordability and affordability. To thank for most of this we have the previous Federal and Labor Governments which established the structures that we live with today. There is a need for restructuring and that is occurring. Subsidies generally are out and payments to parents and families generally are in as a means of empowering families.

However, I want to talk about child-care workers this afternoon, because members may not realise how hard it is for child-care workers, first, to become qualified and, secondly, to find gainful employment. They must go through a couple of years of full-time TAFE or university training. They are extremely hard working people who get out there and do their best on behalf of the children of Australia. They work extremely hard over long hours, including 38-hour weeks with perhaps only two hours for programming whereas the rest of the time they are hard at it. This makes an interesting comparison with other professions, such as teaching, where often more time is provided for programming.

I also want to talk about a level playing field. The cutting of subsidies to the community based child-care sector by the Federal Government was the right decision. For too many years those subsidies had failed to find their way to children and families in need. The ultimate test of whether or not those subsidies were being adequately used was simply that private child-care centres were able to provide accredited and licensed services of equal or better standard more affordably than the community based services that were subsidised. Where did the money go? It went on over staffing, inefficient practices and poor management, and I might talk about that later during debate on the member for Taylor's motion on child care.

Community based child care now has the challenge ahead of it to become efficient or to be driven out of business. Those who are successful in becoming efficient will succeed and should be congratulated for doing so. Jobs are being lost in the community based sector to backyard care, and I would like to make particular mention of what the Allied Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union is doing about this—or not doing, to be more specific. I understand that the union has more than 500 members in child-care centres. What is it doing to stop this flow of business to the backyard sector? Absolutely nothing.

So, award workers who are in the union and who have undertaken training are losing their jobs to backyard operators who are not in the union and who have no training. What

does the union care about it? Absolutely nothing. The resounding message to union members in child care is to get out of the union because it is not doing anything on their behalf.

The other lie I wish to dispel is that fees have gone up exponentially in child care. That is not true. Talk of fees being up to \$200 a week in child-care centres is totally wrong. Anyone who wants to ring around their electorate and check with private child-care centres will find that not only have fees not gone up but in some cases they have gone down and aggregate \$150 to \$160 a week. It is a total misconception to convince families otherwise.

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

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am pleased to follow the member for Waite, because he referred to child-care changes by the Federal Liberal Government and I will cite today one example where those changes have caused much anxiety, hardship and suffering. I refer particularly to those adolescents and young children with special needs who have previously enjoyed the vacation care program run at Minda Incorporated. There have been two significant changes in the past year or so: first, the Federal changes to child-care funding and, secondly, the change in focus of Minda itself whereby the Minda school operation has been moved to Hamilton Secondary College. This creates a dilemma for those young people with special needs in the southern suburbs who have been looked after during the day at a vacation care service run on the Minda premises. That service is under threat. I have tried to get the most up to date information and I have received no assurance that the program will continue.

This situation needs to be sorted out. It staggered me when I learned that the issue of vacation care for these students has been tossed back and forth between health and education services over the years. I am glad that in South Australia we now have a specific portfolio to look after disabilities, but I am afraid that the Hon. Mr Lawson, the Minister responsible for that portfolio, when he attended a meeting at the St Anne's Special School recently, was able to offer only the commitment that the South Australian Government would maintain its current commitment to that vacation care program. In other words, without Commonwealth commitment of an equal magnitude, the service will go completely.

That means that for a number of families—about 15 families attended the meeting to which I referred—their employment will be threatened. Let us face it, in families where there are children with severe disabilities—often mental disabilities and the like—there are extra expenses involved, no matter which way you look at it, such as medications and special equipment to transport people. Even with the various forms of Government funding, extra expenses are involved in bringing up children in a family such as that and there is all the more need for parents to go out and get employment if they possibly can. But they cannot do that if their children who attend school—and they can attend school until they are 20 years old—cannot get vacation care: there are several lengthy periods during the year when those parents have to go without employment. In many cases that means that they are going to have to give up their jobs and become more reliant on social welfare benefits. In the end this may be counterproductive.

All that is needed to fix the problem is a commitment of about \$50 000 a year. Unfortunately, at this stage the State

Government has not seen fit to ensure that the program will continue. Something needs to be done urgently. This matter was raised in Parliament last June and nothing has been done about it. I want to highlight that point: it was in June last year that this issue was raised in the Legislative Council. In a letter from the then Minister for Education and Children's Services of 27 June 1997 to one of the parents, it was clearly stated that the State Government and the Commonwealth Department for Health and Family Services were working on the problem. They have been talking about it and trying to negotiate something since at least June last year. It is staggering to think that the bureaucrats have not been able to get together and solve this problem.

I can tell this Parliament that the parents are very anxious, and this problem needs to be resolved as soon as possible, particularly given that the forthcoming school holidays may be the last school holidays during which these special students can enjoy vacation care of any kind.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I wish to address the issue of juvenile justice. At the outset, I would like to say that the overwhelming majority of our young people are fantastic, with fewer than 6 per cent getting into any significant trouble with the police. Members would know that I have always had a great passion for our young people, a passion that I had long before I was Minister for Youth and one that I will always have. I am concerned for young people and for their well-being, and I am concerned for their future. It is for that reason that I believe it is appropriate that we refine the current juvenile justice system. I would like to see built into the criminal law a greater focus on making young people accountable for their actions. I wrote to the Attorney recently about that matter, but he argued that the system already does that.

I would like to see the system tightened up along the same lines as the civil action undertaken by the City of Onkaparinga, which takes action against the child and not the parents. I have never supported action against the parents. You should always direct the attention to the offender and not to the parent or relative. Their approach is to threaten civil action against the young person who engages in vandalism, graffiti, and so on. That scheme has been incredibly successful to the point that out of 51 young offenders only one has re-offended. That should be enshrined very strongly in our criminal law and, most importantly, it should be followed up.

One of my concerns—and I know there is an element of this in our current system—is that what tends to happen is that a young person brought before the court or involved in some other aspect of the justice system might be asked to plant a tree or to do something like that as a punishment for having committed an act of vandalism. The problem with the current system is that there is too long a time between the commission of the offence and the actual punishment, and the punishment is often inappropriate. The policy used by the City of Onkaparinga—that you pay whatever you can afford to get the thing fixed, or you remove it, if it is graffiti—is a better way to go, and I would like to see that implemented in our system.

The police tell me that they have difficulty ascertaining the names and addresses of young people. The Attorney expresses a contrary view, but it should be made absolutely clear that the police have the right to ascertain the name and address of a young person suspected of committing an offence or acting in a way that warrants some preliminary inquiries by police. Police should also be able to accompany a young person

home to meet with parents where there are reasonable grounds to believe that that young person is at risk of engaging in anti-social or criminal behaviour. The intention of this is to allow police officers to provide informal counselling, guidance or a warning regarding the consequences of continuing that sort of behaviour, and the police should have special training to undertake this.

Many members would be aware of Senior Sergeant John Wallace, who for many years has been based at Hindley Street. As a police officer, in an informal capacity he would call on children who he knew were on the brink of getting into trouble, ask them how they were getting on at home, whether they were helping their parents and that sort of thing. He had great success with those children, and I would like to see that expanded as a way of helping some of these young people avoid getting into more serious trouble.

The other matter that needs to be addressed involves the fact that our current system of criminal law accepts that young people under the age of 10 years may not know that they are committing a criminal offence even though they are doing so and, therefore, they do not have any intent. We can accept the generality of that. The point I want to make is that young people under the age of 10 years who are doing things they should not be doing should receive serious counselling or guidance from the police. I have nine-year-olds in my electorate who do a lot of damage. They know full well what they are doing, but, as the law stands, the police cannot touch them. This is not a heavy-handed approach, but they should at least be subjected to some guidance and counselling, with the police hopefully working with the parents to point out to them the consequences of going down that path, particularly when they get to the age of 10 years or above.

I am suggesting some modifications to an already improved juvenile justice system we have in South Australia; I am not suggesting draconian measures. This is not an attack on young people who, in the main, are fantastic. Prevention is the best way to go and, if we can keep one person out of Yatala, we have accomplished a great deal. We have moved in the health area along the lines of 'prevention is better than cure'. I would like to see a similar approach in the crime area. To that end, we could adopt some of the measures used in countries such as New Zealand where they have community police and police officers who can work with families.

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

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Today, I would like to come to the defence of all AFL footballers and ask, 'What is the AFL Commission doing to our great game with respect to the melee rule?' Australian Rules football is a unique sport. This is a sport invented by Australians for Australians. No other sport comprises all the components of Australian Rules football. It is only in our game that we can run, jump, kick, mark and tackle. We play a physical game; we play an emotional game. Also, one of the great fundamentals of Australian Rules football is that there is a team ethos, that we play a team game and that there is camaraderie within the team that goes out onto the football field. What the AFL Commission is doing with the melee rule is a total disaster. It does not have the support of any of the teams in the AFL, the young Australians currently playing AFL football or the sporting public.

One might ask, 'What is the melee rule?' The member for Fisher would like to know what it is. Out on a football field, what the AFL Commission has deemed to be a melee is that,

if you have four players—presumably from two opposing teams—who congregate and get involved in some sort of physical contact—wrestling, a melee, whatever you want to call it—that is a melee. That means that if you have on the football field two players from the one team, presumably, against a person from the opposition team, that player who is up against two players cannot and will not be supported by his team mate. This is absolutely ridiculous. The AFL Commission is trying to take out of this great game of ours the physical nature of the sport. None of us in this Chamber would support the behind-the-play incidents, the king hits or the kicking, all of which has been well and truly taken out of the game, and for that I commend the Australian Football League and the South Australian National Football League for what they have done.

In this instance, however, the AFL Commission is putting our game at risk. This rule is destroying the very culture of Australian Rules football. The AFL Commission is trying to put velvet gloves on young Australian athletes who are going out there in their chosen occupation, in the majority of cases, to play their chosen sport. I call on the State Minister for Recreation and Sport to immediately contact the AFL Commission to express our concerns, to represent all the AFL footballers who play in South Australia and the sporting public and to inform the AFL Commission that this is just not acceptable. At the same time, I call upon the State Minister for Recreation and Sport—while he is about it, he may as well go the full hog—to get on the telephone and contact his colleague the Federal Minister who can start working at a Federal level to give protection to all AFL footballers around Australia.

What happens after a report? After a report is made, the AFL goes even further than what the Liberal Government here in South Australia would support. It says to the clubs, the coach, the individuals concerned and the administrators, 'You are not allowed to talk to the public. You cannot make any comment about this. You are not allowed to be interviewed by the media.' What an absolute fiasco! Who does the AFL Commission think it is? What would Mr Rupert Murdoch think of this? I do not think anyone would support this type of situation where freedom of speech is being removed.

We only have to look at the recent fiasco where a number of Port Adelaide and Fremantle players were reported under this melee rule. This is absolute hypocrisy. It is an absolute joke. The AFL Commission must immediately redress this. Irrespective of what your political affiliations or club support may be, any commonsense person can see that the AFL Commission is going down the wrong track and making some bad mistakes here. It is trying to change the culture of the game and, at the same time, for whatever given reason, it is victimising one of the great athletes of Australian football in Gavin Wanganeen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRIGHT: It is like Fawley Towers.

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

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): It was with considerable curiosity that I set out for Brisbane last week to attend the first ever national convention of the Liberal Party of Australia, followed by the Federal Council meeting on Sunday. It began on Thursday night with sessions on Friday for women and continued on Saturday and Sunday. Indeed, the highlight of the occasion was the address given by the Prime Minister

to the open forum of over 1 500 people. I was there in company with other members of this place, including the members for Schubert and Waite, and the Hon. Angus Redford, among others, to hear that address, which was indeed an inspirational one.

We were privileged, as is rarely the case for ordinary citizens, to hear some history making announcements, particularly the one relating to the sale of the remnants of Telstra to members of the general public in Australia. I think that is a brilliant proposition that the Prime Minister has put, and the Government's policy in that respect is to be commended, to give every Australian the opportunity to participate in the great telecommunications carrier. Announcements were made about our ground breaking industrial relations reforms and the necessity for us to review our taxation laws in this country—all loudly and roundly applauded at the time they were made during the course of the workshop sessions on Saturday and Sunday. One particular motion, moved on Sunday afternoon, to the Federal Council on policy reads as follows:

That this Federal Council notes the Government's determination to combat drug abuse through its tough on drugs strategy. In doing so, this Federal Council calls for an increased focus on the following areas of concern:

- drug education programs;
- reconvening a Senate committee of inquiry into the problems of drug and alcohol abuse;
- more effective use of volunteers within the community through improved training and equipment to alleviate family pain and stress;
- tax reform to assist the rehabilitation services; and
- transfer of surveillance equipment used by Federal Government agencies to the control of the Australian Federal Police for drug detection purposes.

The Prime Minister immediately accepted that motion on the spot and said that he, along with his Cabinet colleagues, would also be examining other aspects; and he has announced only a matter of 24 hours ago further get tough on drugs surveillance matters.

I want to draw attention to a statement made just over a week ago by Judge Allan, who, according to the front page article of the *Advertiser* in question, wants us all to be like the three monkeys when it comes to crime detection: you cannot see any evil, you cannot hear any evil and you cannot feel any evil. If we cannot use sensory devices or call on the help of dogs to discover where drugs are being secreted away and carried, then God help us, because the crime busters certainly will not be able to. In my opinion, the judge needs to take a long, hard look at where the hell he thinks he is taking society if what he advocates is the way to go.

The police had incontrovertible evidence that drugs were being carried between the States on buses, and the way to detect the presence of those drugs is quite clearly and simply to use sniffer dogs. When you turn up the drugs, naturally you want to catch the person responsible for them, which the police did, and the good judge got it all wrong. Judging by the reaction I have had to Judge Allan's remarks, a lot of people share my view on that.

When such crimes are committed, it is important to recognise that people do not suspect that they are being committed. It is only when we see something, feel something or taste something that you are aware that it has been done. How else do you know? We have always used anything at all that can help us catch the crooks. To my mind, sniffer dogs on the cargo holds of transport vehicles, such as buses, is a very important means of detection in this regard. Maybe it is also his opinion that we should not be using electronic

sensing equipment to photograph offenders, as is done currently in the mall, because they do not have any reasonable grounds of suspicion that any one person will commit an offence at any time when the equipment is installed and switched on. That is a bit ridiculous. He seems to be saying that no crimes are committed unless we install the detection device and have reasonable grounds that it is going to happen before we do so.

ELECTRICITY CORPORATIONS (RESTRUCTURING AND DISPOSAL) BILL

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for the restructuring and disposal of all or part of the assets of electricity corporations; to amend the Electricity Corporations Act 1994; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As I announced on 17 February 1998 the Government intends to examine options for the sale or lease of ETSA Corporation and SA Generation Corporation, trading as Optima Energy. Between 1991 and 1995 Australian Governments made a series of decisions in relation to the implementation of national competition policy and the establishment of a national electricity market. As part of the reform process, ETSA was restructured to create two Government businesses, namely, ETSA Corporation (responsible for transmitting and distributing electricity) and Optima Energy (responsible for generating electricity): These reforms will result in:

- the cessation of the monopoly on electricity generation and retail operations previously residing with the Government;
- consequent exposure of ETSA and Optima Energy to competition, which is expected to increase over a number of years;
- exposure of ETSA and Optima Energy to regulation deriving from national legislation and/or intergovernment agreements.

Recently the Government announced further reforms of the electricity industry. These were outlined in my statement to Parliament on 17 February 1998 and include the sale of ETSA and Optima Energy. The objectives for reform and sale of the State's electricity assets are to deliver real benefits to South Australian electricity customers through the implementation of a major program of microeconomic reform, to maximise returns and to minimise risks to the Government through the sale process, to reduce debt, and to enhance overall State economic activity. The outcomes for reform of the State's electricity assets, to be achieved over the next few years, are as follows:

- an efficient, competitive electricity industry in South Australia, within the context of the national electricity market and competition policy;
- sustainable lower electricity prices and choice of supply for consumers;
- an appropriate regulatory environment to encourage competitive outcomes and protection for consumers;
- long term security of supply;
- repayment of budget supported debt;
- reduced risks to taxpayers;

· acceptable access and equity to supply for regional South Australia.

The commencement of the national electricity market was previously scheduled for 29 March 1998. Jurisdictions have recently agreed that a test market should begin on 29 March 1998. The national electricity market is expected to commence formally at a later date when jurisdictions are satisfied that national marketing arrangements and structures perform satisfactorily. The delay in the commencement of the national electricity market is entirely separate from the Government's announcement of its reform and sale program for ETSA and Optima Energy.

The new market arrangements pose substantial risks to the Government, as the owner of ETSA and Optima Energy and as the guarantor of their liabilities. These risks have become more evident as the national market becomes imminent. Recent independent research carried out for the Government states that the value of the State's power assets is at risk and that the financial risks to the Government of operating in the national market are very significant.

We do not believe that South Australians should be exposed to these risks. These risks are for the private sector to deal with, not taxpayers. At the same time, the national electricity market will create many opportunities for experienced and skilled private sector market participants. Indeed, the Chairman of ETSA believes that the Government should sell its power assets sooner rather than later.

There is also an inherent conflict of interest between commitments by the Government to implement the Electricity Reform Agreements and the Competition Principles Agreement on the one hand, and its interest as shareholder and guarantor of ETSA and Optima Energy on the other. This conflict of interest could put at risk the Commonwealth Government's competition-related financial assistance. These 'competition payments' amount to approximately \$332 million over a nine-year period and current financial assistance grants of \$690 million over the same period.

The Government must address these issues now. With South Australia's full participation in the national electricity market in the next few months, South Australian taxpayers will be immediately and fully exposed to all the risks just outlined. Victoria and New South Wales are already well advanced in the reform process compared with South Australia. In particular, Victoria has achieved successful sales of its electricity facilities. Its sale process, and others, has demonstrated that financial markets currently have an appetite for electricity facilities and will pay premium prices to procure them.

A successful sale in South Australia would enable the Government to retire a substantial amount of debt and achieve substantial interest savings, with consequent benefits to the budget. As a result of the sale, the Government would be able to invest in urgently needed community infrastructure.

Since my announcement, the credit ratings agencies, Standard and Poor's and Moody's Investors Service, have been reported as indicating that the sale of energy assets would have a positive impact on South Australia's standing and credit rating. The Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Bill is proposed in order to facilitate the restructuring and disposal of ETSA and Optima Energy.

The Bill is based on precedents set in other legislation enabling the sale of other Government assets. Over the first three months, preparatory work will include information

gathering and a detailed study of proposed reforms, business structures and future regulatory arrangements.

The Bill repeals section 47A of the Electricity Corporations Act 1994 and associated provisions and words. This will allow the actual sales to take place. The Bill enables the transfer of ETSA and Optima Energy assets or liabilities (or both) to a State-owned company, or companies. It also enables the grant of a lease, licence or other rights related to the assets of ETSA and Optima Energy to a State-owned company or companies. The retransfer provisions of assets and liabilities allow for circumstances where there may be a change in a planned State-owned company structure or to correct a transfer order.

Importantly, the Bill also enables the sale of electricity assets or shares in a State-owned company which holds those assets. A lease, licence or other rights over electricity assets could be granted. It must be emphasised that no actual transfer of assets or liabilities of the electricity corporations will proceed until after a due diligence has been undertaken. Further, the Government does not intend to proclaim these sections of the Act, nor to act under these provisions, until it is clear what the nature and extent of any transfer of assets and/or liabilities to a State-owned company or companies is required and after consultation with the relevant parties.

An appropriate regulatory environment will be developed over the next few months. When this work is completed, further legislation may be required to be introduced to establish or revise regulatory arrangements. The Government recognises that the employees of ETSA and Optima Energy are a vital and valuable part of the electricity industry in South Australia. Therefore, with regard to employees, work on addressing all the issues related to the terms and conditions of employment is underway and these issues will be subject to further legislation, where necessary, after extensive consultation with the relevant parties.

In the restructuring phase, it may be necessary to enable the services of the employees of ETSA and Optima Energy to be made available to a State-owned company or companies established under other provisions of the Bill. These persons would continue to remain the employees of ETSA and Optima Energy during such an arrangement or until future terms and conditions of employment are established. This process was used for the sale of Forwood Products.

The reform program is planned to consist of three stages and is expected to be completed over a two year period. It will involve: a three month preparatory period for information gathering and for a detailed study of proposed reforms and business structures; a period of implementation of the reforms and for restructuring ETSA and Optima Energy over three to nine months; and the sale of the businesses over approximately a one year period.

To give effect to the electricity reform and sale program the Government has established an Electricity Reform and Sales Unit (ERSU) within the Department of Treasury and Finance. It is expected that consultants across a range of disciplines—technical, accounting and legal—will assist with the reform and sale program.

The Government is committed to achieving positive outcomes for the community out of the sale process. With regard to prices, I can assure residential and small business customers who are low users of power that their price of electricity will stay below CPI until the year 2002. After this, these customers are expected to be able to negotiate with suppliers. Power prices to households and small business after the year 2002 are expected to come down through fierce competition

between suppliers. These benefits of privatisation in terms of prices to customers have been confirmed in Victoria.

Consumers will be safeguarded by a range of measures, including the appointment of an independent regulator to ensure private power companies charge customers fairly and meet their obligations to supply electricity to appropriate standards of quality and service. A community committee, comprising representatives of social welfare groups, such as SACOSS, will be appointed to work with the Government.

Families or individuals who currently receive power at concessional rates will continue to do so after privatisation. The Government will continue to support those in need. Again the benefits of privatisation in Victoria have been demonstrated by a 47% reduction in the number of households having their power disconnected. Consumers in regional areas will also gain from the electricity reform and sale process. Country households will receive their power at prices which rise below CPI until the year 2002, exactly the same as city users. After this, these customers will also be able to benefit from the fierce competition between suppliers. The Government notes evidence from regional Western Australia and country Victoria that private power suppliers are keen to service regional markets. Groups of customers in the country, even whole towns, could band together to negotiate lower prices in the competitive market.

The environment will also benefit from the removal of past monopolies. With deregulation, new suppliers will enter the market, and it is expected that at least some of these will trade on promoting 'clean' power. In the eastern States, where the market already operates, a number of suppliers offer 'green' tariffs for customers who wish to purchase power that has been produced from renewable resources. Even individual households have installed solar power and are selling any excess power back into the grid. Reform of the Government's electricity assets is essential to achieve and meet the current and future needs of industry, households and economic development.

This Bill allows the Government to proceed with the fundamental reforms in a professional manner. The due diligence program will be extensive. There will be appropriate safeguards for consumers, especially country power users and employees. Households will be able to choose their own supplier, to change their supplier, to produce their own power, to sell what they do not use back to the market, and to bargain with suppliers for the lowest price. I commend the Bill to members.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

VALUATION OF LAND (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Administrative Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Valuation of Land Act 1971 and make a consequential amendment to the Local Government Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: 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 State Government's 'Planning Strategy for Country South Australia' has, as a priority, the protection of productive agricultural land. The value of rural production in South Australia has a

significant impact on South Australia's economy, accounting for approximately \$2.3 billion of South Australia's export income.

Primary production land close to urban centres is subject to the pressures of urban development. The protection of productive agricultural land requires the establishment of conditions necessary for efficient and sustainable business. These conditions include the adoption of rating and taxing valuations that reflect productive primary production land uses. The adoption of this approach ensures that a primary producer in a locality favourable to land development is not penalised for continuing farming when compared to a primary producer operating in an area not influenced by such land development opportunities.

Section 22A of the *Valuation of Land Act* introduced Notional Values in 1981 to protect genuine primary producers from rating valuations based on the highest and best use of the land. Notional Values determined under this section ignore the potential for uses other than for the business of primary production.

In determining Notional Values, the Valuer-General's policy has always ignored the existing internal subdivision of a landowner's property if the property is used for the business of primary production. However, a recent legal opinion suggested that where a property had existing subdivision, the Notional Value should be determined by including enhancements to value resulting from that subdivision. An amendment to the *Valuation of Land Act* will ensure the continued application of Notional Values to the properties of genuine primary producers where the property is affected by existing subdivision. The amendment will be retrospective to protect ratepayers from any possible liability for back rates and taxes.

A Notional Values Working Party was established in November, 1995 by the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources to examine and interpret the intention and application of Notional Values to preserve primary production land. The Valuer-General's policy on Notional Values, in response to the recommendations of the Working Party, has been amended to ensure all properties used for the business of primary production receive a Notional Value where the value of the property is enhanced by a use other than primary production.

The introduction of the policy has the potential to increase the number of properties with Notional Values thus adversely affecting the revenue bases of rating and taxing authorities. A study undertaken by the Deputy Valuer-General found that the introduction of the policy would reduce the revenue bases of the local government areas most affected by up to 3.5 per cent.

To limit the negative effects of a greater number of Notional Values on rating or taxing authorities, and ratepayers more generally (including those who currently have Notional Values), the benefit of the concessional value should be delayed to financial years subsequent to that in which the application for a Notional Value is made. Delaying the operational date of Notional Values in this way will limit the impact of newly established Notional Values on the budgets of rating and taxing authorities. Existing revenue and budgets will be unaffected by the successful application for a Notional Value: the new Notional Value will only have to be taken into account in forming subsequent budgets.

The Notional Values Working Party endorsed the amendments on the 29 January, 1997 following consultation with local government. The proposed amendment will:

- retain the current incentives for ratepayers to continue using their the land for the business of primary production even where an existing subdivision of the holding is in place, thus assisting in the protection of productive agricultural land.
- allow primary producers to avoid liability for increased rates and taxes caused by property values reflecting the existing subdivision of their property.
- reduce the budget impact on many local government authorities following a change in the Valuer-General's policy on the eligibility criteria for Notional Values by restricting the operation of a Notional Value for rating and taxing purposes to subsequent financial years. Rural districts close to major urban centres, where the application of concessional Notional Values is likely to be concentrated, would particularly benefit from this amendment.
- increase the maximum penalty for not informing the relevant valuing authority of a change in circumstance affecting the owner's entitlement to the benefit of a Notional Value.

Common date of Valuation

General Valuations of land are made in all local government areas of the State, largely for rating and taxing purposes. Currently there are 21 dates of valuation placed in the government gazette

which correspond to the completion date of the valuation for the relevant local government area.

In a sharply rising or falling real estate market there may be inconsistencies in value levels where adjoining local government areas are valued up to six months apart.

Rates notices are mailed at different times by different rating authorities. The various users of the values often believe the rating value is current at the time of mailing. The establishment of a common date of valuation for all local government areas, as proposed by this Bill, will benefit ratepayers by providing clarity concerning the underlying basis of the valuation. The use of a common date of valuation will also provide consistency of value levels across the various local government areas and the State, especially for owners with multiple holdings in various local government areas. Public and industry understanding of the value levels would be enhanced if all rating and taxing notices listing the valuations relate to a common date of valuation.

The current system relies on the valuer's judgment to predict the value levels at a future point in time. The common valuation date will facilitate the determination of values at a common point in the past.

A common valuation date will assist Councils in the process of amalgamation as part of local government reform by providing them with value data relating to a single point in time. This will assist in rate revenue modelling for prospective new larger Council areas.

All other States, with the exception of Victoria, have implemented a common valuation date.

Limited objection period

Early in 1995, the Local Government Association made a submission to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (the Minister then responsible for the administration of the *Valuation of Land Act*) regarding the difference in the time allowed to lodge an objection to a rating valuation under the *Local Government Act* and the *Valuation of Land Act*.

The *Local Government Act* allows for a period of 21 days from notification of valuations in which to lodge an objection. The *Valuation of Land Act* allows ratepayers to object at any time while the valuation is in force.

Agencies using the Valuer-General's valuations for rating may have significant reductions to their income when objections to the valuations are successful. These reductions in income currently can occur throughout the financial year thereby affecting the current budgets of agencies. Agencies affected by successful objections would have greater flexibility in managing income cash flows and be able to allocate financial resources more effectively if objections were limited to a specific period of time. Net revenue totals could be finalised much earlier in the financial year.

Statistics reveal that 60 per cent of objections are lodged by the end of September each year. This increases to 80 per cent by the end of December, with the remaining 20 per cent of objections being lodged in the second half of the financial year.

A working party comprising representatives from Local Government, South Australian Institute of Rate Administrators and Department of Environment and Natural Resources, with input from S A Water and the State Taxation Office, was established to determine a common objection period for the *Local Government Act* and the *Valuation of Land Act*. The relevant legislation and policy concerning this issue has been examined by the working party.

The working party recommended that both Acts be amended to allow objections to be lodged up to the 30th of September or within 60 days of the date of the first rating and taxation notice, whichever is later. Amendments to the *Local Government Act* based on those recommendations have been passed by Parliament, although the amendments have not been brought into operation. The provisions of this Bill modify the recommendation of the working party to ensure that ratepayers have 60 days to lodge an objection from the date that notice of a valuation is first served on them by a given authority. If they are subsequently given notice of the valuation by a different authority, they will have a further 60 days from the date of that subsequent notice (unless they have already objected). This Bill also proposes amendments to the *Local Government Act* to establish a common objection period for both Acts.

The proposed objection periods ensure property owners and tenant's rights are preserved by giving enough time for the rate notice to reach them and for an objection to be lodged.

Local government and SA Water budgeting will be enhanced by having the vast majority of objections dealt with early in the rating year. The State Taxation Office will have all objections to values for Land Tax lodged within 60 days of giving notice under the Act.

By condensing the period in which to lodge an objection, more efficient use of staff resources can be made in agencies receiving and processing objections to value. This results from the processing of objections within a set period rather than across the whole financial year.

Both Victoria and Queensland have a 60 day period within which objections to valuations may be lodged. There is no specified date within New South Wales legislation.

Appointment of a Valuer-General

Currently the *Valuation of Land Act* allows for the Governor to appoint a Valuer-General for a term up to age 65 years.

A Valuer-General has not been appointed since March 1993 following the resignation of the former Valuer-General pending the change in the terms of appointment. A Deputy Valuer-General has been administering the *Valuation of Land Act* in the interim.

The statutory appointment of the Valuer-General until age 65 was intended to make the position independent from political interference. While achieving this particular objective, it does not reflect current administrative practices and the principles of *Public Sector Management Act* term appointments. A contract appointment of 5 years would be consistent with contract positions under Section 40 of the *Public Sector Management Act*.

A contract appointment applies to other positions requiring independence such as the Director, Public Prosecutions and the Police Complaints Authority.

Similar provisions to that of the New South Wales *Valuation of Land Act* are included in the Bill concerning the fixed term appointment, and reappointment, of a Valuer-General.

If the Valuer-General is appointed for a fixed term, there are no clauses in the *Valuation of Land Act* to prevent the incumbent from taking the statutory role to another position unrelated to the valuation function of the office. Administrative problems under these circumstances were experienced when the previous Valuer-General was appointed Chief Executive of another administrative unit of Government but was reluctant to vacate the statutory office. The proposed amendments provide for these situations in a manner similar to that of the New South Wales *Valuation of Land Act*, by requiring Ministerial approval for employment outside of the statutory role.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for the commencement of the Bill. Paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 12 apply retrospectively. They are taken to have come into operation on the day on which the provisions of the principal Act that they amend originally came into operation. (They amend subsections (1) and (2) of section 22A of the principal Act, which deal with the entitlement to and determination of notional values). Clause 17 of the Bill, which amends section 173 of the *Local Government Act 1934*, comes into operation immediately after section 12(b) of the *Local Government (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 1997* comes into operation. The other provisions of the Bill come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 6—Valuer-General and Deputy Valuer-General

This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act, which deals with the appointment of the Valuer-General and Deputy Valuer-General. Where the Valuer-General is temporarily absent from his or her duties, or the office is temporarily vacant, subsection 6(2) currently empowers the Deputy Valuer General to perform the functions and duties given to the Valuer-General under the principal Act. This amendment empowers the Deputy Valuer-General to also (in that situation) perform any functions or duties given to the Valuer-General under any other Act. The amendment also provides that during the appointment of a Deputy Valuer-General references in other Acts to the Valuer-General will (in relation to the functions or duties of the Valuer-General) be read as references to the Deputy.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 7—Delegation

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act, which empowers the Valuer-General to delegate his or her powers, duties, etc., under the principal Act. This amendment empowers the Valuer-General to delegate powers, duties, etc., conferred on the Valuer-General by other Acts as well.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 9—Term of appointment, etc.

This clause amends section 9 of the principal Act, which deals with the term of appointment of the Valuer-General and the ways in which the Valuer-General can be removed or suspended from office.

Section 9(1) currently provides that the Valuer-General is appointed for a term expiring on the day on which he or she reaches 65. This amendment provides that the Valuer-General is to be appointed for a term not exceeding five years and is, on the expiration of a term of office, eligible for reappointment for a further term not exceeding five years.

Section 9 also currently provides that the Valuer-General can be removed from office by the Governor on an address by one or both Houses of Parliament (depending on the circumstances) asking for his or her removal. Other situations in which the office becomes vacant include the Valuer-General becoming bankrupt or being convicted of an indictable offence or becoming (in the opinion of the Governor) incapable by reason of illness of performing the functions and duties of the office. This amendment adds a further situation in which the office of Valuer-General becomes vacant: it empowers the Governor to remove the Valuer-General from office where the Valuer-General engages in any remunerative employment, occupation or business outside the duties of the office without the consent of the Minister.

This clause also inserts subsection (6), which provides for the reappointment to the Public Service of a person who was a Public Service employee immediately prior to his or her appointment as Valuer-General. Where such a person is not reappointed as Valuer-General at the end of a term of office, he or she is entitled, if his or her conditions of appointment so provide, to be appointed (without any requirement for selection processes to be conducted) to a Public Service position at least equivalent to the one that he or she left.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 11—General valuations

This clause amends section 11 of the principal Act, which requires the Valuer-General to make general valuations within each area of the State and prepare a valuation roll for each area. This amendment removes an obsolete reference to the commencement of the principal Act.

Clause 7: Substitution of s. 12

This clause repeals section 12 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section 12. Section 12 currently provides that where a general valuation of land is made in an area the value assigned to land for the purposes of that valuation is to be the value of the land as at the date of completion of the general valuation: i.e., values are to be assessed as at the date of completion of the general valuation.

This amendment provides that the date at which the value must be assessed is the date determined by the Valuer-General in relation to the general valuation. That date can be before, on or after the completion of the general valuation for the relevant area if the Valuer-General so determines.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 13—Notice of general valuation to be published in Gazette

This clause amends section 13 of the principal Act which, among other things, requires the Valuer-General to give notice of a general valuation in the *Gazette*.

The clause makes a number of changes that are consequential upon the insertion of new section 12 into the principal Act. It also amends subsection (3) of section 13. Subsection (3) currently empowers the Valuer-General to determine a commencement date for a general valuation: i.e., to determine a date at which the new valuations that comprise a general valuation supersede the previous valuations. This amendment requires the Valuer-General to include that commencement date in the notice of the general valuation that is required to be published in the *Gazette* under this section.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 14—Frequency of general valuations

This clause amends section 14 of the principal Act which, among other things, allows the Valuer-General to make a new general valuation by declaring by notice in the *Gazette* that the existing valuation roll correctly represents the value of land in the relevant area. The Valuer-General can do so where he or she is of the opinion that values have not materially changed since the previous general valuation for that area. This amendment provides that where a general valuation is made in this manner, the date as at which the values will be taken to have been assigned to the land for the purposes of the 'new' valuation will be the date specified by the Valuer-General in the *Gazette* notice. That date can be before, on or after the date of the notice if the Valuer-General so determines.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 15—Valuer-General may value any land

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 15 of the principal Act that is consequential upon the changes made to sections 12 and 14.

It also makes it clear that the date determined by the Valuer-General for the commencement of a valuation made under this

section may be the date of that determination as well as before or after that date.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 22—Adoption of valuations

This clause amends section 22 of the principal Act to make it clear that the date on which a valuation comes into force under this section can be the date that the valuation is adopted by the Valuer-General, as well as before or after that date if the Valuer-General or other authority is satisfied that a person is entitled to the benefit of this section.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 22A—Notional valuations to be made in certain cases

This clause amends section 22A of the principal Act. Under section 22A, where the Valuer-General or other valuing authority is satisfied that a person is entitled to the benefit of the section, the Valuer-General or other authority can (and must at the request of that person) reduce the valuation that would otherwise be given to the person's land.

To be entitled to the benefit of the section the owner has to have a particular interest in land (fee simple, Crown lease, etc) and one of the conditions set out in subsection (1)(b) (e.g. the land is used for the business of primary production) must be satisfied. In addition, the value of the land must in the opinion of the Valuer-General or other valuing authority be enhanced by its potential for subdivision or for use for a purpose other than that referred to in the relevant condition in subsection (1)(b).

In these circumstances the Valuer-General or other valuing authority, in determining the value of the land, can (and must at the request of the person) ignore any enhancement in value resulting from that potential for subdivision or alternative use. The land is valued as if that potential for division or for changed use did not exist.

This clause amends section 22A to enable the Valuer-General and other valuing authorities to also ignore any enhancement to the value of the land resulting from an existing (rather than potential) division of the land. This amendment applies retrospectively (*see clause 2 of this Bill*). It is to be taken to have formed part of section 22A since the relevant parts of that section were first enacted.

This clause also repeals subsection (5) of section 22A, inserting subsection (2a) in its place. Subsection (5) provides that the making of a valuation under this section does not affect rates or taxes for which the owner has already become liable. Subsection (2a) instead provides that a valuation under this section (ie. a valuation that ignores any enhancement in the value of the land resulting from division of the land or a potential for the different use of the land) only operates for rating or taxing purposes in respect of financial years subsequent to the financial year in which the request for that valuation under this section was made. If the request was made in the last month of a financial year the notional valuation only operates for years subsequent to the financial year immediately following that in which the request is made. Under new subsection (10) a certificate issued by the valuing authority is proof of the date of receipt of the request in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Finally, this clause increases the penalty for failing to notify the relevant valuing authority of circumstances by virtue of which the owner ceases to be entitled to the benefit of this section or transactions by virtue of which a change of ownership of the land may occur. The current maximum penalty is a fine of \$2 000, with an expiation fee of \$200. The new maximum penalty is a fine of \$5 000, with an expiation fee of \$315.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 22B—Heritage land

This clause amends section 22B of the principal Act, which provides that in valuing State heritage land a valuing authority has to take into account the fact that the land forms part of the State heritage and disregard any potential use of the land that is inconsistent with its preservation as part of the State heritage. This clause increases the penalty for failing to notify the relevant valuing authority that land valued under this section has ceased to form part of the State heritage. It increases the penalty in the same manner as for the equivalent offence under section 22A: from a maximum fine of \$2 000 to a maximum of \$5 000, with the expiation fee increasing from \$200 to \$315.

Clause 14: Substitution of s. 23

This clause repeals section 23 of the principal Act and substitutes new section 23. Section 23 currently requires the Valuer-General to give notice of a valuation to the owner of the land. It provides that inclusion of the valuation in an account for rates, etc., will constitute notice of valuation for the purposes of the section. The new section 23 adds more detail to these provisions, removing references to 'giving' notice and substituting more precise references to 'serving'

notice. (This additional detail is required as a consequence of the amendment to section 24 of the principal Act). The new section also empowers the Valuer-General to give notice of the valuation to the occupier of the land instead of the owner, where the Valuer-General thinks it appropriate, or to give notice to both. The new section makes it clear that—

- (a) the Valuer-General has to serve notice of a valuation on the owner or occupier of the land (or both);
- (b) an account for rates, etc., that includes the valuation will be taken to constitute notice of the valuation for this purpose; and
- (c) service of the account under the Act imposing the rate, etc., will constitute service of the notice of valuation.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 24—Objection to valuation

This clause amends section 24 of the principal Act. Section 24 provides that a person who is dissatisfied with a valuation of land in force under the Act can object to that valuation by notice served on the Valuer-General. This amendment specifies a time limit within which such an objection must be made if notice of the valuation is given to the owner or occupier of the land. In particular it provides that after notice of a valuation (whenever made) is first served on the owner or occupier of the land after the commencement of this amendment, an objection to the valuation may only be made by the owner or occupier so served within 60 days after the date of service of the notice. However, if the owner or occupier is served with a further notice of the valuation, the person so served has a further right to object to the valuation as long as the further notice is the first notice of the valuation served on the person under the Act under which the notice is served and the objection is made within 60 days after the date of service of that further notice.

This clause also makes it clear that a person cannot object to a valuation if the Valuer-General has previously considered an objection by that person to the valuation.

For the purposes of determining the precise period within which an objection to a valuation must be made, this amendment provides that notice of the valuation sent by post to a person at a proper address for service of that person will be taken to be served at that address at the end of the second day after the day on which it was posted, unless it is proved that it was not delivered to that address at all. The authority sending the notice can issue a certificate specifying the notice and when, where and to whom it was sent, and such a certificate is proof of those matters in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Clause 16: Statute law revision amendments

Clause 16 and the schedule set out further amendments of the principal Act of a statute law revision nature.

Clause 17: Amendment of Local Government Act 1934

This clause amends section 173 of the *Local Government Act 1934*. Section 173 makes provision for the making of objections to valuations made by a valuer employed or engaged by a council (as opposed to valuations made by the Valuer-General). Under that section objections have to be made within 21 days after the objector receives notice of the valuation to which the objection relates (unless the council in its discretion allows an extension of time for making the objection). This amendment provides that objections must be made within 60 days after the date of service of the notice of the valuation to which the objection relates (unless the council in its discretion allows an extension of time for making the objection).

Under clause 2(2) of this Bill, this amendment will come into operation immediately after the commencement of section 12(b) of the *Local Government (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 1997*. Section 12(b) of that Act, which has been passed by Parliament but not yet brought into operation, also amends section 173 of the *Local Government Act 1934*, inserting an objection limitation period that is different from the one inserted by this amendment. The effect of the commencement clause is to repeal the amendment to the *Local Government Act 1934* made by section 12(b) of the *Local Government (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 1997* as soon as it comes into operation, inserting the amendment made by this clause instead.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

**NATIONAL WINE CENTRE (LAND OF CENTRE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 February. Page 572.)

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): It is with pleasure that I rise to speak in favour of the National Wine Centre (Land of Centre) Amendment Bill, although I think it is important that this Parliament recognise the chequered history of the centre and the degree of incompetence with which it has been handled by this Government.

First, let us look at what we are doing. Last year, with bipartisan support, before the election, this Parliament passed the National Wine Centre Act 1997, which was designed to enshrine the National Wine Centre on the site of what is commonly known as the Hackney Bus Depot near the Botanic Gardens. This Bill provides for amendment to the National Wine Centre Act to reflect the change of site for the National Wine Centre, the administration of the Botanic Gardens, the State Herbarium, and the location of the new Adelaide International Rose Garden.

During his second reading explanation, the Deputy Premier said that the National Wine Centre Act was proclaimed to designate the site commonly known as the old Hackney Bus Depot as the location for the National Wine Centre development. However, he also told the House that, following discussions with the wine industry and a number of local community and special interest groups, the Government believed that an even better proposal and site had been identified. The Deputy Premier has told the House that this revised and expanded proposal offers scope for a project of even greater national significance than first envisaged. It will incorporate the creation of the National Wine Centre, the Adelaide International Rose Garden and the Rose Trial Garden whilst providing what he described as 'a seamless transition to and from the adjacent and historic Botanic Gardens'.

The Deputy Premier told the House that this integrated development would reinforce Australia's growing reputation as a world-class wine producer and provide a national focus for Australia as a rose growing destination and enhance existing adjacent attractions. He went on to say that the location of the new rose features in close proximity to the National Wine Centre mirrored the historical and practical links that exist between the production of wine and the propagation of roses. He said that this collocation would increase the financial viability of all operations within the precinct. Of course, he also pointed out that this would help in terms of bulking up for additional visitors, sharing of resources and common facilities, and that the location would be close to Adelaide's East End food and wine precinct, which has grown considerably in recent years.

The Deputy Premier also advised the House that the location of the rose gardens immediately adjacent to the Bicentennial Conservatory would provide a significantly enhanced setting for this internationally renowned building and at the same time provide the opportunity to restore a significant section of Adelaide city's green space. He also advised the House that this proposal had the support of the National Wine Industry, the Botanic Gardens Board, the National Rose Society and the Adelaide City Council.

I want to trace the genesis of this project and Government support for the wine industry in this State. In doing so, I am sure I will have the support of the Deputy Premier. In July 1993, as Minister for Business and Regional Development and Minister for Tourism, I announced that the State Government would provide \$500 000 to the Barossa Wine and Tourist Association to develop the State's first Wine Interpretation Centre. This followed extensive submissions to me from the wine industry that in the wine State of South

Australia there needed to be a centre in the Barossa to which people could go for explanation and interpretation.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to hear that the Deputy Premier praises this decision. We said that funding would enable the Barossa Wine and Tourist Association to purchase the former Die Gallerie restaurant and the Bergman property in the main street of Tanunda and develop the premises as a tourist information office and a wine interpretation centre. In our plan for doing this we said that the development would be a major focal point for tourists which would strengthen South Australia's reputation as the premier wine and food capital of Australia.

I responded to those submissions from the wine industry in 1993 because it seemed to me that, apart from providing tourists with all the information they needed about the Barossa Valley, this Wine Interpretation Centre on the Die Gallerie site (historic in its own right) would provide visitors with an informative insight into wine making and the history of the region with, of course, its strong German associations. The complex was designed to become not only an essential source of information but a tourist attraction in itself, because the Barossa Valley already had an excellent reputation locally in South Australia, interstate and overseas, and the centre was designed as an important addition which could only add to the experience of visiting the region.

I was pleased that the Barossa Wine and Tourist Association also announced in July 1993 that it would provide \$150 000 in addition to the \$500 000 that I approved as Minister for the development of the property which until recently operated as a restaurant—a restaurant, by the way, which reached its zenith in the Dunstan years as a place to which the Government used to take distinguished visitors from overseas. I am pleased that—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Schubert asks me which restaurant it is. It is the old Die Gallerie restaurant, which became the Wine and Tourist Centre, on the Bergman property on the main street of Tanunda. I was delighted that in September 1993 work began because I believed that the new complex would service the Barossa region as well as its visitors and also house the administration offices of the Barossa Wine and Tourist Association.

On 20 July 1993, I stated that the Barossa Valley was an important tourist drawcard, particularly considering that it was the location of two of the State's most popular festivals: the Barossa Vintage Festival and the internationally acclaimed Barossa Music Festival, which is currently run by Nicky Downer. I say in a bipartisan way what an outstanding job she does in promoting and organising the Barossa Music Festival. I was delighted to give support and to work in partnership with the private sector and the Barossa Valley winemakers, to contribute to the development, because we could only enhance South Australia's reputation for food and wine.

At a similar time, I announced \$1 million—I think it was more than that—and presented a cheque at the Magill Estate to the wine industry. I did so because it seemed to me that the opportunities for export development for the wine industry of South Australia were second to none. I had been approached by leading representatives of the wine industry in late 1992 and I know they had been to see Lynn Arnold when he was Minister for Industry and when he was Premier and also former Premier John Bannon seeking support nationally for a major export push around the world. They came to me

asking for us to make a contribution and I was pleased that South Australia was not only the first State to provide funds for the export marketing push of the wine industry into Britain, the United States, Europe and Asia but also a goad to other States. We hoped that other States with wine regions, such as Victoria, Western Australia with its growing wine region and the Hunter Valley in New South Wales, would come in behind us.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, but it is very important. It is the genesis for this, because at that time when we provided those funds it was the stimulus for the wine industry to kick start a much more aggressive and coordinated wine export and marketing plan around the world. Certainly, we were pleased to be part of that and I know the wine industry was greatly appreciative. However, there was some disappointment, because it was then announced by Ian Sutton of the wine industry that the first Australian International Expo that was coming out of the money that we provided—and I can see the Deputy Premier nodding in agreement—was not to be held *in situ* in South Australia, either in McLaren Vale, Coonawarra, Clare, the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley or, indeed, the Riverland but was to be held in Darling Harbor in New South Wales. So, the South Australian Government and South Australian winemakers kicked in in a big way but they held their expo in Sydney. When I complained to Mr Sutton about the process, his response was that that was where the market was.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will get onto Anne Ruston later: do not worry. Of course, I was able to point out to Mr Sutton that, in fact, the historic wine expo of France was held not in Paris but in the Bordeaux region, *in situ*, in location, people coming from around the world to visit the wineries.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, I have not been, but I am pleased that the Deputy Premier is offering to take me to one of the world's biggest wine shows, probably the biggest, held in Bordeaux. Of course, the Italian wine expo is held not in Rome but in the Tuscany and Chianti area. It is held *in situ* in the wine regions in which it should be held.

But what did the wine and brandy producers do—the classic cringe, the South Australian cringe, 60 per cent of the industry located here in South Australia, the Government of South Australia, the only State at that time to kick in money to the project, but what did they do? They thought that they had better keep the New South Wales part of the industry on side and hold it at Darling Harbor (where it was lost in Sydney) rather than holding it in the Barossa or elsewhere, where it could have been not only a showcase for South Australian wine, not only a showcase for South Australian food, but also a showcase for South Australia.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased that the member for Schubert agrees with me, because I know that he cares about the wine industry in his district, and I know that he would have liked to be at the opening of a world wine expo in the Barossa Valley. That would have been fantastic. We could have built a major international wine and food festival around that.

Unfortunately, that opportunity was lost, and the arrogance displayed by Mr Sutton of the wine industry was simply extraordinary. He got his cheque, got the money and, basically, he copped a snoot at South Australia in terms of trying to achieve something for this State, the flagship State

for premium wine and, indeed, the wine industry in South Australia.

Of course, after that we heard that they had the Barossa Wine Centre but winemakers in other regions said, 'What about us? Are we going to have one in McLaren Vale, the Coonawarra, the Riverland or Clare?' It was decided that a National Wine Centre should be based in Adelaide which could be an interpretive centre for wine, explain the process, be a showcase in the centre of Adelaide for the wine industry, and also encourage visitors from interstate and overseas to then go off to other wine regions around the State.

On 11 September 1996, Greg Kelton, political reporter for the *Advertiser*, writing from Milan, reported that a multi-million dollar National Wine Centre would be built on the former Hackney bus depot site next to the Botanic Gardens. In his report, he said:

The centre, based in the historic Goodman Building, will include a vineyard, tasting cellars, a Hall of Fame—

which presumably would recognise the achievements of people like Max Schubert, the famous winemaker of Grange Hermitage fame, and in more modern times people such as Brian Croser—

and working exhibits.

Mr Venning: Peter Lehmann.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, Peter Lehmann, and Peter Gago. Let us make this a real international hall of fame. Greg Kelton went on to write:

[This centre] will comprise a wine art gallery, an education centre and theatre, a cafe bistro featuring Australian wine and food. The historic tram barn on the site also is expected to be used. Other sites considered—and eventually discarded for a variety of reasons— included Ayers House, the Torrens Building and—

somewhat as a surprise to me—

the Central Market. The State Government contribution will involve handing over to the wine industry the site and the buildings and also underwriting the interest payments on a loan of up to \$10 million. The industry will then finance the running of what will be known as the National Wine Centre.

At that stage, he was talking about in kind support from the Government—not tens of millions of dollars but in kind support, and the underwriting of interest payments on a \$10 million loan that would be repaid by the industry itself.

The former Premier, now a Minister in the Olsen Government, announced details of the plan in Milan in a joint statement with the then Tourism Minister, now Deputy Premier. The former Premier said in Milan that one of the key reasons why the Hackney site had been chosen ahead of the others was that the industry wanted to plant vines there. The report by Greg Kelton continues:

This weekend, Mr Brown [the Premier] will visit the famed wine museum at the Ancien hotel at Beaune in the Burgundy region of France. 'I'll be closely examining what we can learn from the Beaune museum and how we can adapt some of their ideas into the National Wine Centre,' he said. Mr Brown said South Australia aimed to have a \$2.5 billion tourism industry by the turn of the century. . .

And it will be interesting to see how well the Tourism Minister does. He has two years to reach the \$2.5 billion mark in the tourism industry, and certainly he will have my support, enthusiastic encouragement and, indeed, congratulations when he reaches the \$2.5 billion mark by the year 2000. It continues:

. . . by focusing on one of the State's most famous assets the Government believed that South Australia would easily reach that target.

At the same time, we saw the South Australian Tourism Commission develop the vine leaf as a key symbol of South Australia. What is South Australia known for internationally? It is known for a couple of things: one is the wine industry and the other is our outstanding outback. The Premier believed that South Australia would easily reach the \$2.5 billion target. Greg Kelton then announced that the industry had welcomed the Government's move, with the Chief Executive of the Winemakers Federation of Australia, Mr Ian Sutton, saying that it would be a world class facility. Mr Sutton said:

International consumers, commentators, buyers and distributors are becoming increasingly interested in Australian wine and the technical characteristics and diversity of some 50 wine producing regions [here in Australia]. [The now Deputy Premier] said [at the time] South Australia planned to concentrate on wine tourism because no other State was so intrinsically linked to wine production.

And he was right in saying that. He said that an incorporated body would be established with national representation to run the centre and that it would comprise the Chairman of BRL Hardy, Mr John Pendrigh; Mr Sutton himself; the Chairman of Orlando Wyndham, Mr Perry Gunner; and the Chairman of the South Australian Wine Tourism Council, Mr John Lamb, who was to later to provide a statutory declaration in support of the Deputy Premier.

On Thursday 26 December 1996 we then saw, rather horrifyingly, a report in the *Advertiser* by civic reporter Regina Titelius headed 'Parklands Wine Centre in Doubt'. This was only a few months after the former Premier had made the announcement in Milan. The article states:

The State Government's decision to locate a multi-million dollar National Wine Centre alongside the city's Botanic Garden has been thrown into doubt. The Tourism Minister, Mr Ashenden, this week would not confirm whether the centre was to be located in the heritage listed Goodman Building—the former Hackney Road bus depot site east of the Botanic Garden.

Mr Ashenden is quoted as stating:

We don't want to get into talking about the location at this stage.

That was after the big announcement in Milan just three months previously by former Premier Dean Brown. The article continues:

But Mr Ashenden said the Government was still committed to setting up a wine centre.

I will read from this, because it is important to establish the very chequered history of the wine centre. It states:

The former Premier, Mr Dean Brown, announced in September that the centre would be based at Goodman Building and would include a vineyard, tasting cellars, an art gallery and a cafe bistro. The heritage listed Tram Barn A would also be used as part of the development. The Government was prepared to hand over the buildings and the site to the wine industry which would finance

—and remember that this was back in December 1996—

the running of the centre. The fresh uncertainty over the centre's location has added to growing opposition to the Government's decision. The Australian Democrats State Leader, Mr Mike Elliott, said support for the old bus depot site was very low. 'What is driving the Government to commit itself to this site? It doesn't make a lot of sense,' he said. Mr Elliott said that the Penfolds Magill Estate at Magill or the Barossa Valley would be appropriate sites where the wine centre would be in historical context. An alternative should be the city—such as a site adjacent to Victoria Square—where it would be more accessible. 'The Victoria Square precinct is an area that seems desperate for some other attractions,' [the Democrats leader] said.

The Acting Director of the National Trust, Mr Graham Hancock, was also quoted as stating that the trust had originally suggested to the Government that the centre be

located in the city centre, where it could make use of restaurants and other hospitality industries. The article continues:

Mr Polomka, who was an architect for the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide in the 1980s, believes the Tram Barn and Goodman Building should be demolished so that area can revert to parklands.

We saw at that early stage a big start to the process, then there were doubts over it and then, on 22 January 1997, the Hon. Scott Ashenden MP issued a media release headed 'Toast to National Wine Centre', which states:

Minister for Tourism, Local Government, Recreation and Sport, Mr Scott Ashenden, today toasted the State Government's commitment to the building of a National Wine Centre in Adelaide and has confirmed the location as the former Hackney bus depot site.

So, it was on, then off and back on again the following month. It continues:

Mr Ashenden told the Wine and Tourism Council this morning that the State Government was committed to the site adjacent to the Botanic Gardens.

We must remember that in the meantime there had been a change of Premier; the present Premier was in command, and apparently in January the present Premier strongly supported the Hackney bus depot site. The press release continues:

The announcement puts an end to speculation that Mr Ashenden as the new Minister for Tourism was going to change the proposed location of the National Wine Centre.

It took him some time to get around to correcting the *Advertiser's* story. It continues:

'This project is a high priority for the State Government and we will be moving quickly to finalise all the details so we can start building the National Wine Centre to become a major tourist attraction for Australia's wine capital,' Mr Ashenden said.

Former Minister Ashenden stated:

It is most significant that the site at Hackney and the establishment of the National Wine Centre in Adelaide have the full support of the total Australian wine industry.

I know why he said that: it was because a number of wine industry leaders were at that stage white-anting the Hackney site. He went on to say:

The proposed centre will transform the deserted Hackney site into a vibrant centre which will be of major interest to all South Australians and the national wine and tourism industry.

He then went on to repeat what would be in the centre and stated that it would be located in and around the historic Goodman Building and would include a boutique vineyard, extensive wine tasting cellar, exhibits, a wine industry hall of fame and museum. He said that other features included an education centre and theatre, a cafe bistro, an entertainment venue, a specialist library, a wine art gallery (which I am really looking forward to seeing) and wine industry offices. He said that the plans for the National Wine Centre were still being finalised and once they had been completed they would be released for public consultation and submitted to the Adelaide City Council for approval.

We in the Labor Party have given bipartisan support to the National Wine Centre, even though the Opposition was not dealt with honestly in this matter by either the Government or several industry leaders, and that was disappointing. I have already mentioned some of the matters in the past concerning Mr Sutton, but perhaps I should point out how we were then dealt with by Mr Ian Sutton.

Back in April 1997, I received an urgent phone call. I think it followed my sitting next to Brian Croser on a plane trip from Sydney, from memory. I received urgent phone calls requesting a meeting with the Winemakers Federation,

in April 1997, from memory. Also from my memory, that meeting, which was then hastily arranged, because it was in the interests of the national wine industry, included Mr Ian Sutton and Mr John Pendrigh, who met with the then shadow Minister for Tourism as well as me. At that meeting we were told that, unless the Opposition agreed as a matter of urgency, the Hackney wine centre could not be designated as the National Wine Centre of Australia. We were told that, unless the Opposition quickly agreed to come out publicly—and there was a meeting on that Friday—in support of the Hackney site and in support of the National Wine Centre being based here in Adelaide, the national wine industry might give the designation of the National Wine Centre to an alternative centre to be located in Melbourne with the support of Jeff Kennett and the Liberal Government there or even, God forbid, in Canberra.

We were told that we had a couple of days to come out with an announcement, with my support as Leader of the Opposition, committing the Labor Party to the Hackney site. We were told that without bipartisan support issued in an announcement by me the national wine industry would not support the wine centre at Hackney. I indicated support but said I would like to see the plans and designs. The plans are still not available a considerable time later. I said I wanted to discuss it with my shadow Cabinet and Caucus colleagues. To my absolute amazement Mr Ian Sutton suddenly produced a document—an agreement—with my name on it. It was drawn up with absolutely no consultation with me, my colleagues or my office, for me to sign with details committing the Labor Party to the project in a formal agreement between the Winemakers Federation of Australia and the South Australian Labor Party. I have a copy of the agreement, which states:

Winemakers Federation of Australia Incorporated.

This is at the initial meeting, with no plans whatsoever. This is how confident Mr Sutton is. Continuing:

An agreement between the Winemakers Federation of Australia and the South Australian Labor Party as the Opposition. The Winemakers Federation of Australia, the peak national wine industry body, is committed to the establishment of an Australian National Wine Centre. The centre is to be of national perspective capable of achieving international recognition and must be representative of the whole Australian wine industry. The major objective of the facility will be to showcase the excellence and diversity of Australian wine, winemakers and wine regions. The development will consolidate the headquarters of the Australian wine industry and be designed to become the home of Australian wine tourism.

Importantly, the centre will act as a catalyst to encourage people to visit the wine regions of Australia to gain first-hand knowledge of the winery, vineyard, winemakers and their wines. Support is given for the centre to be located on section 571 of the hundred of Adelaide, county of Adelaide, commonly referred to as the old Hackney bus depot. All parties acknowledge that this agreement does not constitute a legally binding contract—

this guy really is Sherlock Holmes—

but is intended to represent an in-principle endorsement for the development to proceed. This support is conditional on satisfactory resolution of issues relating to funding and management of the development. The following parties therefore give their in-principle support for the establishment of the National Wine Centre at the Hackney site. (Signed) Mr Stephen Shelmerdine, President, Winemakers Federation of Australia and Hon. Mike Rann, SA Opposition.

So, without any consultation, without our seeing the plans whatsoever, without even mentioning the word 'legislation' and without telling us that certain buildings were to be bowled over, suddenly they produce an agreement like a little contract for me to sign on the spot, without my going to my colleague the shadow Minister. If that is how the Government

works, no wonder it got itself into a huge problem over this centre.

Obviously, I did not sign it, but I was prepared, with the shadow Minister for Tourism, to make a joint announcement saying that we would like to see the centre based here in South Australia. So, on 16 April, of course always trying to be constructive and positive in Opposition, I issued a statement put out under Trish White's name, as follows:

The State Opposition has called on South Australian businesses to join it and get behind the establishment of a National Wine Centre in Adelaide. Shadow tourism Minister Trish White says the Opposition has declared its strong support for a National Wine Centre in the city. Ms White says South Australia is the home of the nation's wine industry.

She states:

It is logical that we should be the centre of wine tourism in Australia. The National Wine Centre offers South Australia a tremendous opportunity to capitalise on a dynamic, growing and successful industry, which is vitally important for this State's economy. We want this centre to act as a catalyst to encourage tourists to visit South Australia's excellent wine regions, promoting easy access to the Barossa, Clare Valley, the Adelaide Hills and McLaren Vale.

The release continues—and this is obviously a major announcement which captured the imagination of the media and the wine industry in South Australia at the time (just like Capital City did):

The State Labor Leader, Mike Rann, and Ms White met with the wine industry leaders yesterday to discuss the centre. Mr Rann says he believes tourism must cash in on our successful wine industry. As Minister for Business and Regional Development I gave more than \$1 million to the industry to assist in their marketing. The National Wine Centre will ideally complement previous marketing efforts. I agree with the Winemakers Federation that we need a major facility that will showcase the excellence and diversity of Australian wines. It must be based in South Australia and Adelaide is the logical choice as the gateway for the wine regions.

There were then more negotiations and correspondence between us and the Government over the Australian National Wine Centre. I received a telephone call thanking us for that support because they had until Friday to get support from the national body. They asked whether I could not have mentioned Hackney in the release. We were not sure what the Government wanted at that stage, because it kept changing its mind. However, we were given a statement and I want to read from it. From the Winemakers Federation and headed 'Australian National Wine Centre', it states:

Key objectives.

1. To establish a centre of excellence of national perspective capable of achieving international recognition that is representative of the whole Australian wine industry.

Strategic objectives.

1. To create an interpretive, educative and entertaining centre which will promote and entrench Australian wine within the national culture.

2. To reflect the economic and social importance and wide-ranging influence of the wine industry, both within Australia and internationally.

3. To consolidate the headquarters of the Australian wine industry.

4. To be a world class facility designed to become the epicentre for Australian wine tourism.

5. To reinforce industry's learning culture through research and development, environmentally sustainable practices and commitment to innovation and quality.

6. To emphasise and support the delivery of the Australian Wine Industry's *Vision 2025*—

from which I hope to quote later—

Functional objectives.

1. To showcase the excellence and diversity of Australian wine, winemakers and wine regions.

2. To be representative of the whole Australian wine industry.

3. To act as a catalyst to encourage people to visit the wine regions of Australia to gain first-hand experience of the winery, vineyard, winemakers and their wines.

4. To promote the wine industry and associated tourism opportunities nationally and internationally.

5. To educate visitors to a greater understanding of wine.

6. To create a link between food, wine and the Australian lifestyle.

7. To showcase the development of the wine industry and the role it has played in the development of Australia.

8. To take advantage of the opportunities presented by the year 2000 Olympics in Sydney.

9. To create links with other major national and international wine centres.

10. To be the focal point for the dissemination of information about the Australian wine industry.

11. To reflect industry's commitment to responsible consumption of wine.

12. To raise the level of domestic wine sales by promoting the sale of wine to domestic and international markets.

We were told that the National Wine Centre Steering Committee membership would include, as Chairman, John Lamb, who is Managing Director of Southern Television Corporation, Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Commission and Chairman of St Hallett's Wines; from South Australia, Perry Gunner, Executive Chairman, Orlando Wyndham Group; John Pendrigh, Chairman, BRL Hardy Ltd; Ian Sutton, Chief Executive, Winemakers Federation; Brian Croser, Managing Director, Petaluma Ltd; and Philip Laffer, President, South Australian Wine and Brandy Industry Association, and head winemaker, Orlando Wyndham Group.

From Victoria, the board would include Hugh Cuthbertson, President, Victorian Wine Industry Association and Marketing Manager of Mildara Blass. From New South Wales, the board would include Don McWilliam, President, New South Wales Wine Industry Association and Chairman, McWilliam Wines. From Western Australia, the board would include Ian Mayo, President, West Australian Wine Industry Association and Managing Director, Cape Mentelle Wines. While tracing the chequered history of this matter, I received a letter of 13 May 1997 from the Premier of South Australia but signed by the Acting Premier, as follows:

Dear Mike,

Further to your discussions with the Premier, and at his direction today, I am forwarding to you a draft copy of the proposed joint resolution of Parliament to make the Hackney site available to the proposed National Wine Centre. I am also forwarding a copy of a draft Bill to establish the National Wine Centre so that you and your colleagues are fully informed of the approach the Government proposes to take to ensure that South Australia secures this important development.

As we discussed, it is important to gain a clear passage for the National Wine Centre as soon as possible. The sense of urgency is heightened by indications that at least one other State is moving rapidly to pre-empt South Australia. As you are aware, industry has expressed a commitment to South Australia as the location, but has very strong expectations that the State will confirm the arrangement as soon as possible.

I would appreciate an opportunity to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss your response to the draft resolution and Bill.

That was signed, 'Graham Ingerson, Acting Premier'. The draft resolution was as follows:

That this House resolve, pursuant to section 14 of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978, to authorise the Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium to divest itself, and be divested of, control of the following land: (part of section 571, Hundred of Adelaide, County of Adelaide).

I have to say that I did meet with the Deputy Premier, and we had a cordial conversation.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: As we always do.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, and I also met with the Premier. I have to say that no mention of legislation was ever made by the industry itself. When they wanted me to sign along the dotted line, when they wanted me to sign the agreement, they did not mention that there was any legislation. We then came out and announced our support in principle, but obviously I will not sign a document about a wine centre with no plans, no preparation, no funding agreements, and so on.

However, I had conversations with the Deputy Premier, who said there was a reason why there needed to be legislation, and that is because that site was covered by the State Herbarium Act, that we needed to change it, and that there would be controversy in relation to the tram barn, and so on. Again, I asked—and I know he will confirm this—for the plans, the actual design of the building, to see how it complemented existing arrangements. Would it be inside the Goodman Building? Would Tram Barns A, B or C be bowled over? Of course, I could not be given that information. However, I am not criticising the Deputy Premier, because at that stage I thought he was at least trying to be helpful. I am sure that both of us wanted to see the wine industry continue to boom.

However, on 15 May I received a fax from the National Wine Centre Committee. It was addressed to me from Anne Ruston, who was the then Executive Officer of the steering committee, with a copy to the Hon. Graham Ingerson, Deputy Premier, as follows:

Dear Leader,

The Deputy Premier has asked me to provide you with some further details regarding the site and proposed demolition to be undertaken on that site.

This is the demolition part coming in. The fax continues:

Attached is a copy of the draft site map—

this is the first time we saw not a design but a cursory map that could have been done by my son or daughter—

referring to part of section 571, Hundred of Adelaide, County of Adelaide, commonly referred to as the Old Hackney Bus Depot. A formal and detailed survey of the site, including the area of proposed demolition, is currently being undertaken. I will forward you a copy of the final site plan by Tuesday 20 May 1997. The subject land can be defined as located—

and we still do not have it—

in the south-western quadrant of the junction of Hackney Road and Plane Tree Drive, commencing approximately 90 metres north of the intersection of North Terrace and Hackney Road. The site's depth varies between 129 metres and 147 metres and occupies approximately 4.1 hectares of land.

The demolition described in part 3, clause 6(2) of the draft Bill, defined by schedule B, refers to the land currently occupied by Tram Barn A. Specific details of the authorised demolition site are to be included in the survey currently being undertaken.

I trust this information will be of assistance and I will forward the final surveyed areas referred to in schedules A and B to you by Tuesday.

Yours sincerely, Anne Ruston.

Of course, I have to say that this was the same Anne Ruston who was mentioned in a no-confidence motion by me previously regarding her appointment to her position. I want to mention that, because it is important that we understand the genesis of this project. Members will recall that I moved the following no-confidence motion in this House:

That this House has lost confidence in the Deputy Premier as a Minister of the Crown as it is of the view that the Deputy Premier has misled the House in relation to matters surrounding the employment of staff in the South Australian Tourism Commission

and has behaved improperly in the administration of his portfolios; and, further, this House censures the Premier for failing to obtain the resignation of the Deputy Premier or recommend to the Governor the withdrawal of the commission of the Deputy Premier as a result of the Deputy Premier's statements and actions in relation to these matters.

Of course, I was referring to the fact that there had been a misleading of the Parliament by the Deputy Premier, and that related, in part, to the actions involving the appointment of Ms Ruston to the position of Executive Officer of the National Wine Centre. We must remember the very public charges against the Deputy Premier. His former Chief Executive, the head of his department for the previous three years, Michael Gleeson, said that the Deputy Premier put pressure on him to appoint one of the Deputy Premier's former personal staff to a prestigious new tourism job, and the former Chief Executive Officer said that the Minister also told him to fire a senior executive, Rod Hand.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brokenshire): Order! I remind the Leader of the matter of relevance as required by Standing Orders and ask him to bring the debate back to the Bill, which deals with the National Wine Centre.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sir, this relates to the appointment of the Executive Officer of the Wine and Tourism Council. If we are talking about the wine centre, surely this is relevant. We saw the Deputy Premier sack the Chief Executive, who had refused to do his bidding. The Deputy Premier says that he did not influence anyone to hire Ms Ruston or to sack Rod Hand. The Deputy Premier told the House that Mr Gleeson was a bungler and that is why he had to get rid of him, even though the Tourism Commission board, just a month or so earlier, expressed full confidence in Mr Gleeson. As I said, someone was not telling the truth at the time. Of course, there has been considerable debate about a fix or a stitch on this position—it did not go through normal procedures—in terms of getting Ms Ruston the job.

This was a major issue which I believe damaged the credibility of the National Wine Centre. It became a national issue. It was reported nationally, and I know that members of the Liberal Party were phoning the Opposition, not only at night but in the early morning and during the day, to give us information about that appointment. Members would also remember that it related to not only the appointment but also the level of salary—how that position had been advertised at a certain rate; that perhaps Ms Ruston, it was claimed, was not the committee's preferred candidate; and that the Deputy Premier had intervened to appoint Ms Ruston and then bumped up the salary in order to assist someone politically. It was basically a political deal, a stitch.

This went on, and it was very damaging to the National Wine Centre. The *Adelaide Review*, in December 1996, carried an article headed 'A Liberal Dose', written by Jacqueline Willcox Bailey, which read as follows:

Did the Minister of Tourism, and now Deputy Premier, Mr Graham Ingerson, mislead Parliament when he twice denied he had used his influence to appoint his close former aide to a senior position in the South Australian Tourism Commission? Opposition Tourism spokeswoman Trish White asked him, 'What was the Minister of Tourism's involvement in the appointment process of his former adviser, Ms Anne Ruston, to the position of General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council?'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to return to the content of the Bill before the House. The Bill does not relate to appointments to which the Leader of the Opposition is now referring, and I would ask him to come back to the matter contained within the Bill.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to do that, Sir, but I might refer to it later, because new information has come to hand. I guess I could just leave it to the Parliament for another day. I will go through the process. First, it was to be on the Hackney site. Then we were told that it would not be on the Hackney site. Then there was a huge debate over the appointment of the person who was to be the Executive Officer, creating national controversy, absolutely enveloping this project in scandal, intrigue and controversy. Then I was asked to sign on the dotted line for something I had not seen, and refused to do so. I had meetings with the Deputy Premier and the Premier and was told, 'Mike, we want it at the Hackney site. It has to be there. We have to make this decision. We have to proceed apace. We have a few days to decide.' There was all this urgency, but then someone dropped me a copy of a letter addressed to Mr Ian McLachlan, Minister for Defence, and signed by the Premier of South Australia, as follows:

Dear Ian, the South Australian Government is committed to the establishment of a National Wine Centre in Adelaide to showcase the achievements of all of Australia's wine producing regions. This will be an important project for Adelaide and for South Australia as the wine State and has support from the wine industry around Australia.

The project will be a key contributor to tourism development and the national wine industry development. For the project's commercial success, and to consolidate industry's support for it, a location in central Adelaide that maximises tourism opportunities and visitation levels is sought.

The Torrens Parade Ground and associated buildings owned by your department presents itself as a particularly advantageous location. It is centrally located among the cultural tourism institutions in the North Terrace precinct. If it were to be available for development as a home for the National Wine Centre, the unique social history of the site could be preserved and presented to the public alongside complimentary attractions.

I would be grateful for your urgent consideration of whether the Torrens Parade Ground could be made available. Yours sincerely, John Olsen, Premier, Minister for State Development.

The letter was signed on 17 March 1997, two months after the announcement about Scott Ashenden toasting the Hackney site and indicating that all these problems had been resolved and that the final location would be at Hackney. Meanwhile, two months later, we have the Premier writing off to his mate Ian McLachlan and saying that the Government preferred the Torrens Parade Ground. What appalling maladministration of this State by a Government that does not know what it is doing!

I then telephoned the wine industry and said, 'What the hell are you people doing? You come down to see me at Parliament House, asking me to sign off, to sign an agreement about the location at Hackney and, meanwhile, your Premier, the bloke you politically support, is writing off to Ian McLachlan and asking for it be located at the Torrens Parade Ground.' We expect to get national accreditation and we expect to be taken seriously, yet the Government is constantly giving the go ahead and then going in reverse, going forward and then going in reverse, on its preferred site.

What happened then? After giving that in-principle agreement back in April, I thought it was necessary for the South Australian Labor Opposition to rescue this project. In fact, on 27 May 1997, and headed 'Labor backs Hackney site for wine centre', I put out the following statement:

The State Labor Opposition has announced its support for the National Wine Centre to be established in the site previously occupied by the Hackney bus terminal. Labor Caucus this morning backed the Hackney site. State Labor Leader, Mike Rann, said the Premier should immediately announce his support for Hackney and publicly drop plans to have the centre established at the Torrens

Parade Ground. 'The Hackney site is the best available location. We must move now to beat off rival bids by Jeff Kennett in Victoria, by Sydney and even by Canberra. John Olsen's parade ground move would not have served the wine or tourism industry. The whole idea of the National Wine Centre is to establish it in a central location but surrounded by hectares of vines.'

You could not do that down at the Torrens Parade Ground.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is right. Guns and roses—we would have wine and roses down at Hackney. The statement continues:

'It must play the part and look the part. Rows of vines would fit in well with the area adjacent to the Botanic Gardens and Botanic Park. It must enhance the environment, not spoil it.' The shadow Tourism Minister, Trish White, said, 'South Australia must immediately apply for funding from the Federation Fund—

that is the national Federation Fund announced by John Howard last year—

to ensure that the National Wine Centre goes ahead. It is an ideal project for the Federation Fund. The divisions over several sites must stop now.'

Obviously, if the Government does not know which site it wants to choose, how can it expect to have national and industrial support? The statement continues:

The shadow Minister for Tourism said, 'The Parade Ground debacle has damaged and delayed Adelaide's bid for national recognition for our wine centre. It has also angered diggers. We have not seen any plans or designs for the centre.'

That was on 27 May, yet members may recall the letter I received from Ms Ruston and the letter I received from Mr Ingerson telling me that that would occur by the end of the week. We still have not received that information. Of course, it must fit in with the history and heritage of the Botanic Gardens environment and landscape.

I then announced publicly our support and wrote off for support from the Federation Fund to have the Torrens Parade Ground site not designated as the site for the National Wine Centre but designated as an annex of the National War Memorial in Canberra. Indeed, I spoke to the General in charge of the National War Memorial who told me that in a depot of the War Memorial in Canberra there was an enormous amount of militaria, paintings and equipment which came from South Australia and which told the very rich history of the South Australian military. I was told that this material could be made available if there were national support to designate the Torrens Parade Ground site as an annex of the National War Memorial in Canberra.

So, rather than a wine centre, we believe that the Torrens Parade Ground should be a live, active memorial to the sacrifice of the thousands of diggers who have served our State and nation at home and overseas. I still continue to support that. I hope we can get Federation funding for the Torrens Parade Ground to be a designated annex of the War Memorial. It would be a high tech centre which would tell our military history and in many ways tell the history of the State. Also, it would be able to accommodate travelling exhibitions from Canberra. So, we would have the wine centre at Hackney and the Military Museum—a living memorial to wartime sacrifice—at the Hackney Parade Ground. On 27 May I announced that Labor backed the Hackney site. On 2 June I received a letter from Philip Laffer, who is the President of the South Australian Wine and Brandy Association, in which he said:

Dear Mr Rann,

How pleasing it was to receive your news last week supporting the Hackney site for the National Wine Centre.

Obviously the wine industry was pleased that we were supporting Hackney, even if the Government was supporting the Torrens Parade Ground. He went on to say:

The industry in this State has long held the view that Hackney was the ideal location for a centre of excellence from which to showcase and educate about the wines and wine regions of Australia and provide a significant impetus for wine tourism across the country. As noted in your release, the backdrop of the Botanic Gardens provide a superb setting within which vines can be planted to create the natural ambience essential for a project of this stature. The cultural heart of Adelaide along North Terrace and the restaurants of the East End are a stroll away through the gardens. It is no wonder that our interstate colleagues were unanimous in 'signing off' on Hackney as THE site. Congratulations on taking such a strong stand on this matter.

Ms Hurley: Someone had to.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sometimes in Opposition you have to take the lead. He continues:

I look forward to working with you to build a dynamic centre of international standing, an icon which will focus worldwide attention on Adelaide as the wine capital of Australia and on South Australia as the wine State.

Yours sincerely,
Philip Laffer, President.

We were certainly happy to be the catalyst to break the impasse and to get national support. Meanwhile the hapless Government was supporting the Torrens Parade Ground, supporting Hackney, changing its mind and promising everyone plans we still have not seen.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As the member for Peake says, we are pathfinders. This Opposition, unlike our predecessors in Opposition, is always prepared to put the State before Party positions. I also received a letter on 23 June from Phillip Styles, the Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Commission Board, with copies to the Hon. John Olsen, Premier of South Australia, and to Scott Ashenden, Minister of Tourism, stating:

Dear Mr Rann,
National Wine Centre.

At a meeting of the South Australian Tourism Commission Board last week, the board resolved that I write to you regarding the National Wine Centre. As you may be aware, the South Australian Tourism Commission Board has always been a strong advocate for the development of the National Wine Centre at Hackney and would like to express its appreciation to you for the bipartisan support that the project received earlier this year.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: What date was that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It was from Phillip Styles on 23 June 1997. He continues:

A centre of this nature in Adelaide would be a major tourism asset for South Australia and would reinforce the State's reputation as the home of the wine industry in Australia. However, the board is concerned that the recent public debate regarding the centre could seriously damage the project. The coverage of the debate interstate, where the full support may not be known, could have severe detrimental effects on the future of the centre for South Australia.

I presume Phillip Styles was writing to me and talking about the public debate on whether it was Torrens Parade Ground or Hackney. He continues:

The board would greatly appreciate and seek your continued full and positive support for this most important project and essential development that will preserve and promote South Australia's key place in Australia's wine industry.
Yours sincerely, Phillip Styles.

I have enormous time for Mr Styles and recall appointing him to positions when I was Minister for Tourism. Thank God there was some recognition of what the Labor Opposition was doing in terms of rescuing this project. We took on the

political flak. We were prepared to take on the flak from people who opposed the Hackney site. Whilst I was getting support for rescuing the wine centre, I also received quite a bit of flak. One letter states:

Dear Mr Rann,

I am deeply concerned about the Bill which the Government is about to introduce into the House concerning the proposal to locate a national wine museum on Hackney Road. The worst aspect of this intention is that it would alienate for all time an important section of the parklands which should properly be handed over to the Botanic Gardens to enable the fulfilment of the excellent plans its board has for that area. If this does not happen, any further development of the gardens would be impossible. It is proposed that the wine museum be under the control of a Government-appointed board, on which there will be wine industry representation.

From a perusal of the projected aims and objects of the centre it becomes obvious that the whole operation will in effect become a mainly commercial undertaking with an expectation of at least covering costs. If \$40 million is spent on its construction the hope of a satisfactory return on investment seems most unlikely, even ludicrous. The greatest beneficiaries will be winemakers who will have a superb headquarters for their organisation, but have so far shown little if any interest in contributing to the cost of its establishment. Indeed, I have been told that winemakers generally have shown scant interest in the project. South Australia's financial involvement, even if limited to \$20 million, with substantial funds coming from the Commonwealth, would quite rightly be subject to enormous adverse criticism at the present time when there are so many more urgent calls on the public purse.

I am therefore hoping that the Labor Party will oppose this proposal, at least in its present form, particularly bearing in mind that, if it goes ahead and \$20 million proves insufficient to complete the project, the State Government will no doubt be expected to provide the necessary funds for completion. I understand there is an alternative proposal which, whilst involving compromises by all concerned, could well be acceptable. It would be a good idea if a conference of all those involved could be organised before any further action is taken.

I wrote back and said:

The Labor Caucus recently voted on this matter, and has publicly announced its support for the National Wine Centre to be established on this site. We believe this site is the best available location to serve our wine and tourism industries, both of which are extremely important to South Australia's growth and development. The Labor Party is anxious that plans and designs for the centre fit in well with the history and heritage of the area, and with the Botanic Gardens environment and landscape.

We were prepared to take on political flak even though it cost us politically to support tourism and the wine industry. Another letter I received states:

Dear Sir,

The suggestion of using the old Auldana Cellars at Skye for a national wine museum is the only rational one I have yet seen. Really absorbing and atmospheric historical centres that I have visited overseas owed much of their impact (and visitor numbers) to being situated in areas related to and blending with the historical display. Placing the centre in an old historic vineyard, together with old cellars all steeped in the viticultural history of this State, is an opportunity South Australia cannot afford to knock back. The old tram barn should come down and the remaining building at the Hackney site could be used for displays related to the Botanic Gardens, which can be extended to surround it. These displays could be all kinds of art on botanical themes or to a progressive display depicting the evolution of our plants from the era of Gondwana.

The Auldana site should enable the wine centre to be established more quickly. I am sure Jeff would love to have it so close to his city. A progressive walk from North Terrace to the tropical rainforest and onto a display similar to my suggestions would all tie together and be a delightful day out. The phylloxera danger could be eliminated by keeping visitors from entering the vineyards—the explanation making an opportunity to emphasise our disease-free industry.

Actual grapes of each variety could be used in the display in season or for a permanent display, very realistic artificial season or, for a permanent display, very realistic artificial ones. Planting, pruning and picking methods can all be illustrated and explained without visitors setting a foot in an actual vineyard. I beg our

politicians: please do not keep us locked into something so inapt as the Hackney site just to forestall the eastern States from getting in first. We could act in haste and repent forever.

That was sent to me on 27 June. Again, I pointed out that despite that criticism the Labor Party was resolute in supporting the Hackney site.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That's right, leadership which the Government was not prepared to offer. I then received an open letter, sent to me by Ian Gilfillan, which is headed 'Use of a site in the Adelaide parklands for the proposed National Wine Centre' and which states:

A Bill, at present before Parliament in South Australia, allocates a portion of the Adelaide parklands for a National Wine Centre. Alienation of that site for commercial purposes as proposed would be the worst assault on the integrity of the parklands in our time. The parklands surrounding the City of Adelaide constitute Adelaide's most precious feature, defining its character and adding immeasurably to the beauty and amenity of the city. The parklands surround the city with an unbroken ring of open space for the enjoyment of all South Australians.

The site concerned is located at Hackney on an area that was designated as parkland in Colonel Light's plan for the city. It was open space until 1908. The Government of the day then allocated it for the use of the Municipal Tramways Trust which built upon the site. By 1992, it had been vacated, although two heritage listed buildings, the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A, remained. The Government then dedicated the site as Botanic Park and Gardens. This restored the status of the site as parkland. Its dedication for this purpose was supported by all political Parties and welcomed by the community at large.

It goes on to say:

The Bill now before Parliament establishes the National Wine Centre, nullifies the dedication of the site as Botanic Park and Gardens and allocates it for the use of the centre. The functions of the centre are: to serve as the national headquarters—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There's a famous Billy Joel song that goes: 'I don't like clever conversation, I never want to work that hard.' That sums up the Deputy Premier's interjections.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Do you want to keep going?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The letter states:

The functions of the centre are: to serve as the national headquarters of the Australian wine industry; to promote the Australian wine industry; to promote tourism associated with the industry; to provide exhibits, tastings, classes, etc. for the public. We support the idea of establishing a National Wine Centre in Adelaide for the purposes indicated in the Bill but not in the manner proposed on this site.

Although the functions include provision of some public facilities, the centre is to be a commercial self-funding corporate body acting for the wine industry. Alienation of parkland for commercial purposes in support of an industry is an unprecedented step. It establishes a new criterion for alienation of parkland from the people of South Australia. All previous alienations have been for State purposes.

The Bill is not specific about developments on the site. Neither capital budgets nor business plans for ongoing operation of the centre are public. However, the State Government has allocated \$20 million, and the State will seek a grant of a similar amount from the Commonwealth Federation Fund. The possibility of a \$5 million or \$6 million contribution from the wine industry has been indicated.

It goes on to say:

Indications have also been given that the steering committee for the centre favours use of the Goodman Building, construction of a new building of approximately 5 000 square metres and planting a demonstration vineyard. These plus staff and visitor car parks would occupy about 4 hectares of the site leaving about one-third for landscaping, etc.

Allocation of Adelaide parkland to a corporate body established for commercial purposes in support of an industry would be a major assault on the integrity of the parklands. Construction of a major new building will detract from the character of the parklands as open space. We support the State initiative to establish a National Wine Centre in Adelaide with Federation Fund assistance but not if it were to be in the manner proposed on this site.

We request all South Australian members of both State and Federal Parliaments to consider their personal responsibility for protecting the open space character of the Adelaide parklands for the people of South Australia, to consider the impact of this Bill on the Adelaide parklands, and to use their influence to have the National Wine Centre established in Adelaide with support from the Federation Fund but not on the site proposed in the Bill.

The signatories are: Ian Gilfillan, Chairperson, Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association; John Chappel, Acting Chairman, Architecture Foundation of South Australia; Ted Dexter (not the former English Cricket Captain, now Lord Dexter), Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, South Australia; Margaret Lee, Secretary, Civic Trust of South Australia; Jasmine Rose, President, Conservation Council of South Australia; Necia Gilbert, President, Friends of the Botanic Gardens; Phillipa Menses, Director, National Trust of South Australia; Edgar Briedis, Chairman, North Adelaide Society; David Butterworth, President, Preserve Kent Town Association; Peter Balan, President, St Peters Residents Association; Kim Voss, Chairperson, South Australian Council of Open Space Preservation Associations; Paul Downton, Convenor, Urban Ecology Australia; and Rick Abbott, Committee, Victoria Park Action Group.

That is the kind of political pressure that I was put under, but unlike this Government my colleagues and I did not buckle. We did not change our mind; we announced our support for Hackney. We copped it on the chin from distinguished people such as these, leaders of the environmental movement, the community movement, and movements in marginal seats in South Australia, such as Norwood and so on. We bit the bullet and supported the Hackney site even though it cost us politically. That is the difference between the Opposition and members of the Government who were too busy brawling amongst themselves, looking after their mates in the industry, appointing political advisers to prestigious positions and fixing up the salary to get on with the main game.

As to this attack on us by these distinguished leaders who said that we should act in the interests of the State and not in the interests of a particular commercial proposition or industry, I reject that totally. There is no other industry that can equal in terms of symbolism and future importance the wine industry in this State. By backing the wine industry you back South Australia: you support jobs, exports, an environmentally sustainable industry and tourism. That is so important. That letter was presented on 24 June, but it did not cause us to blink in any way. Again in June the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide and the State Herbarium issued a media release headed 'The Botanic Gardens and the National Wine Centre', which states:

At its meeting today, the board of the Botanic Gardens considered the Government's decision to introduce a Bill to establish the National Wine Centre in the Hackney precinct. Following the meeting, the Chairman, Mr Clive Armour, made the following statement:

'The board of the Botanic Gardens is disappointed that the Government with bipartisan support of the Opposition—

hear that, Deputy Premier, who wants to have a go at me— has decided to establish the wine centre on the Hackney Depot.

Of course, Mr Armour is the head of ETSA. He must be doubly disappointed: he seems to be having everything sold from under him. Mr Armour continues:

The board has seen the transfer of the former bus depot to the Botanic Gardens as a fulfilment of a long-term commitment to return the land to Adelaide's green belt.

I am quoting Mr Armour, the Chairman of the board of the Botanic Gardens. He states further:

The Botanic Gardens' own plans for the restoration of the area as part of the open space around the city, and as a complement to the Bicentennial Conservatory, had been inhibited by lack of funds and by the heritage status of the buildings on the site.

The board believes that it is not in the long-term interest of South Australia that this land be again alienated from the green belt. Notwithstanding its disappointment—the bipartisan decision having been made—the board believes that the gardens should now work cooperatively with the wine centre to achieve an optimum outcome for both parties.

That means the wine centre and the botanic gardens, not the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. It continues:

The board believes that any plans for the future of the site should allow an open view of the Bicentennial Conservatory and maintains its view that Tram Barn A should be removed. The board looks forward to developing plans in conjunction with the wine centre to enhance the existing beauty of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens and the visual splendour of the Bicentennial Conservatory.

Here we have the Botanic Gardens board saying that it does not want this but will cop it because a bipartisan decision has been made. Again, that added to the political pressure on the Labor Party before the election—the political pressure that we resisted. I should say, by the way, that when I met with Mr Sutton and co. and talked about how it was vitally important—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very happy because one day Ian Sutton will want to come to see me and I am looking forward to welcoming him into my office.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let me just tell you: he will not be there either because we know how honest he is in his dealings with public officials.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We were told by the industry that, if we supported it and were prepared to sign off, there would be a joint announcement of the centre by the Government and the Opposition. What a load of codswallop! Whom do these people think they are kidding? They got support from us and they duded us, but we are still supporting it: I do not support Ian Sutton but I support the industry, and that is the difference. Members opposite in the Government were prepared to play politics with this National Wine Centre and lurch from incompetence to incompetence in the process. I then received a letter dated 17 July 1997 from Mr Ian Sutton of the Winemakers Federation of Australia, and I quote:

Further to our communication last week, the National Wine Centre Steering Committee in a meeting this morning decided to propose a program to satisfy your concerns for a process of public involvement and, at the same time, ensuring that the project is not unduly delayed. As mentioned in our letter last week, we are concerned that the proposed PER process and its associated politicking could well see another State exploit the perceived uncertainty about the project. We are also concerned that the PER process, following advice from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Crown Solicitor's Office, could cause a delay in the delivery of the project by four months. If this were to happen we believe we could well lose the all important opportunity for promotion and international visitation in the lead-up to the 2000 Olympic Games.

Here is Ian Sutton writing to me on 17 July saying that if there was the adequate consultation for which we asked this could delay the project by four months. We supported the damn site. We supported it right down the line. We copped the criticism and political flak on the chin. We were prepared to be resolute, unlike the Government, but we asked for consultation about the removal of tram barns and so on. And we were told that this could delay the project by four months. It is now March and they have changed the design and location yet again. That is how resolute they are about getting it up and running for the 2000 Olympic Games. This was about giving the hapless Premier—who is not here today—some political brownie points for the election. The *Financial Review* described him as 'the loser of the century'. It was about politics: it was not about the wine industry. That is what this Government is about: it is about how to make the Government look better than it is; how to fix up a few mates with jobs; how to fix up their salaries; how to fix up a few mates in the industry; and how they will back up politically. That is what this was about.

The delays were not coming from the Opposition at all. We were prepared to put ourselves on the line. We saw delays from an incompetent Government that could not decide what it wanted, where it wanted it, what the location was, what the purpose was and so on. Let me return in a bipartisan way to the Winemakers Federation letter, and I quote:

If this were to happen we could well lose the all important opportunity for promotion and international visitation in the lead-up to the 2000 Olympic Games.

Let us hope that it has not been lost, Deputy Premier. Let us hope your bungling has not lost the opportunity to exploit and capitalise on the 2000 Olympic Games. The letter continues:

The National Wine Centre Steering Committee provide the following proposal for your consideration and support.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Premier accused me of lying. I would like him to withdraw that statement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the statement.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I withdraw.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to see that he withdrew with sincerity.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It will not be in a minute; it will be later this evening. We will bring in a CD or perhaps a little radio so you can dance along or tap your feet to Elton. The letter continues:

The National Wine Centre Steering Committee provide the following proposal for your consideration and support.

- Public display and presentation of at least three alternative design options to special interest groups and the South Australian community in general.
- Receipt of submissions and considered assessment of all submissions prior to the selection of final design by the steering committee.
- The final design, including the model, to be on display at Wine Industry House at Magill.
- Application lodged with the Development Assessment Commission and relevant council.
- For the DAC to call for public submissions via a notice in State paper.
- Members of the public to have 30 business days to provide comments to the DAC.
- DAC reports to the Minister on the application.
- DAC report to include comments from the public.

- Minister must, as soon as practicable after determining the application, prepare a report on this matter and have copies laid before both Houses of Parliament.

This is Ian Sutton writing to me, the one who said that I was going to be part of the big announcement, the one who wanted me to sign on the dotted line. The letter continues:

These additional provisions will be undertaken in parallel to the requirements of a section 49 Crown development process. This process is a formalisation of our intentions to involve the community in our project and will ensure the project timetable is maintained. Please be assured that the Winemakers Federation of Australia is strongly committed to the sincerity and integrity of this proposed process.

In so doing, we believe we can satisfy your concerns regarding a formal and satisfactory consultation process. The industry would also like to assure you that we understand the sensitivities of the site and will only support a development that enhances the site. The industry has a reputation for architecture that reflects the history, culture and ethos of our industry and the National Wine Centre will be no different. We urge you to give your support to allowing the National Wine Centre project to progress without the requirement of a full PER process.

We have supported the legislation and the site, and now they are wanting me to bail them out again. The Government is still rowing about it; the Premier is writing to Ian McLachlan indicating that he prefers it to be at the Torrens Parade Ground, making the Deputy Premier look totally foolish. The Deputy Premier knows that he had my support right down the line; he knows he had my support, and the Deputy Premier also knows about the file I had on appointments which I did not use because I am not into that. I believed it was very important that the National Wine Centre go ahead.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I would like an apology from the Deputy Premier and a withdrawal of the word 'scumbag'. It is the sort of thing which we hear in Canberra and which we do not want in this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a parliamentary term, and I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I withdraw.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased that the Deputy Premier was—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Good. And I will get a chance in the third reading stage, because I have some more to talk about later. So, we were told:

We urge you to give your support to allowing the National Wine Centre project to progress without the requirement of the full PER process. Please be assured that the wine industry is committed to the delivery of a world class facility that will be sensitively and appropriately integrated with its surrounds and in which all Australians can be proud.

So, on 17 July they were asking the Labor Party to fix it up, to limit the consultation procedure so they could get the thing going, and again we assisted and got behind the project. And now we have another location; we have to come back to Parliament to fix them up once again. That was in July and during the election campaign we saw more announcements about the wine centre. That was the next thing; it was obviously political. Somehow, I was not invited to that press conference. They needed my support to fix up the Government and get this project under way. They wanted us to remove public controversy from it, but of course nothing was returned in kind from Mr Sutton. The Deputy Premier says he is not a big fan of mine: I would be greatly offended if he were. On 30 January this year I put out this press release, headed 'Major Wine Centre Blow-out?', which states:

The Olsen Government should end industry speculation of a major blow-out in cost of the proposed National Wine Centre at Hackney according to the State Opposition. Deputy Labor Leader Annette Hurley says that the wine industry is concerned by rumours that the wine centre will now need an extra multi-million dollar cash injection. Ms Hurley says last year State Parliament gave bipartisan support to pass Government legislation to enable the wine centre to be located in historic buildings at the former Hackney bus depot. [She stated] 'According to senior Liberal sources the Premier has now approved substantial changes to the project to ensure it proceeds despite the blow-out.'

Once again the Liberals were on the telephone; they always wanted to talk to us about appointments, positions, salaries and all that sort of thing.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is on 30 January. He says it is made up; we will check the next release. The Deputy Leader stated:

According to senior Liberal sources the Premier has now approved substantial changes to the project to ensure it proceeds despite the blow-out.

We had been told during the election campaign that the whole thing was happening apace, although it was quite clear to us that nothing whatsoever was happening. Meanwhile, the industry rowed and the Government dithered. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say:

There have been growing concerns in the wine industry about delays to the project, which should have commenced before the state election

We were also told by Liberal sources that they wanted to have a turning of the sod; the Premier would be down there with the Deputy Premier and there would be a wine backdrop of barrels and so on. He was to turn the sod and perhaps John Howard would fly in to announce national support from the Federation Fund. But that did not happen, because they could not even get their act together, even though their biggest concern was political—not to assist the industry. Then the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that, again, there had been enormous concerns in the wine industry about delays to the project which should have commenced before the last State election. She went on to say:

The project has been dogged by controversy, including concerns over the site of the centre—with debate over locating it at the Torrens Parade Ground, and the appointment of staff. It is understood that significant extra funds may now have been allocated to cater for major changes following submissions taken up by Deputy Premier Graham Ingerson.

That was issued by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at 7 a.m. on 30 January. That is very interesting; the Deputy Premier says we did not know what was going on and that we made up our Liberal leaks and sources. Well, on that very same day, about seven hours after that release went out on Friday 30 January, a media release went out from Terrace Towers, issued by the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. John Olsen, headed: 'Friday 30 January 1998: National rose garden to be incorporated in national wine centre.' I will read from that, because you can then see how the changes were made. Again, the rose garden was added to help to disguise the fact that there had been a huge stuff-up. The press release states:

The South Australian Government today released new concept plans for the National Wine Centre which will incorporate a national rose garden with more than 10 000 rose bushes. The project now includes the integrated development of a number of significant attractions, including the national rose garden, the national rose trial garden adjacent to the National Wine Centre and Botanic Garden.

This is a few months after the election campaign, when it was all supposed to be going hunky-dory and proceeding apace, although we had noticed that nothing was happening. We did not want to use it during the election campaign, because we felt that we should not make a point of it then, particularly following the no-confidence motion in the Deputy Premier which resulted in his having to come into this Parliament to apologise and clarify and which resulted with a headline in the *Advertiser* 'Oh, really, Mr Ingerson?' We all remember that, but we decided that in the interests of the wine industry and tourism we would not raise this matter about the delays and the lack of action during the election campaign. We could easily have scored political points but we decided not to; we decided to support the industry and tourism and not make it a political issue.

I will quote what the Premier said five or six hours after the Deputy Leader of the Opposition told the truth that there had been a major change and an extra injection of money. His press release states:

Releasing the plans today, Premier John Olsen said the area would be a precinct of botanical and horticultural significance. 'Importantly, under the proposal, all heritage buildings can be retained and incorporated in the new development, including the Goodman Building, Tram Barn A and Yarrabee House,' [Mr Olsen said]. 'This delivers on a Government election promise to establish a national rose garden of international significance. Adelaide serves as a perfect backdrop on which to highlight the links between wine and rose production.'

That was a nice try; it needs a bit of work, but it was a nice try. We have not reached the bit where he states that they have changed the site and the location, not up to the Torrens Parade Ground but still in the rough vicinity. The press release continues:

The city is known as the rose and wine capital of Australia,—with 60 per cent of the nation's commercial and domestic roses grown in South Australia—a fact we are very proud of.

The Premier did not mention that we also produce 60 per cent of the nation's wines, including the vast majority of the nation's premium wines. The release continues:

Mr Olsen says the National Wine Centre will be a world class facility which will promote the international status of Australian wine and will become the central headquarters for the Australian national wine industry. The Government has committed \$20 million to the construction of a National Wine Centre and the industry has committed more than \$5 million in planting, equipment, maintenance of vineyards, memorabilia and cash.

So, the State Government was putting in \$20 million and the industry \$5 million, although it is a bit of a blur as to whether it was real money, real cash or a bit of equipment and memorabilia. Later I will ask the Deputy Premier how you quantify the value of that memorabilia. It is very hard to do, even though it is important that the industry put in. The press release further states:

In addition the Government has applied for a further \$14 million from the Federation Fund. If this funding is forthcoming, the project can be significantly scaled up—however, the wine centre will proceed whether or not that funding is granted.

So, first, the Premier announced in Milan that the wine centre would be funded by the industry; they would put in a loan of \$10 million to help underwrite it but it would be funded by the industry. Now we see that the cost is ratcheting up, million by million. Now we hear not only that the State Government has to put in tens of millions of dollars but also the Federal Government is on a promise, we hope, to put in an extra \$14 million. It says here:

The State Government has applied to John Howard for a further \$14 million from the Federation Fund.

It says that the plans for the new centre would actually incorporate that extension but it would still go ahead even if the money was not there from the feds. I guess the State Government may have to put in the \$14 million or some of it and we will have another Deputy Premier blow-out.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: Ask me the question and I will fix it up.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He will fix up the question like he fixed up the job of Executive Officer of the association. I continue to quote, as follows:

Adelaide Lord Mayor, Jane Lomax-Smith, said the State Government had responded to the concerns of the various parties about the National Wine Centre.

She goes on to say:

I am pleased they have worked out a solution that returns the maximum amount of land to parklands. . . They are going to fast track the magnificent rose garden, which will enhance the Adelaide International Rose Festival. State heritage listed buildings will be restored—

this is from Jane Lomax-Smith—

which is a win/win situation for all concerned.

It goes on to state:

The City of Adelaide will have the opportunity to collaborate with the Botanic Gardens and use our nursery facility for joint purposes.

Here we go again. We found out later in the day something else that was not mentioned in the press release. The Premier had to rush out that press release because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had blown the gaffe and announced there was a blow-out and major design changes. In fact, there was no mention in the Premier's statement that the location had changed. That had to come later. We found out later in the day that it was not the wine centre which we had approved in this Parliament, which we had been told was a dead certainty and had the financial backing of the industry, and the cost of which the Government was simply underwriting. It involved tens of millions of dollars from the State Government with the hope of leveraging more money from the Federal Government for a big and expanded wine centre but at a new location—and that new location has to be moved up and around the corner onto North Terrace.

Despite the letter and assurances I got from the Deputy Premier in April 1997 indicating that the Opposition would get all the facts and briefings, plans, designs and architectural drafts we wanted and despite the letter from Anne Ruston which said that by the end of the week we would be getting the plans, it is now nearly a year later. It has gone from the Adelaide Botanic Gardens Hackney depot site, a \$10 million project funded by the industry, to the Torrens Parade Ground. There was big uncertainty about whether the project would proceed. Then there was backing and then it has gone back to the Hackney depot and the Opposition, and I had to step in and rescue the project in order to get national accreditation. I am pleased it was recognised by people like Phillip Styles and the key industry groups that without the Opposition's support the project could not go ahead.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is interesting. The Deputy Premier is now disputing those facts. The fact is that I met with the Deputy Premier in his office and I met with the Premier in his office and they both told me that bipartisanship was absolutely essential to get this project to go ahead. That is what you got, because you are the Government. I know you nearly blew it and nearly lost the election, but you got bipartisan support from the Opposition. We came into this

Parliament without seeing the plans and we still have not seen them. We have not even seen a model. I would like to see the architectural plans.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Deputy Premier interjects and says, when I ask for the architectural plans for the wine centre, that I will get them when he gets them. The Government has announced tens of millions of dollars of State funds for this project. The project has already been before Parliament once. We now have to come back and change the location and design of the project, but the Deputy Premier has not seen the plans either. What on earth are we doing here? The Deputy Premier has to answer that question tonight. If he does not know what the plans or their scope are, how can we be assured that there will not be another funding blow-out? How can we be assured there will not be another taxpayers' blow-out on this project? The Opposition has been more loyal to his project than his own Premier has been—and he has to acknowledge that—because the Deputy Premier did not know that the Premier had written to Ian McLachlan telling him about the change in location. Is that true?

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You knew about the change in location?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader should direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If you knew—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If the Deputy Premier did know that the Premier was trying to do a secret deal with Ian McLachlan to get the wine centre located on the Torrens Parade Ground he should have had the decency to tell me when he sought the Opposition's support, because I was told by Ian Sutton and the wine industry that they did not know that the Government was talking to the Federal Government about locating it at Torrens Parade Ground. If the Deputy Premier is now saying that the industry and he knew about the Premier's letter, then I have been totally lied to by the Government and the industry. If a deal was done about the Torrens Parade Ground—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will not use the word 'lie' in this Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We will deal with other matters later tonight—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You are dead right, there will be, because you told me that the Hackney depot was your preferred location and that you needed accreditation to achieve that. That is what you said. If we find out by your tabling that document that you were involved with the Premier in trying to dub the industry by doing a backdoor deal over the Torrens Parade Ground, then you stand condemned and there will be another no-confidence motion.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: We'll fix you tonight.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You had to apologise last time and you will have to apologise again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'The biggest crook in this Parliament', is what the Deputy Premier just said and I ask

him to withdraw that. I do not know if he is referring to me or himself, but I would like him to withdraw it and apologise.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat and I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw that remark. It is an unparliamentary remark.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Mr Speaker, I withdraw.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. I want to try to facilitate the passage of this legislation as soon as I can, because we have been the people out there supporting this proposal despite the political flack we have received. Let us remember what we are doing here tonight. We are making a parliamentary and legislative admission that we got it wrong last time in the legislation.

Ms Hurley: We had to rush it through.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We had to rush it through because otherwise we would miss the Olympics and lose it to Jeff Kennett or Canberra. We would not have a chance of getting national accreditation for the centre at Hackney to be the National Wine Centre, and the Deputy Premier has just concurred in that. Despite all the argy-bargy and all the self-created controversy and scandal that afflicted the project, we came into the Parliament before an election and, in the interests of the State, passed legislation which basically committed the Government and this Parliament to a particular site. We were told that it had to happen, would happen and would actually be under way within months, because otherwise there would be a four-month delay. We cooperated with the Deputy Premier, who led us up the garden path. What we are doing today is not really just adding to the legislation but saying that last year we got it all horribly wrong. We were conned about the site, the funding, the design and the politics of the whole process.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That's fine. If you want, you can often get things asked in Dorothy Dix fashion, but you usually get yourself into trouble. The 'Oh, really, Mr Ingersons!' did not do you a great deal of credit in terms of your position in your own Party. We are now saying that, as part of the revised proposal, the national wine industry, the Botanic Gardens Board, which previously criticised it, and the National Rose Society of Australia have given their support to the amended proposal, as has the Adelaide City Council. As part of the revised proposal, the National Wine Centre would be repositioned to the site currently occupied by the Botanic Gardens Administration and the service area, and the State Herbarium, with these functions to be relocated to the retained Goodman Building and Tram Barn A. In order to facilitate this new expanded proposal, it will be necessary to redefine the areas under the care, control and management of the Botanic Gardens and the National Wine Centre authorities.

It is proposed that today we take action to transfer the land between the two statutory authorities to take place on a date to be fixed by proclamation to coincide with the practical completion of the new facilities of the Botanic Gardens administration and the State Herbarium, and prior to commencing construction of the National Wine Centre. We are prepared to support this, because I want to be positive today. But the Government must not get it wrong again. I point out to the honourable member that in future he should not come in here with a project such as this just before an election and, because it has to get national accreditation, pretend that it has to be passed straight away in order to be in place for the 2 000 Olympics. All we have seen is delay upon delay, and we have been conned in the process.

I am interested in what is happening to the \$14 million from the Federal Government, which was announced with great gusto on 30 January. As I recall, the Premier explained the new location by saying that we had to plant the roses, shift it over and that it was a better position for tourism. He then went on to say that \$14 million had been applied for from the Federation Fund. I want to know what chance we have of achieving that funding. At what stage are the negotiations? Will the Premier raise this matter with John Howard on Friday at the Premiers' Conference, or has an agreement already been reached for the Prime Minister to fly in during the election campaign to somehow try to get political mileage out of this centre that was botched last time just prior to the State election? That is what this seems to be mostly about.

Last year, we really had to hurry up so that we could make a joint announcement in a bipartisan way. There was the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, Ian Sutton, John Pendrigh and Brian Croser all sitting in a row saying, 'We are doing this for the good of the State,' when the rush to judgment in a parliamentary sense and in terms of funding was really about the State election and not about the industry. That is the difference between the Government and us. We took on this project and supported it in order to help the industry proceed, yet we have seen a bunch of people, including a few of those in the industry, decide to play politics.

I suspect that it will be a matter of, 'Here we go again!' What we are doing now is supporting legislation for this project, the design of which is uncertain, because the Deputy Premier has told us he has not seen the design. I have not seen the design. I was promised it by the Deputy Premier and Anne Ruston last April and May, but I still have not seen the design plans. The Premier and the Deputy Premier promised that I would have the details within a week. However, I still have not seen those details. Today, the Deputy Premier is asking us to sign off on the dotted line in a legislative sense about a project whose funding is uncertain, whose design has not been drawn up yet and whose administration is still under a cloud. In order to expedite this matter, I will draw my discussion to a close and indicate that the Labor Party supports the Bill.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to support the Bill. I wish to make a couple of comments. First—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: You won't be going to the concert, my son. You won't be going home until 12.30, so get used to it. I was not going to the concert, anyway. I am quite happy to sit here and do my duty at any time, as most members know. I noted the import of the previous Bill introduced by the Premier to sell ETSA and Optima. I will now speak on the National Wine Centre. I noted the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, who spoke for nearly two hours. His speech was so repetitious. I had to agree with some of it, because I have been vitally involved in the negotiation process. I have known of the complications, the hassles and the problems. I was quite disgusted with the speech, because the honourable member was a Minister of the previous Labor Government that lost the Grand Prix. To carry on as he did today, with prevarication and delay tactics, I think was quite disgusting. He began by—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I remind the member for Hart that I went to the Grand Prix when it was up for negotiation. A leaflet

was being handed around by the Labor Government at the time stating that, if you voted for the Liberal Party, we would lose the Grand Prix. In effect—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: You check your diary. The fact is that we had already lost it. If you do not believe it, have enough courage to read it. We know all about that. I will comment on what the Leader had to say. I did not appreciate his continual knocking. I, too, went to the National Convention of the Liberal Party, and I heard a brilliant speech by Dame Leonie Kramer. I was very impressed with what she said about the role of Government and that of Opposition. I get a little tired of the knocking that goes on continually, because it brings the House and the whole system of Government into disrepute. I want to refer to the comments of the Leader—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: If you listen you might learn something. The Leader commented about the Barossa Wine and Tourism Centre, and I support what he said. I was not aware that it was a directive of the previous Labor Government but, if it was, congratulations are in order, because it did something right. I note the success of this centre now, particularly under the management of Barry Salter and his staff, who are doing a very good job. If the decision to set it up was made in September 1993, it was a good decision of the previous Labor Government. That is two that I can recall now. The other one was the dual highway to Port Wakefield. I am quite prepared to give credit where it is due.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Did you say Marineland or the Morgan to Burra road? I give previous Minister Blevins credit for completing small sections of that road on the Burra to Spalding side, but the major project was done by this Liberal Government. I give Labor the credit for Marineland, although we have not heard the end of that one yet. I will return to the Bill, because I am being diverted by the Opposition. I welcome the effort put in by the previous Government in respect of the Barossa Wine and Tourism Centre. It is very successful under its current management of Barry Salter and his crew. I pay them the highest tribute because they organised the recent hugely successful Julio Iglesias concert, as well as the Shirley Bassey concert prior to that. It was a huge project to take on and a huge risk to organise concerts like that. If things go horribly wrong, the risks are huge. You have to give somebody a bit of credit—come on, do not knock all the time. Be real.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr VENNING: No, I did not get a free ticket. In fact, they were not cheap. I hope the BWTA receives the credit for the success of those concerts. The Leader commented about the expo in Sydney. I must agree. I was horrified when it went to Darling Harbour, but we had little say in respect of that matter. It should have been here in South Australia. I am very parochial about South Australia and particularly the Barossa Valley.

I am honoured to represent probably the most recognisable wine region in the world. As I travel around Australia and very occasionally overseas, I am asked where I come from. I say South Australia but, when I say the Barossa Valley, the eyes light up. If I mention Jacobs Creek, that switches them on. In particular, the English know all about the Barossa. We have a very recognisable area, and I am very cognisant of that. I also noted the comments about the National Wine

Centre being in the Barossa. As the Leader said, and correctly, it is like Bordeaux in France. It is in the region. I believe that it could have been located there, because the precedence is there already. I agree with the Leader, who made some very good points. As I have said, the Barossa is a very recognisable wine region.

The Leader spoke today about the document that he did not sign. I am aware of that, and I can understand that he did not wish to sign it. But it did not matter that he did not, because he gave a commitment, and we needed that commitment because we knew other eyes were looking at this project. We needed a bipartisan approach to save it. I say again that that expression of support was necessary and appreciated. That is what the document was all about. I know it has taken a long time but, in the end, I believe we certainly now have the right decision.

Being the member for Schubert, I have great pride in representing the most famous wine region, the Barossa. I wish to report to the House the wonderful evening I had a couple of weeks ago in this place with Mrs Max Schubert and her family. As I said in my first speech as the member for Schubert, I am very honoured to be the member for Schubert and to be linked so closely and intrinsically to the wine industry via the late Max Schubert, and it was certainly a pleasure to have his wife and family present when I made that speech, and even more pleasing to drink a bottle of Grange Hermitage—the real stuff—and, more importantly, to have the wine decanted by his lovely wife with instructions written by Max. It was a top night, and I will long remember it.

Having spoken to numerous members of the industry, I know that the centre has very strong support from both grape growers and wine producers. It not only enhances the already strong profile of the State's world renowned wine region but also promotes our increasingly important tourist industry. After all, as the Leader correctly said, the State crushes 60 per cent of all the grapes for wine production in this country. Therefore, it only makes sense that we have the centre here in South Australia.

We have seen how other capital cities do not possess the same levels of entrepreneurial expertise as South Australia. The Grand Prix has been a recent example of this because, now that it is held in Melbourne, it is deemed to be just another event. It has been absorbed into the enormity of that city, but international celebrities, such as George Harrison, have actually attested to that fact. Adelaide hosted a much more vibrant event with significantly more patronage. I was at the last Adelaide Grand Prix, and it certainly was magnificent. Adelaide does do it right. Members need only look at the recent Festival, and I was involved with the Fringe Festival. We seem to give it something extra, and it is appreciated by the patrons.

As you know, Mr Speaker, a cheque for \$310 000 was handed to the Premier just the other day by the Chairman of the Festival. This shows that, under the guidance of the Liberal Government, world class events can be run at a profit, and we should all applaud that. I know that some commentators stated that the Festival was driven more by accountants than by artists. But we must all live in the real world and realise that, in most cases, money does make the world go around. I wonder whether previous Labor Governments would have been able to achieve that. Certainly there was not an accountant in sight when the State Bank disaster was at its height.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr VENNING: It is important to acknowledge and highlight the Government's achievements and policy directions. As the Premier stated, the Labor Party is a policy-free zone and all it can do is knock, knock, knock. Tonight we have heard that yet again. It is understandable that the National Wine Centre be located in the capital city and not in a regional area, although I did and still do believe that Chateau Tanunda was an ideal site for the centre. Anybody who knows the Valley would know Chateau Tanunda. It is a magnificent building and I had a desire that the centre be located there as it was tailor made for it. I strongly believe that the centre must have close links with the grape growing and wine producing regions of the State. It would be extremely errant of us if these regions did not benefit from the tourist dollar that the centre should attract and promote, as I am positive it will. The management of the centre will have to closely liaise with these regions.

The Chateau is a magnificent building and would be ideal. It was for sale when we were discussing this legislation earlier. I did all that I could to try to attract the centre for the Barossa. First, it was the most historic region and, secondly, the building was tailor made sitting in 40 acres of existing vineyard. It is an excellent location. It has not happened and I can understand why. I spoke to many people in the industry and I am pleased that the Chateau has now been sold to a Mr Geber of Cowra Wines. I am confident we will see a magnificent development at Chateau Tanunda in the not too distant future.

I concede that we must look at the bigger picture concerning a national centre. A leading industry spokesman in the Barossa, to whom I spoke today, says that we must equally represent and respect the other wine regions of our State and country to be truly national, otherwise we will end up alienating them, the final result being failure. I appreciate, as the Leader said this afternoon, the cooperation with other States in relation to the centre, having representations on the management committee. We must work as a united team on this to involve all the regions.

Another vital reason for this approach is that we all know that our friend, Jeff Kennett, from across the border would be only too pleased to get out his cheque book and pump dollars into such a proposal to secure it for Melbourne. We must be aware of this and not treat it as a *fait accompli*. Until it is built I would not discount Jeffrey coming over and doing yet another poaching job.

The industry spokesman advised that in his opinion the City of Adelaide was a suitable location as we are regarded as the central State, being centrally located between the wine regions in the eastern States and those to the west. The industry as a whole has grasped and warmed to the concept that South Australia is the wine State of the nation. However, we have further work to do in making Adelaide and South Australia the brand name of the wine industry. He went on to say that the industry as a whole would not accept the centre's being located in the Barossa and, anyway, that would probably increase the tourist traffic by only 5 per cent. Why would you want to alienate the rest of the industry for that? It would not be worth the damage it would cause.

My daughter will be married on the weekend and we are using Ayers House. I was horrified, and I put on the record, that it uses wines not necessarily bottled here in South Australia. I attended another wedding in the Bradman Room at the Adelaide Oval and the same applied—they use wines not necessarily produced in South Australia, although of good average quality. I was ashamed that a premier restaurant in

South Australia, with a historic background, is serving wines that I would class as fair to average quality. I inquired as to what I should do about bringing my own wine. I could do that but, would you believe, the corkage, as the member for Ross Smith would appreciate, is \$8 a bottle. I really had no choice. I am sure we will have a grand night. I put on the record, before somebody else in this place finds out what happened, that we are locked into using their wine. It is good wine, although I would have liked to use better, but we are locked into a situation.

These venues should make available a range of good wine. Of course, the user pays and you pay for it, but we would be slugged \$8 a bottle in corkage. We had a victory: they put on a Coonawarra red, so we will have one good quality wine. Until one travels interstate, one does not realise how good our wines are. I have spent time at Rutherglen and, regarding cabernet shiraz and cabernet sauvignon, there is nobody even near us who can put it together as we do in the Barossa in South Australia. I was a guest of the member for Mawson the other day and after the Liberal conference we went to a couple of the wineries and had a magnificent few hours. We are doing a marvellous job with our wines in this State.

We must sell the centre vigorously. It is anticipated that it will be the first port of call for overseas tourists and with proper promotion we can hold these people in the State for at least one week if they visit our wine areas after they have been to the centre. Think of all the dollars spent and the resultant benefits that will flow from this. They will arrive in Adelaide, go to the centre and then go out into the regions. Other industry sources have voiced an opinion that the centre might have been located within the cultural precinct of the city, on North Terrace near the Art Gallery, and there has been an even greater pursuit of the Torrens Parade Ground as a potential site. The Leader told us all about that. It was not as protracted as he said it was: he dragged it out over two hours. The logistical constraints at these sites pointed to North Terrace and Hackney Road as the most attractive, being located near other tourist attractions such as the Botanic Gardens and the Zoo.

A centre such as this needs space around it, which the recommended site gives, with a surrounding vineyard. It should not be crammed in with other buildings: you need a feeling of openness and freeing of the senses when you associate yourself with wine. It is close enough to the city centre that you can take a leisurely stroll down North Terrace, past the Botanical Gardens, and a few metres on you are at the National Wine Centre. This option is much better than the original option of the Goodman Building. I always had a problem with Tram Barn A. As a National Trust person, I do not know why it was ever put on the heritage list. It was not worthy of classification. If it fell down tomorrow, I would not shed a tear. I am pleased that we have chosen to put the centre in a new area to protect the Goodman Building for other use.

This is fantastic for Adelaide, South Australia and the whole country. I am pleased that we have finally come up with a decision. I urge everybody to let us get on with it. I hope this Bill is passed in both houses of Parliament quickly without any problems. I fully support the Bill and I will certainly be there on opening day.

Mr CONLON (Elder): It is with some enthusiasm that I support this Bill and add my comments to the few brief comments of the Leader of the Opposition. I say 'with some enthusiasm': many members on this side would know of my keen interest in the South Australian wine industry.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I am so interested in the National Wine Centre and the wine industry that I would much rather be here talking about it than at a concert down the road. So, I will be here talking about it and not at that concert down the road, and members opposite will be listening to me.

The wine industry is extremely important to South Australia. For those of us who know a little about the industry, it is one of the few success stories in South Australia in recent years. The Leader of the Opposition made a number of pointed remarks about the way in which this matter has been handled to date and the fact that the Government has made pretty much of a dog's dinner out of attempting to get a National Wine Centre in South Australia. If a National Wine Centre were to be situated in any other State, it would not be bad government: it would be an absolute travesty—a triumph of extremely bad politics over good sense—because this is the wine capital of Australia, and for very good reason.

I believe that the Government is lacking a strategic focus and a strategic plan for this extremely important industry for the reasons I am about to point out. In this industry in South Australia in recent years we have had a very fortunate confluence of circumstances which has placed us not only in a traditional position—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: I do not know whether I am a future Leader, but I still have a future as opposed to the honourable member opposite.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr CONLON: As I said, there has been a tremendous confluence of circumstances for the South Australian wine industry in recent years.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will come to order.

Mr CONLON: One of those circumstances happened about three years ago. Possibly the most highly respected wine journal in Australia, *The Wine Spectator*, awarded to the 1990 Grange the mantle of Wine of the Year, one of the most sought after wine awards in the world. That—

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONLON: The honourable member asks me whether I have tried the 1990 Grange. I have been fortunate enough to try it, but it is a little bit beyond my price now.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONLON: Yes, I have tried one or two other years.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I have tried the 1983; it is one of my favourites. On a serious note, that award for the 1990 Grange gave the wine industry in South Australia a tremendous window of opportunity. It had the unfortunate effect for those like me, who are not like Senator Parer and do not have millions of dollars of shares in a coal company, of pricing many premium South Australian wines beyond my reach. I am prepared to wear that for the benefits that it has given the industry. It has shown the world the Barossa Valley, the South Australian wine industry, and particularly the wines of the Barossa Valley: they are now known throughout the rest of the world.

I want to refer to some of our great achievers in the wine industry in South Australia. I refer, of course, to the Grange

itself and the tremendous legacy of the only man I have ever heard of who had a seat named after him for his services to the wine industry—Max Schubert. It is made by Penfolds, which makes a range of extremely high quality wines, including the 707, which is currently on sale and of which the generous member for Peake offered me a glass during the dinner adjournment. There is the 1993 St Henri, an outstanding wine. Penfolds is owned by Southcorp, and Southcorp has an outstanding stable of wines made within and outside this State, but as always the very best of them are made in this State.

I refer, of course, to Lindemans which, generously, was not named by the member for Schubert, but which makes some high quality wines. We have friends in this place who take a keen interest in the Coonawarra. Lindemans has Limestone Ridge, St George and Nursery Vineyard—all very high quality, premium wines from the Coonawarra.

Seppelts is owned by Southcorp. Wynns makes the high premium Michael shiraz among other great wines; the John Riddoch, arguably, together with the 707, the greatest cabernet in Australia; and Tollana, which for poorer people such as me offers outstanding value in good wine. The success of Southcorp was evidenced with recent additions such as Devil's Lair, with outstanding chardonnay from Margaret River shows that the rest of Australia can compete a bit if not at the highest level.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I would be happy to exchange tasting notes with the Minister for Local Government a little later. Let me also mention a few other great contributors in this State. Of course, there is Rockford in the Barossa; Hallett; Henschke with its Hill of Grace; Hardys with its enormous plantings, as I understand it, at Padthaway and Robe; and Southcorp with its new plantings at Padthaway and Robe. These have been enormous contributors to the wealth of South Australia. Unfortunately, there has not been a sufficient strategic focus or plan to make use of this South Australian talent. I will go on to name some more. Recently, Nick Haselgrove in your electorate, Mr Speaker, through McLaren Vale won the trophy at the Sydney Show for the best red wine with an outstanding 1995 shiraz. Of course, there is Brian Croser with the Petaluma stable and some of his second string wines.

I had the good fortune recently to meet Michael Chapoutier of the famous French wine family—no doubt he is famous to my friends on the other side. He was in South Australia seeking to purchase many tens of thousands of acres of land to plant vineyards. He spoke glowingly of the South Australian wine industry, and particularly its achievements with grenache in recent years. I am much happier to see French expertise and influence being concentrated in the ownership of a few of our vineyards instead of in the management of our entire water supply.

The other aspect of this is South Australia's great tradition in wine education. The Roseworthy Wine College is the leader in Australia—and we believe it leads the world—in the education of wine makers and those associated with the industry. It is interesting to see that many of those educated at Roseworthy end up in France teaching its people how to make their wines better.

In terms of education, I would like to pay tribute to Patrick Iland who is not only respected as a wine educator to the point of veneration but also one of nature's gentlemen. I understand that he also happens to have the good fortune to

live across the road from Carmel Zollo of the Legislative Council.

I have run through some of the tremendous assets in the wine industry in South Australia. The National Wine Centre is a good start, but we need a better strategic vision for dealing with the wine industry in South Australia, because it can go much further than it has already. What we have now is a showcase for our wines. I have faith in those people whom I have mentioned that, if our wines are shown on a wider platform than at present, they will win devotees. There are a number of brackets under which I will refer to how we should take this further. The first step involves wine exports.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: There are plenty of wine experts over there: I am referring to wine exports. Earlier, I spoke about a confluence of circumstances. The first was the national focus given to the Barossa Valley and South Australian wine by the success of the 1990 Grange in *The Wine Spectator*. There have been other tremendously good happenings in South Australia which, unfortunately, have been put on hold by recent events in Asia. The first was a couple of years ago. One of the other circumstances, and very fortunate for us, is that about a year after the Grange won the Wine Spectator Award—Mr Speaker, is he talking to me?

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder has the call and he will ignore interjections from both sides.

Mr CONLON: The other outstanding circumstance was the comment about two years ago by the Chinese official in the Republic of China who holds a position similar to that of the Surgeon-General in the United States and who declared that, instead of the Chinese preference for drinking spirits, on a health basis it was actually good for health to drink one or two glasses of wine a day. I did some sums and worked out that if everyone in China takes his advice we will have to replant the Barossa Valley about 350 000 times. That was handy to know if you wanted to export to Asia. Members can see that wine is certainly not only good for health but also good for conviviality because everyone is loosening up—even if some are missing the concert.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will come to order.

Mr CONLON: I am only on the first page. Asia, beyond China, has embraced wine. People reading the *Advertiser* yesterday would have noted that an episode of a local soap opera of a more risqué version in Japan showed two lovers knocking off a bottle of red and then committing suicide. I certainly would not sponsor the second act, but if it was a South Australian red I think the first part of it was worth while.

While I am flippant about that, it is absolutely plain that Asia has embraced red wine. It has embraced wine and, in my experience, those who introduce themselves to the benefits of moderate intakes of wine rarely run away from it to any other beverage, so that augurs extremely well for the South Australian wine industry. That is why I stress that it is extremely important for this Government—and I say this seriously—to have a far better strategic focus on the promotion of the wine industry and associated industries.

The simple truth is that, if we had the produce, we would have been able to treble our exports of wine. That is without the necessary promotion. If we had the necessary promotion and the proper focus, we could easily quadruple—or more—wine exports from South Australia. One of the things that limits the growing of wine is not the availability of land but

the availability of water. I say to this Government—and, when someone finally has the good sense to let us behind the steering wheel, I certainly say—that that is an issue we will address. The proper use of water in South Australia is an issue we will address far better than this Government has done.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I can hardly wait. The other spin-off, quite obviously from the wine industry and quite obviously from the location of the National Wine Centre, is tourism. There has been some discussion about the proper location for a National Wine Centre. My own preference if I had been here—and I was not a member then—would have been for the Barossa Valley. Plainly, it seems that we have finally settled on a site and I think we need to proceed with it. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition points out, if we had the plans we should proceed with it but it must be part of an overall strategy.

In my view, far too little is done to promote the wine industry and associated industries for the strengths that they have. The Barossa Valley has done some good things but it cannot do it on its own and, frankly, the Barossa Valley has not gone anywhere near embracing its full tourism potential. That is something we should look at. With the greatest of respect, if we had dared to expend the same enormous public support in the Barossa Valley as we have given to the people building the terrible groyne at West Beach, we would have achieved a far better result and one that would have supported an important South Australian industry instead of pandering to the visions of some people who think they can build for millionaires.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I have sat here for 15 minutes and listened to this, but I ask you to rule on relevance. I cannot understand that the groyne at the West Beach boat launching facility—absolutely necessary to the majority of people—is relevant to the Barossa Valley.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order in that relevance is important to the debate. I ask the honourable member to come back to the subject matter before the House.

Mr CONLON: It is as relevant as the wines served at Ayers House, but I will come back to my point. I would like to see a great resort in the Barossa Valley serving Port Lincoln tuna and oysters, Kangaroo Island poultry—duck—and marron, our great meat, lobsters and whiting, our spring salmon and serving also our wine.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: They also farm ducks on Kangaroo Island: they do not shoot them, Minister. They intend shooting koalas, but I am not sure about the ducks. I am very serious here: we have not begun to touch the tourist value of our wines, which are now respected throughout the world, and the advantages we have in South Australia with clean air, clean water, great produce, great wines, a great place to visit and, as far as this side of the Chamber is concerned, great people.

We have had no strategic focus. It disappoints me to say it because I am a great fan of the Barossa, but it suffers by comparison with some of our other regions. We have had a march stolen on us by New South Wales in this regard. If members go to McLaren Vale, which has the benefit of being slightly closer to the city, they will see some of the innovative developments. The D'Arenberg Winery has diversified in its marketing and has introduced a charming restaurant—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will come to order.

Mr CONLON:—overlooking the valley. We should see those types of developments in the Barossa as well. I note that not only Nick Haselgrove but also other wineries have done this at their wineries. We really do need a better focus on what we are doing in the Barossa Valley which, in my view, is one of our great assets. I conclude by mentioning, because it would be unfair—

Mr Foley: What about the white wines?

Mr CONLON: I should have mentioned earlier Penfolds' current pursuit of the white Grange, and I will give my advice for what it is worth. When Max Schubert made the Grange he did not play it safe, and there is a great lesson here for people wondering where South Australia is going. You have to take a risk sometimes. Max Schubert made an extremely unpopular wine when it was first made. He was instructed by his company not to make it any longer. He made it secretly until such time as it won market share and it is now, without doubt, the jewel in Australia's wine crown.

That is why I say this: Penfolds has made some terrific trial bin chardonnays. I look forward to the development of the great Australian riesling as the alternative to the white Grange. It is something which I think has all the hallmarks of the original red Grange: it is unfashionable, risky, difficult to make and looks good only after 15 years. My free advice to the Penfolds company is: if you want to make a white Grange, that is the one I would go for.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Before Question Time this afternoon the member for Hammond rose on a matter of privilege and alleged that the Minister for Administrative and Information Services threatened him in that, unless the member for Hammond withdrew an inquiry that he had made of the Minister in relation to the rules and arrangements concerning the use of cars provided to various members of Parliament from State Fleet, the Minister would have the member for Hammond removed from membership of the Public Works Committee. The Chair was asked to determine whether a *prima facie* case could be made out and, if found in the affirmative, that a privileges committee be formed to examine the incident.

In deliberation on this matter I requested the member for Hammond to confirm or otherwise the accuracy of the *Hansard* report, which at this stage is marked 'Confidential and subject to revision'. After reading the report he confirmed it as being accurate. I also asked the Minister for Administrative and Information Services to read the *Hansard* report and to confirm whether he had threatened the member for Hammond, as alleged. While the Minister confirmed that a conversation had taken place, he denied that he had said that he would personally have the member for Hammond removed from the Public Works Committee.

The Chair has no written documentation or record of the conversation between the Minister and the member and cannot rule on the accuracy of that conversation. The Chair notes that the member for Hammond was elected to the Public Works Committee by the whole of the House. He was

ected to the Chair of that committee by the committee itself. The Chair also notes that, even though he is a Minister, the Minister as an individual is not in a position to have the member for Hammond removed from the Public Works Committee unless he wishes to bring on a substantive motion with that objective, which would then be voted on by the whole of the House.

At this stage the Chair is more concerned with its responsibility in relation to Standing Order 141, where the House has a responsibility to intervene to prevent quarrels between members and if possible to prevent them from spilling onto the floor of the House unless it is by substantive motion, when the House would be asked to make the decision. In this case there would appear to be an ongoing dispute, with animosity, between the two members over an administrative matter between them. As the Minister has no powers to remove the member for Hammond from the Public Works Committee, the Chair is of the view that the matter is not one for the consideration of the House, as the alleged threat, even if proven, could never have been carried out by the Minister.

Under the circumstances, as the Minister has no jurisdiction to bring the threat to finality, I rule that no breach of privilege has occurred. In relation to the apparent quarrel between the two members concerned, I ask them to resolve it privately, having regard to Standing Order 141.

NATIONAL WINE CENTRE (LAND OF CENTRE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 670.)

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): After we had listened to the diatribe for one and three quarter hours before the dinner adjournment, it was refreshing to hear the member for Elder at least making some sense in relation to the wine industry, the National Wine Centre and the future economic development of this State. I commend the member for Elder for his enthusiasm and commitment to the wine industry and his ability at least to comprehend the real facts concerning the future of this State. In the next three or four years I look forward to seeing the fight between the members for Elder and Kaurna over who will succeed the current Leader of the Opposition. I have my money on the member for Kaurna because, whilst he is on the opposite side, I respect him as someone who has an interest in this State and a genuine commitment, through the Parliament, to the development and growth of South Australia.

Of course, I have been watching with interest the member for Elder, who does surprise me. He is obviously right into the red wine scene now and perhaps even a little chardonnay. He would like to project to the constituents of Elder that he was into the 'green death' and those sorts of beverage but has now gone a bit above that, realising that the real opportunities in this State lie with the Liberal Party and the healthy, good, gutsy shiraz of South Australia. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition, while he has achieved a few things, recently featured in headlines stating that he would—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. In consideration of your earlier ruling that it was important that the member for Elder speak to the substance of the Bill before us, I would ask that the same ruling apply to the member for Mawson. The subject of the Leader of the Opposition is not relevant to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair was distracted, talking to one of the honourable member's colleagues on another matter relating to this debate. I did not hear the member for Mawson but if he was digressing I ask him to come back to the subject matter.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I can appreciate the member for Hart's being a little uptight about what I have just said. I quite like the member for Hart, who is a good, honest, committed local member. He did have an opportunity to become—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Whilst I appreciate that the honourable member might like me, it is not relevant to the Bill. Whilst I am tempted to ask for that reference to be removed from *Hansard*, would you please ask the honourable member to speak to the substance of the Bill?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was asked earlier to stick to the subject matter. I will repeat that request, and I do not wish to repeat it again.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Thank you, Sir. I highlight to all my colleagues that I am referring to the National Wine Centre and opportunities for South Australia. In creating those opportunities it is very crucial to this debate that I highlight a couple of things that have occurred tonight. Unfortunately, the member for Hart comes into this. The member for Hart had a possible future as Leader of the Opposition, but that was prior to 11 October 1997. What happened then was that a couple of colleagues—the members for Elder and Kaurna—came along and showed that the poor old member for Hart had missed out on those opportunities, very much like—

Mr WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of his seat.

Mr WRIGHT: My apologies, Sir. You have already cautioned the member for Mawson on a couple of occasions in regard to adhering to the subject matter of the Bill. He has clearly not followed your instruction and is talking about matters other than the Bill. I would ask you to rule again, Sir.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Mawson is digressing, I repeat that he must come back to the subject matter contained in the Bill.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Thank you for your guidance and direction, Sir. What I am really concerned about here tonight is opportunities for South Australia—opportunities that the Labor Party has not provided in the past 11 years, cannot support and provide now, and will not—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. This is now in absolute defiance of your three previous rulings. I ask you to rule yet again on the issue of relevance to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I will make an observation to the whole Chamber. This debate is starting to degenerate into the sort of frivolity which I do not think is appropriate to the importance and proper tenor of this debate. I ask members to adhere to the subject matter of the Bill and other members to refrain from interjecting.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Thank you, Sir; I will stick to the main framework of the National Wine Centre (Land of Centre) Amendment Bill 1998 and in doing so I accept the fact that the other side is not really serious about this, but I am. I will tell you why, Sir—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not prolong the debate with those sorts of remarks, either.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will stop the member for Hart, too.

Mr BROKENSHERE: I am very serious about this Bill for the simple reason that what this is about is putting another

piece into the jigsaw of opportunities for constituents, including young people, who live in the electorate of Mawson. Within the electorate of Mawson is the famous McLaren Vale wine district. Particularly in the past couple of years, what we have seen happening in that district can be described as a magnificent success, not only for South Australia but also for the whole of Australia. I will highlight a couple of recent instances.

First, I refer to Steve Maglieri, who came to Australia in 1964 as a 21-year-old Italian who wanted to capitalise on the exciting opportunities of the world. He chose South Australia, because he knew that geographically we had opportunities to develop a wine industry, about which he had a passion. Steve Maglieri's experience is one example of what is happening in this State; last year he won a wine gold medal in Italy. He did the same thing as Mr Crotti of San Remo did with pasta when he took red wine back to Italy and won a gold medal. With the same shiraz last year he won the international shiraz award.

My colleague the member for Elder, who is a highly intelligent young man and who appreciates a drop of the good product, mentioned Nick Haselgrove. Nick Haselgrove had the opportunity of ringing the bell in the electorate of Mawson which I proudly represent, because he is an exciting example of young winemakers in South Australia.

What we have in South Australia is a wine industry that is as old as any part of Australia. Not only has it the root stock to allow us to create very good wines but it has highly qualified young winemakers who have done well, as the member for Elder said, in Roseworthy and other places. Through the support of the CSIRO and the Waite Institute, and the opportunities they provide, we will further grow wine opportunities in this State. Let us look at those wine opportunities.

First, we have the McLaren Vale wine region associated with the Fleurieu Peninsula; secondly, the Clare Valley; thirdly, the Coonawarra; fourthly, the Barossa Valley; and, fifthly, the Riverland. For nearly five years I have heard the Opposition say that this Government does not look after our regions. I have just highlighted that three-fifths of South Australia have an economic growth opportunity through wine. This is an economic growth opportunity that the Liberal Government fundamentally and philosophically supports. It is committed to agriculture and value added product, including the wine industry.

The Government has looked after three-fifths of the region by encouraging wine opportunities. That situation is very much in contrast to the work of the Labor Party, which hit the brandy market and that opportunity in South Australia to a point where it is almost non-existent. The Labor Party has continued federally and also in South Australia to knock growth opportunities in that export industry. This Bill will allow us to capitalise on the three icons of South Australia. The three icons are simple and everyone should know them. First, we have value added quality green food. We can be the green food basket to Asia and the rest of the world. Australia and particularly South Australia is positioning itself for this role. Secondly, we have quality clean wine, grown almost organically and internationally renowned. Thirdly, we have roses and tourism. Couple them together and it adds up to jobs and economic wealth for South Australia.

Earlier tonight we heard the Leader of the Opposition carry on for almost two hours, but he was not really interested in the wine industry at all; he was interested in only one thing—holding members back to make sure that the House

did not adjourn early. That is what it was about. The Leader's speech was a charade and a nonsense act that the media may or may not pick up. However, I will remember dearly in the future when colleagues opposite—some of whom I respect—want to go to a union conference in Tasmania and beg the Leader of the Government to let them off at 6 o'clock so that they can enjoy good food and wine from South Australia with their colleagues and tell them how good it is to live in this State. I will remember that, and I will be willing to sit here until 2 a.m. or longer. At least when I debate I talk about the facts and not the nonsense of the Leader of the Opposition.

The facts are simply these. The Leader of the Opposition alone—I refer to no other member, and I will protect every other member opposite other than the Leader—had an opportunity to grow and enhance the wine industry over the past 10 years. Tonight I heard the Leader of the Opposition casting doubt on the ability and commitment of the Deputy Premier—a man whom I commend for his commitment to the wine industry and tourism. He supported a visitor and interpretive centre and an opportunity for my electorate. He is currently involved in creating real jobs in my electorate of Mawson. He committed himself to a vision, and he honoured that commitment.

On behalf of the community of Mawson I thank Graham Ingerson, as Deputy Premier and Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism, for allowing us to get on with the job. He did not run warm and fuzzy announcement rubbish on a four yearly basis saying that he will do this and that. He got on with the job and provided dollars to let us create a centre that has now given McLaren Vale a wine capitalisation edge for our region. This is allowing young people who were on the dole and who had no future or commitment when Labor under Mike Rann was in power to have an opportunity to make a commitment and have a future. I thank the Deputy Premier for that.

I want to talk about how serious we are about this industry. Members might ask why we are so serious, but it is very simple. We are serious because the people who are behind the industry are out grape harvesting right now at 8.15 p.m. on Wednesday night. They are in my electorate, and they will work all night and make sure that the baume test and the quality and continuity of the wine product and the export opportunity from McLaren Vale and South Australia is guaranteed. Why? Because they believe in South Australia, and I thank them for their commitment. I say to them simply this: the Liberal Government of South Australia is right with them. However, it is not behind them waving flags only when it suits it or wanting to grandstand like the Leader of the Opposition did tonight, almost to the point of getting in the gutter to have a go at one of my colleagues. I condemn him for that. Grapegrowers are out there because they are proud South Australians, just like members on this side of the House (although that does not mean that some members opposite are not also proud South Australians).

Let us look at what has happened in the industry so far. The wine industry has an opportunity by the year 2000—only 24 months from now—to be exporting up to \$2 billion—that is \$2 000 million—of value added clean green quality wine from South Australia to the rest of the world. Sir, you may have forgotten—

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Green means that it is quality and it has not encountered any of the Chernobyl pollution or the like and is good quality wine. I point out that \$2 000 million is half of what the Leader of the Opposition, as the then

Minister responsible for trade, employment and other areas, cost us as a State of only 1.5 million people. It caused South Australia to become a rust bucket State. Now people say, 'To hell with that. We know what they did and we will not forget it, but we are going to get on with the job.' Our job as a Government is to support these people. Here we have a situation where the wine industry alone will export \$2 000 million—half the State Bank debacle—by the year 2000, that is, in less than 24 months. What are we doing? We have branded South Australia as the wine State of Australia. We know it is—

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Of course we are under threat. I commend the CSIRO and Waite Institute scientists for their great job of improving through genetic cloning the opportunities for good root stock. Of course we will get threats from the region represented by the member for MacKillop, the Coonawarra and places like that. The fact is, it is all South Australian and it is growing. That is what we are all about, and that is what the National Wine Centre is about. It is about stamping the future of South Australia. I am delighted to see that the Bill allows the centre to move south. I wish it would move further south to McLaren Vale, which is where it should be. That is where the international shiraz and the best wines in the world are grown.

If we are really serious about having the National Wine Centre, it should be located in the best wine district in the world, that is, McLaren Vale. However, given what the Leader of the Opposition had to say tonight, when he pumped the Barossa Valley for some reason, we have had to find neutral ground. We found neutral ground on the corner of Hackney and Botanic Roads. It is a central site and it is there for a reason: it is accessible for all people.

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I commend the Labor Party for starting this. It did one good thing for tourism over 11 years when it built a convention and wine and food opportunity. The Labor Party started it and we have grown it. Why put the centre out to a region? The regions would not put up with it. It could go to a district represented by the members for Schubert, who represents two wine regions, MacKillop or Chaffey but I would oppose that, and so it will be built on neutral ground. The wine industry requested that. As usual, the Government had its ears open and the centre will be on neutral ground. Despite what Philip White says—he is not a bad guy, but every now and again he gets his knickers in a knot—he is wrong when it comes to not supporting this location for the wine centre.

The proposed position for the wine centre is correct. This Government and the Howard Government have supported it; and the industry has not only supported it but demanded it. That is the main point that I want to get across to the Opposition, and particularly to the Leader of the Opposition who has waffled around. He has spoken about some of the things he did in the Barossa Valley over an 11 year period. That is the first real achievement I have heard the Leader of the Opposition talk about that is reasonably accurate. However, in Tanunda things are not working as well as people would wish, and they are now looking at the McLaren Vale model. Notwithstanding that, the National Wine Centre will make that final stamp.

Jeff Kennett may have the Grand Prix at the moment, but that is not our fault, for two reasons: first, the person responsible—the landlord for the Grand Prix—was the current Leader of the Opposition. He was the custodian of the

Grand Prix, and he let it slip through his fingers. That is absolute incompetence. That just reflects the gross ineptitude of the Leader of the Opposition, who not only lost 33 600 jobs and \$4 000 million with BankSA but was involved at senior Government level in an unsustainable and opportunistic debt of \$9.4 billion from 1982 to 1993. Despite the fact that members opposite are yawning, they hate to hear this. However, my great grandchildren will not yawn because they will still be trying to overcome this debt problem. The Leader of the Opposition lost the Grand Prix, as well. Secondly, notwithstanding that, we could not afford it anyway, because we had lost \$7 000 million—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Grand Prix really does have no relevance whatever to the matter at hand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is straying from the subject matter of the Bill. I uphold the point of order.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate that members opposite hate to hear about the Grand Prix and about debt. I return to the National Wine Centre. The bottom line is that we had an opportunity to hold on to the Grand Prix but we lost it, for two reasons: first, incompetence; and, secondly, we did not have the money because of the debt created by the Hon. Mike Rann and other members opposite. However, we do have something that Jeff Kennett cannot take away from us: we grow the best wines, we are the best vignerons, and we are the best winemakers and marketers.

Given that the wine industry in South Australia has 60 per cent of national exports, we have the opportunity to make this proposal work. We are here, and we now need a National Wine Centre to firmly cement that. That is what the Bill is all about, and it ties together into the three ingredients I have already mentioned, that is, food, wine and tourism. It is a great opportunity, and it should be embraced. I am pleased that there has been some bipartisanship on this matter, even though some members used it for political opportunism. However, we will get there, and I endorse the Bill.

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

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I will be brief. As the shadow Minister for Tourism for the Labor Opposition, I would like to say exactly what the Leader of the Opposition has said but in a somewhat more brief fashion. We support the establishment of the National Wine Centre; it is an important initiative for South Australia. Whilst there have been arguments as to where the centre should be appropriately located, nonetheless a decision has been made and, as the Leader has pointed out, we have consistently supported its establishment in this State and the necessary bipartisanship has been given.

I am pleased to see that we are all agreed. Every speaker tonight has agreed with the National Wine Centre and its establishment. If there were any disagreement, I would hate to see how much time would have been set aside for debate. This is a love-in feast, probably akin to that held by the Liberal Party just prior to the new session of Parliament earlier this year.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Look, I will deal with you soon. What we have seen in the contributions so far tonight is this: the Leader of the Opposition has given a very detailed and accurate exposition as to the history—as far as the Labor

Party is concerned—of this matter. The Deputy Premier will have to confront that, and I am sure that he will not be able to do it very well when he replies to the debate. Also, the member for Elder gave a wonderful dissertation on the virtue of the winemakers in this State. I doubt whether any other member in this House could give such an exposition with such detailed knowledge of the wine growers and winemakers in South Australia. Indeed, I am envious that he can afford such fine wine. Up until 20 October last year I, too, used to dabble in fine wines and enjoyed a nice bottle of red.

I would like to thank the members for Elder and Spence for bringing me back to my Labor grassroots because, rather than being able to enjoy fine wines in a bottle, in the more straitened financial circumstances I now find myself since 20 October last year I again can enjoy the virtues of Chateau Cardboard Box and Chateau Torrens Embankment. The member for Mawson complained about the horrors of green death. I presume the member for Mawson was referring to that very famous and outstanding South Australian beer Southwark bitter. By comparison, with the wines I now inflict upon myself—namely, Chateau Cardboard Box and Chateau Torrens Embankment—green death sounds like a Grange Hermitage. I would like to thank the members for Spence and Elder for bringing me back to my grassroots.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It certainly is. I endorse all the points made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I will not go through them in any great detail. The issue of car parking in the Hackney area has not yet been raised in the debate. This is a point to which the Minister should give some consideration. The Hackney Road redevelopment/Hackney parking is cause for concern for a large number of residents in that area. I declare an interest in so far as my brother lives in the Hackney area, just off Hackney Road. He has constantly raised with me the problems of car parking in that area, because the Botanic Gardens and Botanic Park are being used more often for festivals such as WOMAD, and he and his neighbours have no problems with that. Of course, we also have the International Wine Centre and the international rose garden going there, and obviously there will be much more traffic in that region. There is insufficient car parking already with respect to accommodating persons visiting the Botanic Gardens and the Botanic Park on any fine autumn weekend. Indeed, when you have—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Unley interjects in a disparaging tone about the students from St Peter's. I am not here for the students from St Peter's. Indeed, I would have thought the member for Unley would be more careful about that, given that many of his own constituents send their children to St Peter's College. I would have thought that the member for Unley would be far more caring about parents' concerns for their children, given that they are his constituents. I do not know where there will be sufficient car parking within that region for all the extra traffic. We do not want to alienate any more land of the Botanic Gardens or the Botanic Park to accommodate all the extra visitors, but I do not know where else the Government will place the cars. In my submission, we can forget public transport, because in reality South Australians love using their motor vehicles. They will not catch public transport, particularly on weekends, and there is no way the public transport system will promise a service every 15 minutes on a Sunday afternoon to ferry people there.

As I say, there are already problems with car parking around the east end of Adelaide and elsewhere. There is to be a synergy between the National Wine Centre, the international rose garden, the restaurants in the east end of Rundle Street and the like, and this is a very real issue of concern for the residents of Hackney, as the member for Norwood knows only too well. It was a constant source of concern for those residents even before the National Wine Centre was mooted for that area. It is a matter which this Government needs to address, in consultation with the Adelaide City Council, and I will be very interested to know precisely what the Government has in store with respect to handling the traffic.

Without taking up any more time, I simply say that, from my own personal perspective, it is about time we got on and completed the wine centre. It is time that plans were up and running, plans that we could all see to note that on certain dates the work will actually take place, rather than new concepts constantly coming to the fore. That is not the fault of the wine centre management itself but more the prevarication of the Government. I think we all agree that we would like to see financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government through the Federation Fund so that the wine centre can be further expanded upon.

Personally, I would prefer to see Tram Barn A removed, notwithstanding the lunatic policy that was passed by my Party in some previous convention that said we had to keep Tram Barn A. Notwithstanding that particular lunatic provision carried by the Party at that time, to which I am bound, I believe that Tram Barn A is a hideous offence to the beautiful conservatory now in place and, in fact, a breach of our faith to the Commonwealth Government, which donated it to the State of South Australia. Nonetheless, we are stuck with that building for the time being. I only hope that the white ants get to it more quickly than they have so far so it will fall to the ground and provide an uninterrupted vista of that area of the parklands.

In conclusion, I trust that the Bill will have a swift passage through the Parliament and that we finally get to see some action on site rather than the hollow promises to date being made by the Premier and the Deputy Premier. I trust that finally, at long last, he can get something right.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): At the outset I want to add my total support for this legislation. As one of the members representing the Adelaide Hills, an important wine producing area in South Australia—and I believe likely to become one of the more important wine producing areas of the State—I want to say that my full support rests with this legislation.

For a long time we have been working towards the establishment of a National Wine Centre. I recognise the importance of the centre for the wine industry in South Australia which, as has been said before, is without doubt the most important industry in this State and will continue to be so. I also express my support for and interest in the Botanic Gardens because, over the last four years, as Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, I have come to learn a lot about the workings of the Botanic Gardens in this State. We need to realise that the gardens are important not only because of the work carried out through the Herbarium but also as a tourist attraction.

As the Minister would know, the Adelaide Botanic Gardens is one of the most important tourist attractions in the metropolitan area in South Australia. We can be very proud of those gardens. They always have been recognised as being

significant both in Australia and internationally. The staff working in those gardens are very dedicated and, with all the support coming from both sides of the House—and I am delighted to see that that is happening—we need to recognise the importance of the gardens as well as the importance of the wine industry.

I have received correspondence and representation from people who are concerned about what might happen to the Herbarium, particularly as a result of this move. I am quite sure, and I have enough confidence in my colleagues who have responsibility for these issues to believe, that they will do the right thing in providing an alternative to the building which houses the current Herbarium. I refer to this issue, because I am one of the lucky ones: I guess I am one of the very few members of this House who really understand what the Herbarium is about and who—

Mr Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not too sure about that. I hope that the member for Hart does understand. I do not even know whether the member for Hart does.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, it is not the glass thing in the Botanic Gardens: it is probably one of the most important facilities that we have if we have an interest in the heritage of this State, and it deserves not only protection but, I would suggest, a lot more support from this place than has been the case in the past, and I put myself in that category, having had the responsibility for the last four years.

As has been said by a number of members who have spoken tonight, there have been suggestions as to where the wine centre should be placed within the Hackney site. I believe that the site that has been selected is appropriate. If it is to be a national facility, it needs to be prominent. It needs also to be accessible, and the site that has been selected—and that is what this legislation is about—is appropriate. However, I want to add a word of caution about the future of the State Herbarium, because that is something that seems to have been glossed over somewhat in the debate that has taken place.

I refer to correspondence that I have received from Dr Barbara Randell. I am not quite sure whether other members have received the same correspondence, or whether she has written just to me. I will refer to that correspondence, because I think it is important. Dr Randell makes the point that the demolition of the State Herbarium is of concern for a number of reasons. First, she states:

It is a purpose-built scientific museum, housing a priceless collection of more than 800 000 plant specimens—

I would have hoped that every member of this House would recognise the importance of that facility for that very reason—

preserving the botanical heritage of this State. Preservation of these specimens from threats of mould, insect attack and fire requires a very sophisticated building with controlled atmospheres, airtight vaults, and the ability to replace air with inert fire-suppressing gases.

It has been estimated by Dr Randell—and I know there are others who support this—that a replacement building would cost at least \$10 million. I am fortunate enough to have visited the Herbarium, but if other members, including the member for Hart, have not had the opportunity to look at the Herbarium, I suggest very strongly that members on both sides of the House do that. I know that the people in the State Herbarium would be only too pleased to show any member of this House through that facility.

Mr Foley: Dorothy will not let us—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not believe that is the case. I am sure that the present Minister for Environment would be only too pleased to facilitate those visits. Dr Randell goes on to say that the Herbarium is a research facility of the highest quality, providing laboratory space and facilities for professional scientists—and most of them are botanists—who are carrying on basic research to document the State's flora.

Mr HILL: On a point of order, Sir, I am very interested in what the honourable member is saying, but I cannot hear because of the argument going on over here to my left.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. If the honourable member could sit in this chair and listen to the noise I sometimes hear, he would realise that tonight is relatively quiet. However, if honourable members are to carry on a conversation, perhaps they could go out to the lobby.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Dr Randell goes on to point out:

Many new species remain to be identified, others need further study to reveal more of their ecological requirements.

She makes the point that we will never be able to conserve or regenerate our native bush if we do not continue to study what small remnants remain. She also makes the point that almost everyone, including politicians of every persuasion, agrees that protection and preservation of our bush is of the highest possible importance. I am sure that the vast majority of members in this place would agree with the point she makes. Dr Randell continues:

If the State Herbarium is forced to move to new premises—and that will be the case as a result of this legislation, as I understand it—

then the collection will have to be packed, stored, transported, stored, unpacked, reshelved, etc. etc. etc.

Again I point out to the House that we are talking about 800 000 plant specimens. It is no small task. It is something that can be dealt with and worked through. I reiterate the importance of the national wine museum to this State, but we have to understand the responsibilities we have as a State for future generations in particular in regard to the issues that are of such importance as far as the State Herbarium is concerned. The following point is also made:

The collection will be unavailable for examination by members of the public, or by professional botanists, during all this time [between when the building is demolished and another facility is provided]. It will have to be treated for mould and insect attack before it is finally rehoused. The costs of handling the collection during the move, and the cost of wasted professional scientific time, must also be added to the cost of creating a new appropriate building.

Dr Randell goes on to say:

I have little architectural knowledge, but it seems to me highly unlikely that suitable storage facilities could be built within the shell of a heritage-listed building, such as the tram barn. A new home for the Herbarium does not have to be sited within the current Botanic Gardens, but could be established in relation to other research facilities e.g. the Waite Institute, Flinders University, the Levels campus of the University of South Australia.

That is an important point. The Herbarium at present is an important part of the Botanic Gardens, but it does not have to be on that site. It would be just as relevant for it to be moved, as Dr Randell has suggested. She makes the point that any of these sites would be a better solution than forcing the Herbarium to fit within the inappropriate confines of the tram barn. Dr Randell goes on to say:

The staff currently employed in the State Herbarium are public servants, and thus precluded from commenting on proposals made by their employers, i.e., the State Government. I have accepted the

challenge to voice my concerns, to compensate for their inability to speak.

In other words, she is saying that she is speaking out on behalf of the public servants who work in the Herbarium. I do not want to be alarmist about this issue, but I see it as being important. I reiterate that I support the Bill, I support the establishment of a National Wine Centre in South Australia and I support the site that has been established. In this contribution I am attempting to make my colleagues in Government aware of the importance of this facility so that, once the Herbarium has been removed to make way for the new wine museum, we will recognise the importance of replacing it with a facility similar to the present one. I agree with what Dr Randell says. I do not know Dr Randell personally but I support the points she has raised. One point that I strongly support is that the Herbarium does not necessarily have to be housed within the Botanic Gardens. In conclusion, Dr Randell makes the point:

I am sure that the proposal to demolish a purpose-built scientific museum has only been made because most parliamentarians and the general public do not know of its significance or the importance of the work being done there. Many do not know that the Herbarium exists at all! If you or your fellow MPs are not aware of its significance, I know that the Director of the Herbarium would be pleased to provide a tour of the building, to explain the work done there, and its importance.

I have made that point and I reiterate the invitation that I extended earlier. I am one of the lucky ones, having spent some time in the Herbarium and understanding its importance. It is important for all members, if we have any interest in the heritage of this State and the importance of that heritage for future generations, to know what it is all about. The last point Dr Randell makes, which is an important one, is as follows:

Just imagine what the reaction would have been if the proposal had been to demolish the State Museum, or the extensions to the Art Gallery! Is a scientific museum of less importance than a cultural museum?

That is very important. She finishes by saying:

I therefore challenge you and all other politicians with any concern for the preservation of our environment to urge the State Government to ensure that either:

- the State Herbarium survives on its present site in the Botanic Gardens, or
- that it is replaced elsewhere by a building of at least equivalent capacity and quality.

I do not know how many members in this House have had the opportunity to look closely at the tram barn. I have and I am one of the few who, during all of this debate, has suggested strongly that the tram barn should be retained.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mainly, in answer to the interjection from the other side, because it happens to be on the national and the State heritage registers. If this House wishes to remove it from the registers—if that has the support of both sides of the House—let us demolish the building. But I repeat: it is on the national and State registers. It was members not on our side but on the other side who put it on the State register. As I understand it, we have had that debate and the decision has been made that that building will be retained.

I believe that that building can be put to many uses. I do not know how many members of this House have attended the Royal Chelsea Flower Show. People come from all over the world to the Royal Chelsea Flower Show which has a building similar to the tram barn. Having that building on site

within the Botanic Gardens would mean that it could be used for all sorts of purposes similar to international flower shows. The decision has been made that that building will be retained, and I am pleased about that. I might be one of the few who are satisfied that that should be the case.

That decision has been made, but unless the Government has many millions of dollars to spend on the tram barn to provide a facility similar to the current Herbarium I do not believe that it is appropriate that we should consider the tram barn for that purpose. We need to ensure that another facility—and I have been through this in the contribution that I have already made—on one of the university campuses be made available so that the same sort of a facility can be provided for the very important purpose of preserving the 800 000 species that are currently housed in this museum.

Just in case any member of the other side—or, indeed, any member of this place—is of the opinion that I do not support this measure, I say that I strongly support this legislation as I have done over the past four years as Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. I think it is vitally important for South Australia. Every member who has spoken so far has indicated support for the wine industry in this State and the importance of the industry as far as the future of South Australia is concerned. I agree with that totally.

I recognise that the electorate for which I am responsible is becoming an important wine producing part of South Australia. I think the decision that has been made in the legislation before us tonight is the right one, and I support it totally. I want all members of the House to recognise the importance of the Herbarium and to ensure that an appropriate replacement is provided for that important facility, not for the 47 members who sit in this House but for our children and their children, because they will need to know about the 800 000 species contained in that facility.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): As other members have spoken in general terms about the wine industry, I will not do that, but to begin with I will make the point that I also represent a winery in my electorate. Admittedly, it is only one winery—Dyson Winery at Maslin Beach—but one that makes superb wines.

Members interjecting:

Mr HILL: It is not on everyone's list. I support the initiative to have the wine centre built in the city. As members have said, it would be fantastic to have a wine centre in the wine region closest to their electorate. The member for Mawson and I would both like to see it built in the southern suburbs or McLaren Vale, but the reality is that it cannot be built in a particular district: it must be centrally located. I support that initiative.

I also support the location currently planned for it. I was concerned about the original site on Hackney Road, but I think the corner site is a good one which provides some benefits also for the Botanic Park. I am pleased to follow the former Minister for the Environment because the issues that he raised are ones that I also want to address. I had the privilege and the pleasure a couple of months ago to meet with the Director of the Botanic Gardens. I asked him for his opinion about the impact of the wine centre on the Botanic Gardens, and I am grateful for the information that he was able to give me.

As members would know, the net effect of the wine centre being built on the corner of Botanic Road and Hackney Road is that the amount of space that is under the control of the Botanic Gardens will increase. That is not a bad thing at all.

It will mean that the administrative centre and Herbarium on that site, to which the former Minister referred, will have to be demolished. That will create a number of important logistical problems about the location of the Herbarium and how the material that is stored in it can be protected and transferred to the new site.

I have concerns, as the member for Heysen has also indicated, about what will happen to that important and valuable collection. As the former Minister said, there are about 800 000 specimens but only about 100 000 of those have been adequately recorded. I also understand that it is one of the three most important herbaria in Australia. The real question involves not the mechanics of transferring the Herbarium to another site—given enough money and willpower that can be done—but the question that I would like the Minister to address—and I will raise this in Committee—is what sort of budget has been put aside for the transfer of this resource, because I understand that it will not be an inexpensive exercise. I further understand that the plan is for the Herbarium to be placed in Tram Barn A.

Mr Clarke: That monstrosity!

Mr HILL: That monstrosity, as the member for Ross Smith says. As the member for Heysen said, the kind of environment that is required by a Herbarium is a little more sophisticated than what will currently be found in Tram Barn A. So, a large sum of money will have to be spent if Tram Barn A is to be upgraded to a level where it can accept those specimens. If that is the case, it does something to the budget of this project and also to the timeline because, if Tram Barn A has to be upgraded before the Herbarium can be transferred, that will take a considerable amount of time.

The contents of the Herbarium will have to be packed and transferred to Tram Barn A. The suggestion of the member for Heysen is that the Herbarium could be packed up and stored, the building demolished, and the new construction could occur. That would mean that the Herbarium would be out of action for a considerable period. I think people would start to get suspicious that it would ever come back and function again properly. I say to members who support the Herbarium that they should not be fooled by any move to pack up the Herbarium and leave it in storage until some future stage, because if that happened I think it would be very easy for it to be left in cold storage for a considerable period, and that would result in a very valuable resource in this State being lost to the community, particularly the science community.

Another issue is that the administration of the Botanic Gardens will be placed in the Goodman Building. I think that is a sensible move. I understand that the Botanic Gardens has been after that building for some time. I am sure that some members of this place would feel that it is welcome to it. It means that the buildings that have been left on the old bus depot to rot for the past several years will be put to a practical purpose, and that is a good thing. If the Herbarium situation can be sorted out, the Botanic Gardens will have a new face for the public, a very strong face on Hackney Road with a very grand and imposing entrance. Having the wine centre and the rose gardens on that site will give the Botanic Gardens an impressive facade. I think that is a great plan if it can be made to work, but, once again, I am concerned about issues involving finances.

The other issue that concerns me is management. On that site, we will have effectively the Botanic Gardens administration, which will manage the Botanic Gardens, the wine centre and the rose centre. The question I would like to ask the

Minister in Committee is what role the Botanic Gardens will play in the management of the overall site. It would seem to me to be somewhat foolish if the wine centre and the rose gardens were managed separately, both being involved in planting and growing and looking after living things on the ground adjacent to the Botanic Gardens. I think it would be sensible to have one management team to look after all those issues because, as members would know, the Botanic Gardens already has a fairly substantial rose garden. It would seem pointless to have one rose garden in the Botanic Gardens and another on the new site. I would like answers to some of these administrative issues.

The third concern is the issue of parking which the member for Ross Smith has already mentioned. It is a fairly busy road. On busy occasions, especially on nice summer days, the available parking area is taken up. Another question for the Minister would be: what plans are there to extend parking? Certainly, we would not support any further alienation of parklands to provide parking for the facility. I would hope that the Minister, who I am afraid is not currently listening, would be able to answer those questions. Having made those brief comments, I will conclude my remarks at this point.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I rise to speak briefly and somewhat reluctantly. What I really want to say is, 'Bring on the main event. Bring on the Deputy Premier. We want Ingo. We want to see what Ingo can say about the Leader of the Opposition's comments made before the dinner adjournment.' There have been some sideshows but, unfortunately, the member for Elder has forced me to rise and muse briefly on the sin of omission. If baby Ralph were still in the Chamber, I would need to say to him: what about St Marys, Haigs, Zema, Majella, and Hollicks? What about Winters, Highbank and Balnaves? If you start naming some you must name the lot. There is a lesson here tonight for the member for Elder: if he wants to be a wine statesman he needs to know the whole show.

Equally, I criticise the member for Mawson—the milkmaid. He ought to stick to his cows because, again, he has committed the sin of omission. He attempts to name great wine areas but he leaves out Koppamurra, Padthaway, Keppoch, Elgin Valley, Mount Benson and Cape Jaffa. I do not have to name the lot because I am pointing out the sin of omission. I myself will not stand condemned. None are in my electorate. I am doing my apprenticeship and, having checked again with the member for MacKillop, I am well advised that I have the lot.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: We mentioned the Coonawarra. Were you not listening tonight? I am just making the point that, if members want to do the job properly, they must do the whole job. But, as I say, let us get on with it, let us bring on Ingo and the main event.

Let us focus briefly on what we are talking about. We are talking about a national wine icon, and the place for that is in the centre of the city and then you can radiate out to all the great areas. Looking at big Ralph sitting opposite, I am reminded that, if you want to talk about great wines, never leave out Ebenezer and Ebenezer's Black Pepper Shiraz—another great wine and probably within your budget.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: I withdraw that, because it does come in a bottle. I do apologise to the member for Ross Smith.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McEWEN: The point is that we do need a national tourism icon. We need to take the parochialism out of this. It needs to be centrally located and we must ensure that tourists radiate out from there. It is a stepping-off point for exploring the great tourism opportunities across our State that wine and food offer. Let us put it where we want it, let us get it right, and let the whole thing radiate out.

I put on record a plea to the industry to shape up and to put in a fair amount of funding. I plead to the industry to put some reason and some equity into the funding of this. I have noted that there has been some erosion of the percentage that the industry is now offering to contribute and I think that, at the end of the day, that will be a sad thing. It needs to contribute in a reasonable manner. It is their icon, a national tourism icon, and I say, 'Let's get on with it.'

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I agree with the former speaker's sentiments. In my then role as shadow Minister for Tourism, I was involved in the debate on this Bill when it went through this House last year, so I have a few brief comments to make about the way that the National Wine Centre has progressed to date.

I must comment on one of the previous contributions, that is, from the member for Mawson. Tonight, like no other night, I think, the member for Mawson did make me feel like putting my finger down my throat. Nobody in this Parliament, except the member for Mawson, is capable of complimenting the Deputy Premier and his colleagues for what was, basically, a stuff-up. We have heard about what could only be described as a stuff-up in the way this whole project was approached by the Government.

I will give members a little history. The Leader of the Opposition talked at length about the history of this project, but I will recap briefly what happened. Towards the end of 1996, the former Premier and then Tourism Minister announced that we would have a wine centre at the Hackney Road site.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: Is that 1996 or 1997?

Ms WHITE: At the end of 1996, the former Premier announced that there would be a—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms WHITE: At the end of 1996 the former Premier and the then Minister for Tourism announced that Hackney Road would be the site for the National Wine Museum. Perhaps the Deputy Premier would like to check the facts: he was the Minister at the time. After that, there was much to-ing and fro-ing as we now know, about the siting of the National Wine Centre. In fact, in January 1997, even though the Premier had announced the Hackney site for the National Wine Centre, it reached the point where there was so much speculation about the centre's location that the then Tourism Minister (who is now not in this Parliament) had to put out a press release stating:

The announcement [that the wine centre would be at Hackney Road] puts an end to speculation that Mr Ashenden as the new Minister for Tourism was going to change the proposed location of the National Wine Centre.

There was so much speculation that that had to occur. Why was there so much speculation? There were a couple of reasons. First, the proposal that the former Premier had put forward was more a Taj Mahal than a wine centre based around the Goodman Building. At that time, the Opposition thought it was a little silly and grandiose but made no public comment. Instead, we waited for the plans although there were none at that stage. An Ernst and Young report had been

completed and circulated, although it was never made public, but sections of the report found their way into public hands.

There was much concern about what was being proposed. Generally, it was considered that the proposal for the Goodman Building was inappropriate and there was a suggestion in that report that the project would result in a \$1 million a year loss. That was a great concern, and it is no wonder. That was one reason, but probably the most telling reason why there was such confusion about the site for the centre was the current Premier's own actions in 1997 when he wrote to Ian McLachlan, the Defence Minister, suggesting that the site be the Torrens Parade Ground.

In his letter to Ian McLachlan on 17 March 1997, the now Premier said that this was necessary 'for the project's commercial success and to consolidate industry support for it'. It is obvious from what the Premier has written that he is implying that there is no industry support for the chosen project of the former Premier, with whom he got on so well. That project was centred around the Goodman Building at the Hackney Road site. Among all this to-ing and fro-ing, I remind members that the Premier's letter to Ian McLachlan of 17 March came only two months after the Tourism Minister of that time had put out a statement confirming the site at Hackney Road.

At this stage there had been no public comment from the Opposition about the proposal; it was waiting to see the plans and what the Government would come up with. Then, all of a sudden, after all this to-ing and fro-ing on the part of the Liberal State Government, the wine industry approached the Opposition in about April 1997 and told us that there was a real threat that we would lose the National Wine Centre because of this to-ing and fro-ing of the Government and that the bid would be unsuccessful if we did not hurry up and get this thing going. That was way back in April 1997.

The Labor Opposition's reservations about the appropriateness of the Goodman Building for what had been proposed at that stage—and, of course, there is nothing public about what that proposition was, apart from these extracts from the Ernst and Young report, which referred to a completely different project from what has now emerged or what was proposed last year—made the Opposition decide that our concerns about the Goodman Building should be overridden in light of the Government's assurances that what was now being planned for the wine centre at Hackney would be an appropriate facility, as a national tourism icon based in South Australia.

At all times, the Government was aware that the Opposition supported the establishment of a National Wine Centre in South Australia and supported its establishment in the centre of the City of Adelaide, for reasons that other members have now expanded upon. But, at this stage still no plans or designs existed and little detail at all was made available, including to the Opposition, despite—as the Leader of the Opposition has already pointed out—the promises that it would be made available. So, in the interests of making sure that the National Wine Centre would be established in this State and would be a success, the Opposition agreed to legislation, which was introduced in May/June last year and debated at the beginning of June.

The Opposition did indicate that, because we had not seen any plans or designs, we required some public consultation. The Government jumped up and down, saying that this was totally inappropriate. The Labor Opposition moved an amendment to insert a process in the legislation—and members should remember that what we were agreeing to

was a fast tracking of this project, comparable to that of the Capital City project. I refer to the Minister's comments about the project in debate on the Bill, where he said:

It is a major project; it has been deemed exactly the same as the Capital City project—

another Government success—

We want exactly the same procedure to apply.

So, the Opposition agreed to fast tracking but, because it had seen no designs or plans, we asked that there be public consultation. As a result of that request for public consultation our amendment was not agreed to, but public consultation did result, so an achievement was made there. However, in opposing our amendment to the Bill, the Government indicated that it was totally inappropriate to allow this level of public consultation, because it would hold up the process. The Minister said it would hold up the process for between three and six months. That was back in June.

The Government's argument was that we would lose this project as a national centre if we did not get it up and going, yet here we are, getting on towards a year later, and we are getting to the design and planning stage only now. So, either all those arguments that were given as reasons for necessitating fast tracking have dissipated and there was no necessity for it in the first place or the Government has truly stuffed this up. Even with the support of the Opposition in getting through enabling legislation, the Government has not been able to get this centre going for 18 months. I repeat that I concur in the member for Gordon's saying 'Lets get on with it; no more delays.' We hope that finally we will see some plans and designs. We have still have not seen them, but we hope they will eventuate soon. I wonder how long it will take the Government to get the project up and going; with fast tracking provisions and the support of the Parliament it still has not been able to make it happen as yet.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I support the Bill. I am very pleased to see that the centre will be located within the corner of Hackney Road and North Terrace. The selection of that site is excellent and I wish I had thought of it, because it is a clever site in the very best sense of that word. It is central; it does not favour one wine producing area over another; and it is ideal in terms of tourism and the North Terrace precinct. I strongly support your earlier comments, Mr Deputy Speaker, in relation to the Herbarium and the Botanic Gardens, which are important parts of our heritage and very much part of our commitment to preserving and protecting our environment.

As we know, the wine centre is vital for tourism, and the wine industry is important in terms of the economy. I will focus on a couple of aspects related to the latter point. I believe we have a great future in the wine industry if we keep our focus on premium quality wines, but we should not delude ourselves; we will have very tough competition from countries such as Chile, South Africa and others. Anyone who thinks we have a God given right to be automatically selected by consumers should think again.

We should be mindful that, whilst some viticultural frenzy is occurring at the moment, there are some potential down sides. It was not long ago that we had schemes to pull out vines. I am a little concerned about some of the plantings now, and I believe that if we are not careful we could reach a point where we return to that unfortunate situation. There are also impacts as a result of the expansion in the vineyard area, and they include the impact on citrus and stone fruits.

I think consumers will notice the difference in the very near future in respect of the pricing of those products, because of the removal of stone fruit trees and citrus, and it is also affecting other areas of primary production.

That should not necessarily be a negative but it is something we should be mindful of. Another important aspect is that we should not destroy the character of our countryside. We often hear people talking about the removal of scattered trees which, in many situations, are gum trees with character and distinct attributes. I have to say that horticulture and viticulture are in my blood. Many of my family, both living and in the past, have been involved in those activities, and I am still very much committed to ensuring that we retain as much as possible of our natural vegetation and heritage. So I do signal a concern about some of the clearing, not just of scattered trees but other aspects of native vegetation clearance that is going on at present.

Members would be advised to take note of the comments of Mrs Henschke yesterday on radio. We have seen an outstanding contribution from that family which has a great name in the wine industry. She expressed concern about these very points and I draw the attention of members to it, not in the sense of being negative but, whenever we get on a bandwagon, we need also to take our breath and focus and ensure we are not doing things which in the long term we may have cause to regret.

Certainly, I welcome this wine centre. The sooner it is built and fully operational the better. Mr Speaker, I do not share your love of Tram Barn A. I love trams but I do not love Tram Barn A and, when the SAS return from the Middle East, if they have not already, that is one site where I suggest they could continue their training. In conclusion, I look forward to the centre operating. It will be a great asset for the State and I commend all the people, both the Minister and his officers, who have brought this project to this important stage.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I support the construction of the National Wine Centre because it will showcase an industry which is important for my electorate. The member for Mawson has laid claim to the Southern Vales, but I will not allow that to go uncontested. Reynell is actually the home of one of the largest wine companies in the world, that is, BRL Hardy Limited, which employs 375 full-time equivalent staff in Reynella. In South Australia overall it employs 865 full-time equivalent staff. I am very pleased to say that in wages and salaries in South Australia it pays \$25.9 million, and at Reynella alone it injects into the economy \$12.5 million in wages and salaries. Members can see that indeed an opportunity to showcase the wine industry is important to the people of Reynell.

The BRL Hardy company is either the eleventh or twelfth largest wine company in the world, and it has demonstrated its success in many different ways. It has consistently won trophies, top golds and gold medals, and many members would know that it won the Jimmy Watson Trophy for the 1995 Eileen Hardy Shiraz. The 1996 Chateau Reynella Shiraz won the Wine Press Club of New South Wales trophy for the best red table wine in classes 6 and 23.

As to the Hardy company's benefit to the community that the wine centre will be able to showcase, I point out that its total sales revenue, according to the 1996-97 annual report, exceeded \$300 million for the first time; export sales of Hardy wines from Australia rose 41 per cent; and bottle sales increased by 50 per cent. The sale of bottled wine in the

United Kingdom rose 62 per cent in that year, while in the USA it rose 96 per cent. Hardys is very pleased that there will be a centre which can showcase the industry. It is happy with the location in the city of Adelaide, although not necessarily that it will be attached to the Hackney centre. The company simply believes there should be an opportunity within the main tourist precinct for people to see the benefit of taking a trip down to Hardys and the southern area to appreciate the wine industry and the contribution it makes.

Many members will know that Hardys is not operating solely at Reynella but also has plantings in the Coonawarra. In recent times it has developed plantings in that area considerably, and the expansion of varieties planted both at Padthaway and other areas in Australia will produce an opportunity to showcase the Hardy's wine industry continually in the future. The company is looking to expand the industry on a world-wide basis and at being involved in joint ventures with Nobile Vintners and National Liquor Distributors in New Zealand, and a strategic alliance with Brian McGuigan Wines in the Hunter Valley; and it also has a French partner in its *Domaine de la Baume* operations in southern France. So, it is with considerable pride that I report that this industry is operating from the electorate of Reynell, and that it is recording its success both financially and in terms of medals. It is providing employment and wealth to the people of Reynell and it is spearheading the initiatives of the southern area in terms of the contribution our valuable wine industry makes to this State.

There have been several comments about the wine industry's relationship with the food industry. Indeed, we heard earlier today about the important developments with the Regency School of Food and Wine and the achievements in that area. I point out that, if it were not for the vision of former Labor Premier Don Dunstan, the Regency School would not exist and that, in terms of our ability to attract international students to it and other schools, if it were not for the vision and commitment of John Dawkins at the national level we would not be able to bring in students to participate in this State and in this country's education institutions. I remind the House that this side of the Parliament, when in Government, has made some major visionary contributions to South Australia. At the moment there seems to be a collective case of amnesia from the Government side, but these people deserve to be remembered also.

That concludes my contribution, other than to say that I am advised that a very good reason for locating a rose centre adjacent to the wine centre is that roses and vines are subject to the same sorts of diseases. If the roses start dying, we will know that we have to protect the vines. That is the reason for planting rose bushes at the end of vines, as many people have noted, particularly in the South-East where it is a rather common practice.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I intend to speak briefly as I realise that much has been said on this subject already this evening. I could not help but rise, given that there has been much talk about bipartisan support, to offer my support so that it can be tripartisan. As to the location of the National Wine Centre and its location in Adelaide, the Hackney Road site is a sensational site. To have it in Adelaide is a real coup for Adelaide and the wine industry here in South Australia. The National Wine Centre will act as an interpretive centre for visitors to Australia to help them understand and appreciate the industry and for us to showcase the Australian wine industry.

In my own electorate, it will also give the Riverland wineries and grape growers the opportunity to promote the Riverland as a quality wine producing region. For so long the Riverland has been considered second-rate when it comes to the production of wine grapes. We have been labelled the cask capital of Australian wine, and this is just not the case.

The Riverland contributes much to the production of wine right across Australia in that it produces high quality grapes, and it is used in the production of many high quality wines right around Australia. Much expansion is going on in the Riverland, and that includes a \$12 million expansion of the Southcorp Winery at Waikerie for the purpose of crushing grapes; a \$17 million proposed development at Kingston Estate; Thompson Fruit Growers is expanding faster than I can drive to Berri; Century Almonds and the vineyards at Loxton are expanding; and I could go on. So much development is happening in the Riverland that it is extremely exciting. It is the move not only to the growing of varieties but towards irrigation best practice in the region that is ensuring that we are producing very good crops. There is an opportunity for the Riverland to highlight this excellence through the interpretive centre that will be the National Wine Centre.

I would also like to touch on the matter of the rose garden. Renmark is the rose town of South Australia, which has a successful rose festival. Of course, we must mention the very famous David Ruston roses.

It will be fabulous to see the Herbarium moved to newer and better premises. An extensive collection of specimens from all over the State are catalogued at the Herbarium. It is vitally important that, when we move all these specimens from one site to the other, we consider logging them onto a database so that the information contained within the Herbarium is more user friendly. It can be brought up to twenty-first century technology to prepare us for the next century as to how we can use those specimens to introduce landcare programs more accurately throughout the State. I support the moving of the Herbarium and I also support our considering a database for it. I support the Bill.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): After hearing the members for Chaffey and Gordon, and you, Mr Deputy Speaker, praise their own wine growing region in a parochial fashion, I am compelled to contribute. Indeed, the member for Mawson, on every issue that comes before this House, invariably emphasises the importance of his district to the productive mechanisms of this State. As the member for Gordon said, once you start naming people, you have to name the whole damn lot. Unfortunately, many names from my electorate were not included and I feel compelled to correct that. One of the reasons why South Australia historically enjoys pre-eminence as the wine State of Australia is the role that Roseworthy Agricultural College has played over many years. It is sad to see the demise of that role, even though it has been virtually completely shifted to the Waite Institute, which again is a great South Australian institution. I note with sadness the demise of the Roseworthy wine course.

The member for Gordon tried to correct the mistake of some of the earlier speakers by naming a few of the pre-eminent wineries they had omitted. I cite a few wine makers who came out of the Roseworthy institution: Doug Bowen, from Bowen Estate in Coonawarra; Jimmy Watson Trophy winners from Coonawarra such as Ian Hollick, from Hollick's Wines; and Greg Clayfield—people who have really put South Australia on the world map. There are many other

names, and I do not intend to mention them all, but I point out the errors of some of the previous speakers.

The member for Elder said that we should be concentrating on the issue of water and how we could grow many more grapes. Water is an issue that is very dear to my heart, as members would well know. One of the problems with all industries in this State is that, when people come up with simplistic ideas and solutions to complex problems, they can do more harm than good. For the benefit of the member for Elder, I point out that it was under a Labor Government that water policies were developed for a large part of the region of South Australia that I represent, and those water policies have done little to help the wine industry.

I will give two examples: first, in the Naracoorte ranges area, water policies brought down in the mid 1980s have allowed certain landholders to tie up access to water. In fact, they have tied it up so tightly that they have reduced access to water and created artificial false markets in the trading of water, and that has led to nothing but those landholders making huge windfall profits at the expense of the wine industry in that area. There are examples of vineyard developers having to pay more money to buy a water licence than they paid for their vineyard land.

Secondly, the Padthaway area, which has expanded greatly in recent years, has a problem with salinity due to the irrigation practices of the past. The people there—and hopefully I will be able to help them solve their problem in the future—have a problem with salinity, which is increasing at about 50 parts per million per year. To me that suggests that, if we do not take serious action, within 20 years the Padthaway grape growing area will no longer be able to support the viticulture industry. We must take notice of how we handle the allocation of water to various industries.

The member for Fisher said that there was a frenzy of people planting grapevines in South Australia and, indeed, that has been the case in the past five to 10 years. The amount of money spent on investment in wines is extraordinary. In my electorate—and I am sure that a similar situation prevails in other areas—one of the problems is (as those of us who have been mixed up in primary industries for a period of time will remember) the vine pull and the collapses of the wool, beef and other primary industries that have occurred at various times. I would like to echo his sentiments: we should move ahead with some degree of caution and not embrace the viticulture industry as our saviour or as the only industry that will provide for the future of this State.

I would like to echo several points regarding the National Wine Centre, one being made by you, Sir, in relation to the potential problems for the Herbarium. As a primary producer I am acutely aware of the role of and the genetic bank held in the Herbarium. I know from my own business interests—and those in the wine grape industry would have similar sentiments—the importance of such organisations within our community. The Herbarium of South Australia is a much underrated asset of ours and should be given greater recognition.

The wine industry in South Australia had its birth by the foresight of some very great South Australians, and the one within my area was John Riddoch, who first planted grapes in the Coonawarra area. His name is immortalised in that wine mentioned by the member for Elder, the John Riddoch-Wynn's cabernet sauvignon. Even though great South Australians, with that foresight, started to plant grapes here many years ago, the pre-eminence of South Australia as the wine State is in fact quite accidental. One of the accidents that

caused this was the problem that existed predominantly in Victoria but also in New South Wales with phylloxera, which wiped out the wine grape industries in those States. South Australia has been free of that disease to date, and that is probably the major reason—along with its natural attributes for growing wine grapes—that South Australia has become the pre-eminent wine State in Australia. I am absolutely certain that organisations such as the South Australian Herbarium have a role to play in ensuring that freedom from that disease and other diseases continues into the future in South Australia.

It is a great thing that the National Wine Centre is being built in South Australia. It is probably a pretty good thing that it is being built in Adelaide. I said earlier that members in this Chamber who happened to have vineyards in their area exhibited a lot of parochialism. I think that there is even one winery in the District of Kaurana. To be honest, there would not be a rural seat in South Australia that does not contain a vineyard. I am very disappointed that the member for Flinders has not taken the opportunity to speak, because I know that she is very proud of the wine grape industry in her electorate—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: —as is the member for Waite. I have mentioned the Waite Institute. The building of this centre in Adelaide is a compromise, and that is a little unfortunate, I guess, because I always feel that, when you compromise, you tend towards mediocrity. It would be fantastic to see this centre in one of our premier wine grape growing areas, such as the Barossa, the Southern Vales or the Coonawarra, but I accept that, because of parochialism and the distances involved, this is probably a fairly good compromise.

I do have some concerns with the chosen site. I would suggest that at the end of the day there should be some *quid pro quo* for the regional areas of South Australia. I would hate to see this as another case of the City of Adelaide sucking the very life blood out of the rural areas—something that happens quite often—with no return to the rural regions of South Australia. In my electorate—and I am sure it is reflected in other electorates: indeed, I know it is—the tourism industry associated with the wine industry is a very important part of the regional economy. Certainly, townships such as Penola rely heavily on the tourism dollars, and I would hate to see the National Wine Centre have any serious impact on the tourism industry in my electorate.

Finally, as quite a few other members have said, it is an absolute travesty that the monstrosity known as Tram Barn A is still standing on Hackney Road and will probably continue to stand into the future. It is something that should have been bulldozed many years ago. In my mind, it has no architectural merit. It is an absolute eyesore and detracts from everything in that area, especially the magnificent tropical glasshouse. It is a great pity that the eyesore of Tram Barn A will be a blight on what I believe will be this next magnificent project, the National Wine Centre.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I had not intended to speak on this issue but, after listening to the member for Taylor, I decided that I should say a couple of things. In supporting the establishment of the National Wine Centre at Hackney, I

suggest that it will be a monument to a great growth industry, an industry that, over the last 4½ years under this Government, has had the greatest percentage increase in development than in its entire history in this State. Credit must go not only to the wine industry but also to those young academics who have come out of Roseworthy College and have made it an art form not only for the financial return but for the pride they have in being able to take a place in the world's markets for producing wines that I believe are unparalleled anywhere else in the world.

I want to respond to the member for Taylor, because she was very critical of the Government's procrastinating as to where it would site the wine centre, dodging, as she said, from the Torrens Parade Ground to the Hackney site. We just heard about Tram Barn A. When I was Lord Mayor, there was an agreement with Premier Bannon that it should go. One of the traits always related to the Labor Party is that, as soon as 50 people gather at any site—

Mr Hill interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: No, that is true. The vocal minority stood at the gates of the old Hackney tram barn demanding that it be retained. What we have today, in my opinion, is a heap of junk that once housed tram cars. There is a very small group of people in this State who believe that Tram Barn A should stay. What a tragedy, when the Federal Government in the bicentenary year set up that magnificent Conservatory, and, instead of having an absolutely spectacular garden from Hackney Road to the entrance of the Conservatory, we now have an old corrugated iron and besser block shed.

With respect to some of the things mentioned by the member for Taylor in criticising the Government about the establishment of the wine centre, let us look at one example. I could give a dozen but I will not take up the opportunity. When the argument arose that prisoners on remand should no longer be kept at the Adelaide Gaol, I remember that the Labor Government made a decision to build a Remand Centre. It was originally to be sited in Hindmarsh, near Bowden, and I remember that the Adelaide City Council protested strongly, believing that the Remand Centre should be built at Hindmarsh. However, the Bannon Government made a decision to site it at the top end of Hindley Street which guaranteed that the western end of Hindley Street would be virtually useless for the rest of its life because who would build something around a red brick Remand Centre? Thankfully, this Government had the vision to push for a university to be built at the western end of North Terrace and Hindley Street, and that has now started to revive the area.

This location for the wine centre is brilliant. I believe that it will encourage an enormous number of tourists. I would have been disappointed had it been sited in the Southern Vales, the Barossa Valley or in some other rural area, because it probably would have been visited by approximately 50 000 a year, whereas I believe visitor numbers will be double that in its present location.

It will become one of the great tourist attractions and everybody coming to Adelaide will want to visit it. In your area, Mr Deputy Speaker, the early German tourists played a significant part in the establishment of the wine industry in this State and I hope they will be remembered and honoured in that wine museum as the pioneers of the wine industry, because we have a proud history. Having travelled the world, I have yet to find a wine that comes up to the quality of the red wines that this State is producing. We are now on the world stage and world market and the focus is on us. We will not be the best kept secret in the world but the best known

location in the world because of the quality of wines we are producing, and the wine museum will become one of the great focal points of the world.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I thank members on both sides for their contributions to this debate and will make a few comments on these contributions and correct, in some instances, their statements. It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition is not here, but I will say a few things that need to be said at this stage. The Leader of the Opposition fundamentally purports to set standards in this place and for the past six months has been running around in the community saying how important these standards are. I would have expected that he would uphold those standards, particularly when it comes to public servants who cannot defend themselves. It is pretty much an accepted principle in this place that we as members of Parliament can expect to get a bit of a pasting and expect to have all our actions questioned and queried. Those sorts of issues are standard in this place.

I as much as any other member in this place have had to take a bit of stick and, when I know there are potential errors, I am prepared to stand up and correct them. I think that is part and parcel of this place. The majority of members here are prepared to accept those standards, but when the Leader of the Opposition comes into this place and breaks one of the most fundamental rules in this Parliament, namely, those relating to the independence of the public sector and, in particular, independent public servants, it is necessary to comment on that.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There is a throwaway line across the House in relation to the Chief Executive. The Chief Executive of the Tourism Commission is not a public servant. He was appointed to that position and took on the role in that corporation. Under the Act it is an independent position appointed by a board. It is not a position of a public servant, but a position appointed by a corporate structure set up by the Opposition when in Government and supported by me. It is usual for public servants not to comment in public and, if they do, they do so at their own risk.

Ms White interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Wah, wah, wah—here we go again. If you are going to stand up in this community and say that we want some standards, let us start with the Leader of the Opposition. Let us sort out all of those standards. I will work with him to get the standards and will make sure on this side that, if we agree to standards, they are carried out. That is another issue that needs to be put on the record in this place. If this place is to run properly, both sides have to agree to the rules and follow them through. I will not make any further comment on that as it is not worth going any further into it.

Most of the debate we have heard tonight has had nothing to do with this Bill. The debate has been about a National Wine Centre, the concept of which was approved last year to go onto a basic piece of land. This Bill is about changing that aspect because of a changed position noted by the Government. That changed position has come about not because of Government action but because a better position has been put forward after examination of the existing site and consultation with the community. In essence the position returns a significant amount of the land in question back to parklands. It is a very positive step in terms of a change of direction. I note that the member for Kaurua, on whose remarks I will

comment later, made a very good leadership speech here this evening. He recognised clearly—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I reckon I can pick them as well as anyone on that side.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Perhaps he never wanted to go any further. One of the important things is to recognise that the Government wants to make this change because it involves a better outcome and not because there has been a mistake. We have consulted with the community and I would have thought, particularly after what I have heard for the past 12 months from the Labor Party about the need to consult and listen, that, instead of knocking everything as has happened here tonight, the Labor Party would say that it is good to see that the Government is consulting and listening. I would have thought that it was in line with the fundamental policy espoused by the Labor Party over the past 12 months or so.

I was also fascinated with the way the Leader of the Opposition started off this whole hour and three quarters of diatribe with an announcement that he was responsible for the Barossa Wine Centre. The only thing for which he was responsible was making the decision, because nothing happened for the first seven months during which he was Minister. It was because of the support of the Federal Labor Government and the money that had been put in by this Government that that project went ahead. It was because of the push of the Federal Labor Government that the Barossa Wine Centre got off the ground. It was with the support of the then Minister that it really happened and not because of any efforts of the 'I did this, I did that, aren't I good' Leader of the Opposition. It happened because of an excellent Minister in the Federal Government.

There is no mention in the speech of the McLaren Vale Centre or the Faith Convention Centre in the Barossa Valley. There is no mention of the development of Wilpena and Mount Lofty—all of these things that were part of the tourism fiasco of the previous eight years where not one thing happened, although they were all promised. Nothing happened.

If you are to be fair about saying, 'I did this and I did that', you need to also come out and praise this Government for encouraging and improving the wine tourism industry. There has been a tremendous amount of work done in wine tourism. For the first time we have a wine tourism policy and the total support of the industry. That is a very important issue.

There was a throwaway line that Wine Australia ought to have been here in South Australia. I had a blue with Ian Sutton about that and I was not happy about it. Wine Australia has to be in the fundamental marketplace of Australia and that is in Melbourne and/or Sydney. As a State we have to be involved in that process because that is where our market is. I was fascinated to hear the criticism of Wine Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition should have taken the time to witness the fantastic effort that South Australia made in the first Wine Australia Expo in Sydney. It was recognised as the best presentation ever made by any State outside its borders. We ought to be proud of that fact instead of arguing that everything must be here in South Australia. The markets for the sale of our wine are in Melbourne and Sydney. That is where we must be, because that is where the volume is. We do very well in our own State, but the big wine markets are in Sydney.

I note that Tasting Australia has been totally omitted. That was the best food and wine exhibition and conference that has ever been held in this State, and it was held here last year. Some \$30 million worth of international publications resulted from that conference, which we would never have achieved otherwise. That conference was an initiative of this Government and Ian Parmenter of Channel 2. He approached the Government, the exhibition was put together, and it was a fantastic promotion for South Australia. It has been labelled as the best food and wine project ever held in Australia—and it was held in our State. We ought to be proud of that instead of having this continual knocking by members opposite, particularly the Leader. Our general thrust in tourism is in food and wine, because they are our best opportunities. South Australia is a special place to visit: the city, the country and the outback. It is good to see the Leader come back into the House even if it is half an hour into my reply.

I want to talk about some of the issues that were raised by the Leader and other members about the process and what happened as a consequence of the announcement. A lot of facts were missing from their contribution—they made political points just for the sake of making political points. I think it is important that I put the facts on the record, because in his speech the Leader of the Opposition grandstanded about being right. Now and again it is important to put down the facts. There is nothing like mucking up a good story by putting down the facts, so I will do that tonight.

An honourable member: That would be a first, wouldn't it?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I commented earlier that whenever I make a mistake in this place I correct it, and if I have ever made a mistake that has embarrassed this House I have apologised. I am prepared to stand up in this House and say so, and I have done that on many occasions.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am not proud of having made errors, but I am prepared to come into the House and admit them and stand up and be counted. The whole process was announced in France during a trip by the previous Premier in September.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I do not know exactly where in France the announcement was made, but it happened while he was there. In January 1997, former Minister Ashenden reaffirmed that the Hackney depot would be the site. On 17 March 1997, the then Premier wrote to Minister McLachlan. That letter, which has been referred to on many occasions tonight, clearly stated the question whether the Torrens Parade Ground would be available as the site for the National Wine Centre. Shortly after that letter, we heard a lot of guff from the Opposition about the fact that we now had two sites.

As a result, on 17 April 1997—I think it is important that everyone listen to this, because it will put the record straight—a memorandum of understanding was entered into between the State of South Australia and the Winemakers Federation to construct and operate a National Wine Centre in Adelaide on the old Hackney bus depot site. So, it was made clear that there was one site—no second site. That agreement was signed by me as Acting Premier and by Stephen Ross Shelmerdine on 17 April 1997. The matter was put beyond doubt on that date. After that date, no other site was considered—that was it. That was supported by the whole of the wine industry and the Government, and the agreement was signed by me as Acting Premier on

17 April 1997. All the nonsense spoken earlier tonight should be treated accordingly, because clearly that agreement was signed with support of both the Government and the wine industry on 17 April 1997—a registered document for everyone to see.

I am surprised that, if members opposite say that they used to get all these leaked documents, they do not have this one. All they had to do was ask the Government or the wine industry, and they would have been given a copy. I am staggered by the fact that the Opposition continually says that no-one could make up their mind after April when clearly this document was signed, sealed and delivered stating that this was the only site that would be used for the National Wine Centre.

Ms White: It was all over by then, Graham.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Let us run through a few more dates, because members opposite always get them mixed up. We had not started then.

Ms White interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Taylor that when referring to members of the House she should refer to them by their electorate or as Minister and not by their Christian name.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As I said, on 17 April it was confirmed that the Hackney depot would be the site—no further discussion. That did not stop the Opposition. One month later, in May 1997, the National Wine Centre Bill was introduced, and the \$20 million funding was announced. In August, the Bill was proclaimed, and then we started the consultation process with the stakeholders and interest groups. Shortly after that, an election was called. In December, a change was made after consultation on the superior concept and how we should go about it, and on 30 January the new integrated development was announced. Just over a month later the Bill was introduced in the House.

There has been all this nonsense about delays. The matter went through the consultation process, and today we have an amendment Bill to provide for a much better position, returning 1.2 hectares to the parklands. I note that the member for Kaurana, the new Leader in waiting, nods his head to show his support. That land is to be returned to the parklands and, consequently, to the Botanic Gardens. The issue then becomes one of where we go with the Tourism Commission. There was a comment about the Tourism Commission Bill. That came in the middle of this kerfuffle. It was really a comment by Phillip Styles supporting the fact that it ought to be on that site and making that known not only to the Government but clearly to the Opposition.

The other point that I want to make is that by placing the National Wine Centre in the centre of Adelaide we acknowledge it as such and as having the support of all the States. In the memorandum of understanding all the States agreed to have representatives on the board. So, it will truly be a National Wine Centre. But, it does recognise that in our State, which is the wine capital of Australia—I think every one of us accepts that is the position—there are in fact six zones, including the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa, Eden Valley, the Clare region which picks up Eyre Peninsula, the Riverland, McLaren Vale which picks up Kangaroo Island and Langhorne Creek, and the Limestone Coast which is in the South-East. As has been mentioned many times tonight, almost the whole State—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Limestone Coast is formally recognised by the wine industry as the area which

picks up Coonawarra, Padthaway, Koppamurra, Elgin Valley, Cape Jaffa, Mount Benson, Mount Gambier and all the others down there. The wine industry recognises that that region represents primarily the South-East of South Australia. I think it is important to accept that, whilst we are the wine capital of Australia, this wine centre is a national centre and we need to promote it on a national basis.

I want to make a few comments about some of the contributions by other speakers, because I do not think they can go unnoticed. A smart comment was made by the member for Elder when he said that you have to take a few risks. What an amazing statement from the member for Elder! Do we want another Marcus Clark? Here we go again: take a few risks; people ought to take a few risks. Clearly, this is all about returning to the Marcus Clark era. The member for Elder is saying that we should rip through and take a few risks.

The member for Ross Smith raised the issue of car parking. I have been informed that 250 car parks are expected to be available on site and that there will be integration with the standard transport system to ensure a smooth transfer to bus systems past the front door. In fact, the O-Bahn is probably the most sensible system that goes past the front door. It is quite a brilliant system which was introduced by Michael Wilson in a former Liberal Government.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Of course it was built by Labor, but it was introduced by Michael Wilson and Dean Brown. It is an excellent system. I also want to comment on the statement of the member for Ross Smith about the 'lunatic decision' of our Party to maintain Tram Barn A. One of the spin-offs is that because of that so-called lunatic decision we now have a national heritage tram barn which requires a tremendous change of attitude by this Parliament in terms of removing that issue.

The member for Kaurana made what I said earlier was a very mature leadership contribution. I continue to see him rise through the ranks—and it is a very important position in that part of the House; I can remember being there once or twice before. It is a very good leadership opportunity for the member for Kaurana.

The member for Heysen spoke about the Herbarium. The Government will give a guarantee that it will achieve similar standards to those presently existing when it moves to its new position in Tram Barn A. Clearly, the Government recognises the importance of the Herbarium. It is important to note that the Botanic Gardens board is supporting this process but is also ensuring through its role that the Herbarium and all the issues mentioned by the member for Heysen are closely looked at and worked with. It is important that we give that assurance.

The only other comment is in relation to the member for Reynell. I remind the member for Reynell to go to BRL Hardy and to ask its Chairman what his position on this issue. I believe that he is the strongest single supporter and very much in favour of the Hackney site; in fact, he has been one of the major drivers.

The end of this process will give what I believe is a fantastic new extension to the Adelaide Botanical Gardens. It will be tremendous to see this new project, the upgrading of both the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A with the new National Wine Centre, and the opening up with a new rose garden and trial rose gardens of what I now call wasteland in a terrible state. We will see the Goodman Building renovated from its current state and brought up-to-date, with

a vineyard and good parking underneath vines all set up in what ought to be a fantastic attraction for this State.

I believe that this Bill not only provides for the return to the parklands and, consequently, to the Botanical Gardens of about 1.2 hectares but also gives us an opportunity to develop that site in the best possible way. Comment was also made about the general program. Definition project work was commenced in February this year. We expect to commence the detailed design on the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A in March. It is proposed to commence destruction—that is, the restoration of the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A—in about August 1998. We expect to complete the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A some time in April 1999. We hope to move the Botanic Gardens and the State Herbarium facility between February and April so that whole area will be finished in about April 1999. Construction of the National Wine Centre will commence in April 1999, and the whole works will be completed in about June 2000. It is a program that, with public consultation, we believe will achieve the best possible outcome compared with the previous project. It was a good project but it is now superior with a much better outcome.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Mr HILL: As I indicated during the second reading debate, I wish to raise a number of questions about the Herbarium, some of which the Minister has partially answered. I would like to know the budget for the conversion of Tram Barn A into the new Herbarium and whether that money has been secured, or is the Government depending on potential Commonwealth funding? I understand that there has been a bid for an extra \$14 million from the Commonwealth. I would also like to know the process by which the Herbarium will be moved. Is the Herbarium guaranteed a new location to appropriate standard or will the plants simply be moved into boxes while we wait to see what happens?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As I said in setting out the project detail, we expect to commence detailed design of the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A in March this year. I would expect that at the end of this month or early April we would have those costings available. At this stage there is no formalised cost in terms of the upgrade of Tram Barn A, but it is expected that the total project will fall well within the \$20 million.

The Government has made application for a further \$14 million under the Federation Fund and, if that further \$14 million is granted, some extra developments will take place within the building, particularly for the National Wine Centre and probably in the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A. At this stage we expect the Herbarium and the National Wine Centre to be programmed and developed within the \$20 million budget.

Mr HILL: Is the Minister saying that the Herbarium is guaranteed re-establishment in Tram Barn A out of the existing budget?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes.

Mr HILL: My second set of questions deals with the management of the new site. As I said during the second reading debate, it seems sensible to me that the management of the site should be done in such a way that the Botanic Gardens have some sort of overall coordination of the plantings and the development of the ground part of the site,

although not the management of the wine centre. Is that being contemplated?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Both the National Wine Centre and the Botanic Gardens Board will develop the total site. The vineyards will be the responsibility of the National Wine Centre and matters related to that. Any development of the rose garden and its surrounds and the general surrounds of the total area will be under the control of the Botanic Gardens Board. The two of them will work together initially and will work out the responsibilities as they go along, but fundamentally it will be under the control of the Botanic Gardens Board.

Mr VENNING: Will the vineyard be planted on natural or root stocks, particularly given that a couple of weeks ago we announced the phylloxera program? It would be very astute to put it on root stocks.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am advised that the wine industry will plant the vineyard and that it expects it to be a show case vineyard for all the world to see.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Given the negotiations that went on last April, what worries us is that last year there was a stampede to get us to sign agreements and get the legislation through the Parliament, yet we did not see the plans or know the funding or costings. Even though we were told that we had to do all those things because we had a matter of days, weeks, or a few months to get national accreditation and all those things and get the construction started, here we are a year later essentially going through the same process.

Again the Deputy Premier is asking this Parliament to give approval for a project for which the funding is uncertain, yet we still have not seen the plans, which on 17 April last year I was promised within a week. With reference to the \$14 million from the Federal Government and the negotiations for Federation funding, first, when are we likely to get a yea or nay on the Federation funds; and, secondly, if we do not get approval for Federation funding, what part of the project will not proceed?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. First, I am sorry he was not in here when I explained the program, but in essence—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is all right; I know you are a very busy person, but you were not here, and I am sorry about that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is getting very late; I ask members to get on with the Bill.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I mentioned that we expect the final design to be completed at the end of this month or in early April, and as soon as that is available we will make sure that the Opposition sees the detailed plans once they have been approved by Cabinet. Obviously, costings will be included with that. The State's contribution of \$20 million was included in last year's budget, and we have applied for \$14 million as part of Federation funding. I am not certain, but I would expect a formal statement to appear in the Federal budget.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is good, and I am pleased that the Minister expects that we will get a positive announcement in the Federal budget about Federation funding. I think that is good, and I hope we can all expect that. If the \$14 million is not announced in the Federal budget, what part of this project will not then proceed? If there is a \$14 million shortfall on the desired project in its enlarged and changed capacity, what part of the project will not proceed?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The \$20 million in the State budget will allow the National Wine Centre to be built under a certain staged concept. If we are able to get a further \$14 million, that will expand the centre and we will also be able to put far more internal gadgets, electronics and so forth within the building to give it a much better display system. That is fundamentally where most of the balance of the money will go. Again, we will give that information to the Opposition once it is available to us. At this stage, the concept plan is to rely on the \$20 million to build the building and use the support from the industry to fit it out with all the material it wants to put into the centre, develop Tram Barn A, establish the Herbarium, upgrade the Goodman Building and put in the rose garden. That should be possible within the \$20 million budget. That is within the budget as far as the Government is concerned.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: By way of follow-up, if we do not get the \$14 million, we will not see a redesign of this project in any way? If the \$14 million is not announced by the Federal Government, will we see no further redesign? I find it hard to believe that the \$14 million will be spent on technology, particularly when you look at the guidelines for Federation funding, which I understand must include capital works projects but not recurrent expenditure. So, in the Deputy Premier's submissions to the Federal Government and his negotiations with the Prime Minister's Department and the committee that has oversight of Federation funding, what is he asking for in relation to that \$14 million?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Undergrounding of the car park was one option to undertake if we get extra money; increased high-tech within the system; extra landscaping along Hackney Road; and a general upgrading of the site outside the boundaries within which we currently foresee that it would be done. It is a major upgrade; the scope of the redesign of the building will not be changed, but if we get more money we will be able to make it slightly bigger.

Mr CLARKE: In respect of the Minister's last answer to the Leader concerning underground car parking, if the \$14 million Federation funding does not come through—and we all hope that it will—does that mean that there will be no underground car parking; and, if so, what car parking capacity would be provided on site?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As I said in my reply in the second reading stage, car parking will be for 250 cars above ground and under vines. There will virtually be a trellis of vines. It will be like a covered car park for 250 cars. There is a lot of land on the North Terrace side of the Goodman Building that can be used for car parking. It will be vined and trellised and will be very attractive. It will not be just an open asphalt car park.

Mr CLARKE: Is that what you meant by 'underground car parking'? There are 250 car parks above ground and they will be hidden by trellises. The grape stains on top of vehicles will be interesting.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: They will be glory vines.

Mr CLARKE: With no grapes, so birds will not be attracted. How many cars will be provided for with underground parking if federation funding comes through? I assume that the National Wine Centre will be open seven days a week. What opening hours are envisaged? Will the car parking be sufficient to provide for off-street car parking to reduce problems for the residents of Hackney?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: My advice is that there will probably be enough money to build 150 car parks underground. A further 100 will be above ground and along

Hackney Road. There will be sufficient car parking in the IMVS area because the proposed new car park should be built by the year 2000.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

A quorum having been formed:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MEMORIAL DRIVE TENNIS CENTRE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 February. Page 511.)

Mr CONLON (Elder): I support the Bill. As we understand it and as we have been briefed, the proposed redevelopment in the area preserves the integrity of the existing parkland and makes no negative impact upon the current state of the parklands and developments along Memorial Drive. It does not involve any unwise use of Government money and, therefore, it will be supported. The only reservation we have, which I will address now rather than in Committee, concerns the previous history of the developer and a proposed sporting centre in the northern suburbs which failed to go ahead. What undertakings have been required to ensure that people will not be disappointed on this occasion?

Mr FOLEY (Hart): As shadow Sports Minister, I join with my colleague to support this legislation. In terms of sporting facilities in South Australia, it is impressive to say the least. I have not yet worked out the cost benefit analysis and how it will return a worthwhile dividend to the investor, but it is extremely pleasing to see that we have potentially at least an investor who is prepared to put upwards of \$20 million into the improvement of our city's capital stock and not require a great big Government handout. If this is the first time in decades that we have a real live investor with real money—hopefully and touch wood—who does not need 50 per cent subsidy by the taxpayer, it is pretty good news for this State.

This guy is so good that we should lock him up in chains when he gets here and see what else we can get him to invest in. If this project goes ahead, it will be of great moment. Let us hope it goes ahead and is not like other developments—Capital City comes to mind, but the less said on that the better, after my comments yesterday. With this proposal it does look as though it is a significant development, provided that money is put up front. It is worth repeating the point that it is great to see an investor put in money without taxpayers backing it to the tune of 50 or 100 per cent.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): SACA will be one organisation which will benefit, as will those people who are involved in tennis. It is sad that the bowling green which has been there for so long will not be there for much longer. I know that next January an interstate bowls carnival between members of the different State Parliaments will be held there. It is the passing of an era in that respect. People who want to do short-lap swimming and to whom the Minister referred in the course of his second reading explanation will be able to utilise those facilities in the course of their training programs. I guess the bowls will be relocated somewhere else. That situation was not explained to us by the Minister.

I know that those people who have been bowling there for some time feel twinges of regret that not many people there now are members of that bowling club. In any case, such is the passage of time. We look forward to seeing the kinds of plans, and so on, which will come in consequence to provide us with the sort of amenities that are needed by tennis. These have been provided already in recent times in this Government's program, largely led by this Minister and by you, Sir, when you were a Minister, for spectator and participating sports such as netball, athletics, soccer and so on in the western park lands. I support the Bill.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I rise also to support this Bill but do so in terms of the caution expressed by the member for Elder. Memorial Drive is one of the great assets of this State, and every year we see some of the world's great tennis players come here. So, we have a great responsibility to ensure the integrity of our park lands and to ensure that that centre maintains the requisite standard to continue to attract those people to this State. It is a wonderful development, and a \$19 million injection into our sporting facilities sounds great.

As members know, I represent the area that includes the Golden Grove development, which is one of the largest growing areas in our State, and over the next four years it will probably experience an influx of 1 500 to 2 000 people into my electorate. People who move into that area are sold a way of life. Families with children in their early preschool years, school years and teenage years are moving into the area. We have grandparents relocating there so that they can be with their families. As I said, they are buying a promised way of life, and sport is an integral part of that.

Eighteen months ago there was a great deal of excitement in the Golden Grove area when it was announced that a \$10 million sporting complex would go ahead and that it would include a range of facilities, including a tennis centre, a bowling green, a football oval and a baseball oval. In fact, in August 1996 it was announced in the Messenger Press that construction of this \$10 million sports centre looked like beginning within six weeks. The article said that the complex would include, as I said, grassed ovals, a 1 600-seat tennis centre and possibly a bowling green. The person responsible for this said:

I would not be surprised if this is not just a guesstimate. It could be five weeks before we start.

The local members at that time were right behind it. The Messenger quoted the member for Newland, the then member for Wright and the member for Makin as heartily embracing the idea. Unfortunately, that complex has not come to fruition. It was not very long before we saw stories in the Messenger that in fact the backers of this centre, the David Lloyd Group, had withdrawn its support.

I caution this House that we must ensure that the same thing does not happen to Memorial Drive. Before anyone is given a 50-year lease on a large part of our park lands, we must ensure that they are fair dinkum about this development and that this is not just a pie in the sky idea but that it is a concrete proposal of which the people of this State can be proud.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I thank members for their contribution, particularly the member for Hammond. By way of reply to questions from members opposite, we have a developer commitment to the planning process with letters of intent to the Premier, and there has

been three years involvement with the city council. In reply to the member for Hammond's question, it is my understanding that only one bowling green will go, with one remaining. However, because the tennis courts are further behind the SACA grandstands, one may be relocated in that area. The developer is John Lloyd and Associates from London. John Lloyd is the Captain of the British Davis Cup team, and he is being supported in Australia by John Alexander. There has been no further initiative than the letter of intent because, until the Bill passes the Parliament and they obtain a 50-year lease, their applications for finance cannot be approved. We expect to have formal plans quickly, and hopefully the whole process can begin soon.

I am informed that the proposed finishing date is August 1999. Members would be aware that the Government is supporting Tennis SA spending \$1.2 million on upgrading the southern stand this year by constructing a roof on it, putting new seats in the north and south stands, landscaping and upgrading the change rooms. Next year, the remainder of that stadium will be completed with a further expenditure of \$1.8 million. As mentioned earlier, it is fantastic stadium. When it is finished, we will have one of the best covered stadiums in the southern hemisphere. With the major events that we will be able to stage here, we will almost certainly be guaranteed keeping the Australian Hardcourt Tennis Championships in South Australia in the long term.

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

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Ms KEY (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms KEY: When I was asking the Minister for Government Enterprises a question during Question Time today, he made a comment that was derogatory to me, saying that I was laughing about a very serious matter—the collapse of the Adelaide Oval lighting tower yesterday. This is a stunt on his part to demean the contribution that I made—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is starting to comment. She has been given leave to make a personal explanation and must confine her remarks to that.

Ms KEY: My belief is that he slighted me by making that comment. Noting my record in the area of occupational health and safety and workers compensation over the past 25 years, I take his comment quite personally, and I ask him to withdraw it.

HIGHWAYS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 423.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I admire the verve with which the Minister for Transport in another place has championed this Bill, and the Opposition finds itself charmed into supporting the measure. The Minister's advocacy leapt from the pages of *Hansard*. The mischief the Bill is designed to remedy is the rutting of unsealed, rain-affected roads in the Far North by vehicles driven unlawfully on these roads after they have been declared temporarily closed by the Department of Transport. The Bill seeks to overcome the difficulties of enforcing these closures in remote regions. The maximum

penalty for driving on closed roads is increased from \$100 to \$1 250 and a maximum of \$2 500 for second and subsequent offences.

Mr Brokenshire: So?

Mr ATKINSON: A civil penalty may also be applied whereby a guilty driver must compensate the Commissioner of Highways for the damage to the road caused by his driving on it. Alas the member for Mawson does not seem to think that these amendments to the law change anything, but I assure the honourable member that they do change things and the Government is right to be changing them in this way.

The Minister says that the cost of regrading damaged roads is \$160 per kilometre and that rises to \$500 per kilometre if the road is rutted. Thus the civil penalty could be much heavier than the maximum fine, especially for a long unlawful drive along roads such as the Birdsville Track or the Strzelecki Track.

The most important aspect of the Bill is the widening of the department's authority to delegate enforcement. In the past, only officers of the department could place fences, barriers, notices and lights on the road to close it owing to rain damage. It might take the officers days to get to the site.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I said 'days'. It does not take officers of the Department of Transport weeks or months to reach closed roads in the Far North, difficult though it may be to move in those regions. Now, after this Bill, the Commissioner of Highways may delegate this authority to anyone, such as a local council or, in the unincorporated area of the State, the police or national park rangers. This will allow a decision for closure to be enforced more rapidly.

The department plans big road-status signs for some of the unsealed roads in the Far North. I think that the Minister is right to say that people such as pastoralists and miners who live in the Far North of the State have a civic pride and sense of ownership in their roads. The locals resent tourists, and others passing through, driving on their roads when the roads have been declared closed owing to rain damage. One impatient and silly driver, especially a driver of a heavy vehicle, can rut a wet road and make it unsafe for other vehicles for weeks.

Another aspect of the Bill is its changes to controlled access roads, namely, the roads running from private property onto the public road—the driveways of the bush. The Bill increases the penalty for having unlawful access to the highway from \$100 to \$1 250 and introduces a maximum penalty of \$125 a day for persisting with illegal access. A civil penalty like the one mentioned earlier is introduced for damage arising from an unlawful access.

Before 1960 there were no controls on where road users entered and left the highways. From 1972 access had to be specified by proclamation. The Government, heeding the advice of the Crown Solicitor that pre-1972 controlled access roads may not be subject to the Commissioner's jurisdiction, puts the matter beyond doubt in the Bill by giving the Commissioner authority over all access to the highways. The Opposition wholeheartedly supports these sensible measures.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I thank the Opposition for its very wise words.

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

CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 577.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Advances in DNA profiling have prompted Australian Governments to think about the forensic procedures used by our police and to introduce extensive statutory rules about how to collect such evidence. When the Bill talks about forensic procedures, it means acquiring bodily samples that can be used to identify a criminal or to rule a person off the list of suspects.

The statute law that governs forensic procedures in South Australia is section 81 of the Summary Offences Act. This section was first passed in 1928 and it contemplates fingerprinting and later medical and dental examination of suspects. Under these provisions, it is easier for police to order a medical examination of a suspect for the purpose of collecting forensic samples than it is to order the fingerprinting of a suspect. I expect we would all agree the law should be more careful about intimate medical examinations than it should be about fingerprinting.

Decisions on forensic disputes in South Australia are based on judicial interpretations of this 1928 provision whose creators did not contemplate DNA profiling. I think it is the consensus amongst Attorneys-General that it is undesirable for the police to be regulated in their forensic procedures only by section 81 and its interstate equivalents. The South Australian Supreme Court in the case of Franklin (1979) and the case of Dyson (1997) decided that the expression 'an examination of the person' in section 81 would permit the taking of hair and the taking of blood—that is, external and internal harvesting of samples. There is a New South Wales decision to the contrary. Rather than wait for the High Court to choose between the two rulings, it is time for Parliament to say what the law should be. This is what the Bill does.

The Opposition supports the Bill because it is sensible and balanced. Before asking a person's permission to take a forensic sample, the police must have reasonable grounds to suspect that the procedure would produce evidence of value to the investigation. If the person asked for a forensic sample is not a suspect or is indeed the victim, he or she may refuse and there is no appeal from that refusal. It is reasonable suspicion that sets non-consensual forensic sampling in train. The civil-libertarian lobby wanted arrest to be the prerequisite for non-consensual forensic sampling, but I agree with the Government that this prerequisite would lead to many unnecessary arrests as police try to solve serious crime by arresting merely so they can get a sample, a sample that might prove the suspect's innocence.

Of course, it may be that many people associated with the victim of a murder might wish to have themselves DNA tested so they may be ruled out of the investigation. In cases of a wife's being murdered, I would recommend a voluntary DNA test to her innocent husband. Let me give the House a contrasting example from Europe. A few years ago, an English girl was murdered in a French village. The investigation did not result in charges. The parents of the girl and the English press clamoured for all men in the village to be compulsorily tested. This is something the French police could have done had they wished. It is not something we will be able to do in South Australia after the Bill becomes law.

The Bill divides forensic examination into three categories—intimate forensic procedures, intrusive forensic

procedures and non-intrusive forensic procedures. Intimate forensic procedures include examination of the genitals, the anus, the buttocks and, if the suspect is a woman, the breasts. When a suspect is subject to an intimate examination, members of the opposite sex should not be present nor able to view the examination if that is practicable. Intrusive forensic procedures include taking saliva from the mouth, buccal swabs (which are scrapings from the inside of the mouth) and the drawing of a blood sample. Suspects may refuse police requests for an intimate or intrusive forensic examination, but the police can appeal to a magistrate with a view to the magistrate's compelling the suspect to submit.

The question the magistrate should ask himself is whether the public interest in ensuring that citizens are free from unwanted interference is outweighed by the public interest in obtaining evidence tending to prove or disprove the person's guilt. If there are good grounds for believing that the suspect is about to destroy the sample, or the sample is perishable, the police may apply over the telephone for an interim order from the magistrate which must later be made absolute at a second or final hearing if the prosecution is to be able to use the sample in evidence.

The suspect should be represented by a lawyer at the final hearing—indeed, he can be represented by a lawyer at the interim hearing, I understand, if that can be arranged quickly enough. In emergencies, the police may act immediately and seek a ratification by a court later. Reasonable force may be used by the police to prevent potential forensic evidence being destroyed or contaminated. It is important to remember that interim orders may be sought only in respect of indictable offences and that the suspect may be represented by a lawyer at the final hearing.

The Bill provides that consent to a forensic procedure is not to be assumed from an absence of protest. If police go ahead with the forensic procedure they must have the express consent of the suspect, otherwise it is off to the magistrate for a hearing. The exceptions here are protected persons, defined as children or people who are incapable of giving informed consent. Before any forensic sample can be taken from a protected person, even a non-intrusive sample, the police must approach a court and the protected person must have an appropriate representative, namely, a parent or friend or an advocate nominated by a Government department or private agency with the responsibility for care of protected persons of the relevant class. The protected person may also be represented by a lawyer. So, in the case of protected persons, it is always off to the magistrate.

Where the forensic procedure is non-intrusive and the person is in lawful custody, the investigating police can seek authorisation from a senior police officer who is not involved in the investigation. The investigating police need not approach the court for permission. A senior police officer is defined in the Bill as an officer of or above the rank of inspector. Non-intrusive forensic procedures include taking fingerprints, cutting a sample of hair or taking paint flecks from an item of the suspect's clothing.

The Bill provides that the police's obtaining of forensic samples must be done humanely. So, it should not unnecessarily offend the genuinely held religious beliefs or values of the person, nor inflict unnecessary harm, humiliation or embarrassment. In the case of intrusive procedures, no more people than are necessary should be present when the samples are taken. Members of the opposite sex should not normally be present at an intimate forensic procedure, and hair samples

should be cut rather than pulled. Interpreters should be available to those people who need them.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I would hope that you would take the hair from the head—unless the member for Hammond has different ideas. The penalty to the police for improperly obtaining forensic samples is that the evidence will not be admissible in the criminal trial. This is dealt with in clause 45. This clause provides that, if the police violate the Act, the forensic evidence is not admissible in the trial unless the person from whom the sample was taken does not object to its admission or the trial judge believes the evidence should be admitted 'in the interests of the proper administration of justice'. The latter requirement is not fulfilled merely by the evidence being of high probative value. The police cannot say to the court, 'Look, Your Honour, we know we broke the rules to get this sample but by golly if you let us tender the sample we've got the accused by the short and curlies.' Perhaps that is what the member for Hammond was thinking about with his earlier interjection.

In deciding whether the interests of justice would be served by the admission of unlawfully obtained forensic evidence, the trial judge must consider the probative value of the evidence in question, the seriousness of the breach by police and the extent to which the accused has been prejudiced by the breach. Evidence of the accused's refusal to give informed consent to a forensic procedure is not admissible in the trial but his unlawful obstruction of an authorised forensic procedure might be. As I said earlier, the Bill requires the police always to seek informed consent before taking a forensic sample. The Bill provides that a person's consent is not to be presumed from the absence of objection. So, there must be consent orally, in writing or by gesture.

Consent may be withdrawn during the forensic procedure, but that does not render inadmissible the forensic evidence obtained before consent was withdrawn. To check whether informed consent was sought and whether the forensic samples were properly obtained, clause 38 requires a video recording of the whole procedure to be taken. This would be along the same lines as the videotaping of police interrogations with which the last Parliament dealt.

Informed consent includes being told of the nature of the offence; the nature and purpose of the procedure and who is to do it; the entitlement to have a chosen medical practitioner present at an intrusive procedure; that the procedure may produce evidence that could be used against the person; that the person may refuse consent and evidence of the refusal may not be led in evidence if the person is tried; that if the consent is withheld the police may appeal to the courts for authority to conduct the procedure and reasonable force may be used if consent is still withheld; and that, if the person is convicted or ordered liable to supervision owing to criminal insanity or unfitness to plead, the forensic information will be stored indefinitely and included on a national database. That is quite a mouthful for a police officer to tell a person from whom a forensic sample is to be requested, especially if the person is playing up in custody. One can imagine PC Quinnan uttering all that to a suspect in *The Bill* on Saturday night.

The Bill provides that, when a person is convicted of an indictable offence, or the court makes a finding of guilt on an indictable offence, or the court declares a person liable to supervision (such as a person found unfit to plead or found not guilty owing to insanity and either ordered confined to James Nash House or discharged), the person must grant a set

of his or her fingerprints and a blood sample. I presume the blood sample will be used for the national DNA database and held indefinitely, probably until some time after the death of the person who gave the sample.

For the purposes of the Bill, juvenile offenders are in the same position as adult offenders. If the sample is from a person who is not convicted, it may be held for a maximum of two years. Police can apply to the Magistrates Court to have the sample held for longer than two years, but the police will have to give good grounds that persuade the court. I can imagine such grounds, especially where the police had a *prima facie* case against the person but not a case beyond reasonable doubt. As the Minister says, if the police want to keep the samples for longer than two years they should provide some realistic time in which it is reasonable to believe that the investigation will be pursued actively and not just shelved.

There are several events that would require the earlier destruction of a forensic sample and they are, first, that the sample was obtained under a interim order that was not confirmed; secondly, that a court decides the sample is not admissible in evidence; and, thirdly, that the person from whom the sample was obtained is acquitted. This last reason will irritate some police because many accused are acquitted not because the court thinks they are innocent but because the prosecution has not proved the case beyond reasonable doubt. In these cases the police would probably like to keep the sample for the full two years should some new evidence turn up, so they at least might prove to their own satisfaction that they were right. But, in a concession to civil libertarians, the Government Bill requires the destruction of the sample as soon as reasonably practical after acquittal. Another event that will demand the destruction of the sample is that the prosecution was not started within two years of the sample's being obtained.

The Bill carefully ensures that forensic samples are not misused to defame a person. Clauses 47 and 48 seek to ensure confidentiality and restriction on publication. Clause 42(2) provides a penalty on people who disclose the results of analysis of forensic material obtained under an interim order. It is important that forensic samples and analysis not fall into the hands of the media before a person is charged. We would not want police leaking such information to discredit a public figure, or to create a public clamour for the charging of a person or a public clamour for an interim order to be made final.

The last aspect of the Bill I should mention is clause 39 whereby a suspect can require of the police that a part of the sample be reserved for the suspect's use if practicable and that assistance is offered to the suspect to have his portion of the sample analysed. With those remarks the Opposition supports the Bill, not merely because it is based on a uniform national model but because we think it is sensible and suited to South Australia.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier):

I thank the member opposite for his learned comments, and I look forward to further comments in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr ATKINSON: If the Deputy Premier could answer this unaided. In clause 3 a protected person is defined to mean a child or a person physically or mentally incapable of giving

informed consent to a forensic procedure. Would someone who is drunk be incapable of giving informed consent, and does that mean every suspect who is drunk will necessitate a police appeal to the Magistrates Court to get an interim order to have the forensic sample taken?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: My advice is that drunk or not, if they are incapable, which is in the definition, that sorts out the whole issue.

Mr ATKINSON: Is the Deputy Premier telling the Committee that if a suspect comes in drunk and a forensic sample has to be taken, because a drunk cannot give informed consent, the police will be put to the trouble of appealing to the Magistrates Court to obtain an interim order with all the attendant cost to the public that that will necessitate?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes, they can get an interim order and they can do that by telephone; it is not meant to be expensive.

Mr CLARKE: What is the definition of 'drunk'? How do the police form an opinion that beyond a certain level you are legless, in essence?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The word is not used in the legislation, and consequently it is not defined. The word 'incapable' is used.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 6, lines 16 and 17—Leave out paragraph (c).

This amendment arises as a result of a late communication from the Commissioner of Police. The amendment will allow a suspect to give informed consent to the taking of intrusive forensic procedures. As the Bill is currently worded, that is not possible. There were and remain sound reasons for this position but, in the end, the Attorney was persuaded that the protections legislated by the Bill in relation to the informed nature of the consent and the creation of an objective record of the event suffice to allow the focus to be moved to the suspect in this way.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 6, lines 32 to 34—Leave out paragraph (f) and insert:

(f) that, if the person does not consent to the proposed procedure—

- (i) if the proposed procedure is an intrusive forensic procedure and the suspected offence is a summary offence—the person cannot be compelled to undergo the procedure; or
- (ii) in any other case—an application may be made to an appropriate authority for an order authorising the procedure and the use of force reasonably necessary for the purpose of carrying out; and

This amendment is consequential on the first amendment. The whole clause deals with the informed basis of any consent that is given for the police to perform a forensic procedure by specifying the information that must be given to the suspect before a meaningful consent is given. Since it is, by virtue of the first amendment, possible for the suspect to consent to an intrusive procedure but that it remain not possible for an appropriate authority to order an intrusive procedure in relation to a summary offence, it is important that the suspect is given this information. That is what the amendment has been designed to do.

Amendment carried; clause as amended carried.

Clauses 17 to 19 passed.

Clause 20.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 8, line 27—After 'application' insert:

or, if it is not reasonably practicable to fax the application, the application may be read to the appropriate authority over the telephone (however, in such a case, a copy of the application must be provided to the appropriate authority as soon as practicable after the application is made).

The purpose of this amendment is to allow urgent orders referred to in the Bill as 'interim orders' to be made by telephone where a facsimile machine is not available. Again, while the Attorney is of the opinion that our laws should reflect advances in accessible technology and that electronic interchange of the required document is highly desirable, he accepts that provision should be made for the exceptional case where it is not reasonably practical to make an electronic communication by facsimile and where, therefore, the procedure would have to be carried out by telephone. Details of the forms to be used in such a case will be specified in regulations.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 21.

Mr ATKINSON: I draw the Deputy Premier's attention to subclause (3), which provides:

An appropriate representative may be—

(c) if there is no available person within the above categories—a person, who is not a police officer or person involved in the investigation of the suspected offence, chosen by a police officer in charge of a police station or the investigating police officer.

Given that in that subclause it is expressed as a negative, namely:

a person who is not a police officer or person involved in the investigation of the suspected offence—

should not the first 'or' be 'nor' in the drafting and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am informed that that would create a double negative. I understand that the member for Spence was given that advice a couple of hours ago.

Mr ATKINSON: But I wanted to hear it from the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You have.

Clause passed.

Clauses 22 to 49 passed.

Clause 50.

Mr ATKINSON: I refer to clause 50(2) which provides:

Information about a DNA profile derived from forensic material obtained under this Act or a corresponding law must not be retained on the database beyond the time the destruction of the forensic material is required under this Act or the corresponding law.

While that is a very good provision, there is no penalty for its breach. I think this should concern people who are worried by the civil liberties aspect of the Bill. Commonwealth public servants working on the national database may retain this information in contravention of the Act yet there is no penalty for that kind of misconduct. There are penalties elsewhere in the Bill for police and public servants who do not conduct themselves properly and breach safeguards in the Bill but there is no penalty here. This worries me considerably and it should have worried those members in another place who regard themselves as civil libertarians but who seem to have overlooked this clause.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: I do not want the Deputy Premier to say what will occur to him immediately, given his legal expertise, that is, that a person aggrieved can bring a civil action or an

equitable action for breach of statutory duty because, for a start, how is the person whose DNA profile is maintained unlawfully on the national database going to know that it is maintained unlawfully there? This will come to light when someone comes into the national database and reviews what is going on in the national database and finds, presumably, dozens, hundreds or thousands of DNA profiles unlawfully maintained on the database. What we want is a penalty for public servants who do this and some kind of administrative law remedy. I want the Deputy Premier to address this question and not waffle on about breach of statutory duty, which I am sure is the first thing that would occur to him.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Spence. He was quite brilliant in assessing what I was going to say, on advice. I understand that the rules have not yet been set up in relation to procedures in this matter and they will be done in the normal business rules in setting up the whole database.

Mr ATKINSON: What kind of answer is that?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is the answer I have been given on advice.

Mr ATKINSON: Let us say that you are a South Australian who is reasonably suspected of committing an offence and your case has not gone to trial because the prosecution has been abandoned, or you have gone to trial and you have been acquitted, and there was a clear legal duty on those who maintain the national DNA database to remove your profile from that database, what are you going to be able to do about the unlawful retention of your DNA profile on that database? What is your advice to South Australian citizens who find themselves in that position?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the learned gentleman for his question. It is not our intention to make criminals out of police officers. The whole database process is being developed, and as it is developed all the issues that have been brought up by our learned colleague opposite will be handled.

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Spence has asked three questions on this clause.

Mr ATKINSON: No, two on this clause; I can count.

The CHAIRMAN: So can I. The member for Spence has asked two questions on this clause.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: It is thought that the honourable member has asked 2½ questions.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Spence has half a question!

Mr Clarke: He might get half an answer.

Mr ATKINSON: Less than that! I found it faintly amusing that the Deputy Premier would get up and say, in an attempt to answer the previous question, that he was not about making criminals of police officers, because if you look through this Bill you will see that there are a number of offences that police officers can commit by breaching the provisions of the Bill—and in at least two of them, that is, first, leaking confidential information and, secondly, intentional or reckless publication of the results of forensic analysis, the maximum penalty is two years imprisonment.

So, the Government is quite happy to create criminal offences for police and public servants who breach other provisions of this Bill but it seems that it is not prepared to create an offence for one of the most serious breaches possible of this Bill, and that is retaining a DNA profile on

the database longer than is authorised by law. If there is one aspect of this Bill that really worries civil libertarians—and I have not historically been one of their champions in the criminal justice system—it is the national DNA database.

I would have thought that, if the Deputy Premier wanted to reassure civil libertarians anywhere in this Bill, it would be that their fears of big brother in the form of the national DNA database are unjustified because, if those who run the national DNA database do not act in accordance with the law, they will be subject to penalties. Yet there are no penalties here for breach of the proper way of running the national DNA database. Could it be that there is no penalty for breach of this clause because the national DNA database will be run interstate or in Canberra and the State Government finds it just too hard to penalise people who live interstate and work for interstate Governments or the Commonwealth Government for breaches of South Australian law?

I think the people of South Australia deserve an assurance that the national DNA database, which will be supplied with DNA profiles from South Australia, will be run according to law and that the people who run it but who do not act according to law will be penalised in the same way that South Australian police will be penalised for breaching other clauses of the Bill.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank our learned member opposite for his question. It is highly probably that it will be set up outside this State. I acknowledge the points that are being made by the member for Spence. Clearly, these issues need to be, and indeed will be, addressed, particularly in the areas of access and privacy. I would also like to make the point that in fact the only people who are likely to be involved in these offences (if they are potential offences) will be police officers, because they are the ones who are handling the database. I acknowledge the issues and they will be addressed.

Mr LEWIS: Whilst the member for Spence makes an interesting and fine point in debate, in probably the amount

of time it takes for us in this Chamber to get to the point where we are going to an election next, thousands of Australians will be using encrypted DNA identity cues on their smartcards for personal identity and personal security reasons of their bank accounts anyway, and I guess that within a decade the vast majority of citizens will rely on those for personal security reasons. Therefore, I do not see it as an object of great concern that that material would remain on the record. There is no question about the fact that it could be sunset within the computer program that kept it so that it automatically was expunged, and I guess that is the way in which it will be done, because the people who write the program will know the limits of the law.

But unquestionably, we as ordinary people will come to rely upon the great precision that we can obtain by using our own encrypted DNA identity on our smartcards. It is impossible then for someone to forge our signatures or to steal our pin number on a credit card or any other kind of plastic identity card that may at present rely on bar code or a combination of bar code, magnetic strip and other encrypted digital messages. To my mind, that means that we do not need to be unduly worried. For all those reasons, I am entertained by the concern of the member for Spence but not in the least worried as to the consequence.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (51 and 52), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EVIDENCE (USE OF AUDIO AND AUDIO VISUAL LINKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 19 March at 10.30 a.m.