

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 November 1998

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

## ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Judges' Pensions (Preserved Pensions) Amendment,  
National Electricity (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 2 and 23.

## STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The **SPEAKER**: I bring up the report of the Standing Orders Committee 1998 together with minutes of proceedings from 1994-98.

The **Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier)**: I move:

That the report and minutes be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Tourism Commission, South Australian—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development (Hon. R.G. Kerin)—

Australian Barley Board—Report, 1998

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

Environment, Resources and Development Committee—

Aquaculture—Response by the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development

Primary Industries and Resources SA—Report, 1997-98

South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board—Report, 1997-98

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Abortions Notified in South Australia, Committee

Appointed to Examine and Report on—Report, 1997

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1997-98

Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

Australian Dance Theatre—

Meryl Tankard—Report, 1997

Report, 1996-97

Carrick Hill Trust—Report, 1997-98

Community Information Strategies Australia Inc.—Report, 1997-98

Development Act 1993, Administration of—Report, 1997-98

Disability Information and Resource Centre Inc.—Report, 1997-98

Enfield General Cemetery Trust—Report, 1997-98

Film Corporation, South Australian—Report, 1997-98

History Trust of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

Museum Board, South Australian—Report, 1997-98

Passenger Transport Board—Report, 1997-98

Regulations under the following Acts—

Medical Practitioners—Clinical Genetics

Motor Vehicles—Dishonoured Transaction Fees

State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

State Theatre Company of South Australia and Magpie 2

Theatre—Report, 1997-98

TransAdelaide—Report, 1997-98

Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts, Department of—

Report, 1997-98

West Beach Trust—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Government Enterprises (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board—

Actuarial Report, 1997-98

Report, 1997-98

Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1997-98

Corporate Affairs Commission—Report, 1997-98

Correctional Services, Department for—Report, 1997-98

Financial Supervision, South Australian Office of—

Report, 1997-98

Industrial Relations Commission and Industrial Relations

Court—Presidents and Senior Judge's Report, 1997-98

Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund, Claims Against—

Report to the Attorney-General, 1997-98

Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report,

1997-98

Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—

Audio Visual Rule

Roll of Practitioners

Schedule 5 Fees

State Emergency Service SA—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training (Hon. M.R. Buckley)—

Asset Management Corporation, South Australian—

Report, 1997-98

Public Corporations—Regulations—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust

Education Adelaide

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

Environment, Resources and Development Committee—

Aquaculture—Response by the Minister for

Environment and Heritage

Pastoral Board—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Racing Act—Rules of Racing—Harness Racing

Authority—

Alcohol and Drug Testing

Colours and Safety Helmets.

## TAXATION REFORM

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: On Friday, history was made in Canberra. For 50 years or more, successive Premiers and Chief Ministers have called on the Commonwealth to address the inadequacy of their tax base and the problematic system of financial assistance to the States and Territories. The Commonwealth reforms provide a real opportunity to address this problem and for the first time the States walked away with an agreement which protects their revenue base.

What we have achieved is to protect what was always rightfully ours: a commitment that the principles of horizontal fiscal equalisation will remain in place and will govern the distribution of GST revenues. This funding arrangement means that all Australians share equally in the resources of the nation. Its absence would have meant inequality of services across the States. It would have meant that those States which, through no fault of their own, face high costs or have a low capacity to raise revenues would be unable to provide their communities with the same level of services offered elsewhere in Australia. To put State before country, as New South Wales Premier Bob Carr attempted to do, is as divisive as it was destructive. As one correspondent in the *Sydney Morning Herald* noted, if his taxes went to saving a child's life in Darwin or preserving Tasmania's wilderness, that was fine by him.

With the maintenance of this principle, South Australians will not be disadvantaged because we are a smaller economy than that of New South Wales or because we do not have the primary resource base of Western Australia. We have protected, in other words, our bottom line. We have guaranteed that basic services the people of South Australia demand and expect will continue to be maintained. To have achieved anything less would have been devastating for South Australia in the next 10 years. The State's budget simply could not sustain any erosion in Commonwealth funds. Coupled with the successful passage of legislation dealing with our electricity assets, South Australia for the first time, I would put to you, in decades has the opportunity to break free from the shackles of debt which have held us back for far too long.

It is no secret that I am a strong advocate for fundamental taxation reform, and the GST is a necessary part of any such reform. On Friday, the States were successful in obtaining a guarantee from the Commonwealth to legislation to provide all the revenue from the GST to the States and to maintain the rate and base of the GST in accordance with Friday's agreement. The Commonwealth will repeal the wholesale sales tax from 1 July 2000—a tax which is felt the hardest in South Australia because of our strong manufacturing base.

The Commonwealth will guarantee that, during the transitional period following the introduction of a GST, no State, both in aggregate terms and in individual terms, will be disadvantaged by being financially worse off than would be the case under the current arrangements. In addition, the Commonwealth has given a commitment that special purpose payments will not be discounted in any form with the introduction of a GST and the growth in GST revenues and disbursements to the States. The advantage is for South Australia—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, it is; it is a commitment of the Commonwealth Government at the Premiers' Conference, and I am more than happy to make the principles of agreement available to the member for Hart. This will mean that, for some States from year four and for other States from year five, there will be a positive gain to the revenues of those States, and that positive gain will continue year after year. That will give us the capacity for States—and in South Australia's case in about five years—to have increasing revenues and therefore funds for disbursement for the provision of social services.

Obviously, the increase in revenues are a conservative estimate. The Commonwealth has indicated that it will underwrite and fund the shortfall that was identified in

relation to gaming taxes to the tune of some \$300 million per annum, which will be contributed to the pool, and in addition to that the business franchise real property abolition date will be adjusted to ensure that no individual State is worse off. In the event that GST revenue is greater than what is currently estimated, the State budget impact of the tax package would be positive earlier and of greater magnitude.

I would like to appeal to the Senate, as a true State's House, to listen to the will of every State and Territory Leader in this nation. We want and we need fundamental taxation reform. We want and we need our funding base to be maintained. We certainly want reversed the High Court decisions of the past year or two that have removed the predictability of a funding base for States and therefore contributed adversely to vertical fiscal imbalance. It is now time to move forward quickly as we near the next millennium to ensure that this reform is put in place. The Senate should not—and it has no right to do this—delay, block or hinder this legislation.

To have what is a unique agreement between the Commonwealth, all States and the Territories, including Liberal and Labor Governments around this country, must surely indicate to the Senate that these principles of agreement of taxation reform are important and have been signed off by all States and Territories; therefore, it is now incumbent upon the Senate to ensure that there is quick passage of this legislation so that it can be implemented and the benefits start flowing to South Australia. I would be pleased later this day to table the principles that were agreed to at the Premiers' Conference.

#### AUSTRALIAN DANCE THEATRE

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I lay on the table the ministerial statement and report concerning the Australian Dance Theatre made earlier today by my colleague the Minister for the Arts.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### MOTOROLA

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** Why did the Premier fail to tell anyone in the public sector working on the whole-of-government radio network, including the then Premier, of his opinion that a 23 June 1994 agreement with Motorola superseded his April 1994 letter offering Motorola the equipment supply contract, and how does he explain why every relevant Government agency has proceeded on the basis that the April 1994 offer remained alive, in place and had legal effect?

The Opposition has been leaked a detailed six page memo signed by the former Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Information Industries, Ray Dundon, to the State Supply Board in August 1996 which states that the Government's radio network contract was awarded to Motorola on the basis of Motorola establishing its software centre in Adelaide. It goes on to state that the letter from the now Premier (then Minister Olsen) to Motorola in April 1994 had been found by the Crown Solicitor's office to have put in place obligations owed to Motorola if the matter were litigated. The memo makes no mention whatever of a June 1994 agreement.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That has been explained in this House *ad nauseam*, and the question and the preamble by the honourable member adds absolutely nothing to that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### ACI GLASS

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Will the Premier inform the House of the latest plans by ACI Glass to expand in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thank the honourable member for his question: his electorate has a keen interest in the wine industry. Today there is more evidence that South Australia, the wine capital, is further dominating the market through a \$65 million investment by ACI Glass in its Port Road facility, which will be under construction during the next 10 months. That takes the commitment of ACI Packaging from an original \$90 million by another \$65 million up to \$155 million. The investment confirms that Adelaide is a key centre for wine bottle production in Australia. Importantly, ACI Adelaide will now produce 90 per cent of the more than 500 million wine bottles produced in Australia each year and, with export demand for Australian bottled wine forecast to grow considerably, this figure will increase.

While specific additional jobs will not be created as a result of the \$65 million investment of ACI on Port Road, this further investment consolidates its investment in South Australia and maintains this State as the principal State for the production of wine bottles for the market. In the course of the past year or two, ACI has reduced the cost of wine bottles by 15 per cent. That is an exceptionally good record, and the installation of this new modern technology in South Australia ensures that we are able to produce bottles for wine here, which means that they can go into the international marketplace at competitive prices. We will be able to compete with developing countries, where the cost of production might not be the same as in Australia, to reduce a further input cost on wine.

The entry of our product into the international marketplace can only help to consolidate our position as the wine State of Australia. We are now attracting a range of associated investments to underpin that wine industry in this State and we look forward, in the course of the next four to six months, to being able to announce further major investments as a result of discussions we are having with a range of companies which, once again, will expand on the wine industry and its investment in South Australia.

### MOTOROLA

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** Does the Premier stand by his statement to a press conference on 4 September this year when he said that under the Act no-one is able to direct the State Supply Board and that it was up to the board to make recommendations about the competing technologies available for the whole-of-Government radio network? In a leaked six-page memo to the State Supply Board, the former Chief Executive Officer of Information Industries, Ray Dundon, directed the State Supply Board to adopt an appropriate policy to legitimise the agreement between the Government and Motorola. Mr Dundon also told the State Supply Board that there were no other companies in Australia capable of supplying the equipment necessary for the whole-of-Govern-

ment radio network—we will follow that up, too, John—and that ‘hence the matter of whether an open tendering process was adopted is essentially academic’. Does the Premier stand by those statements?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thought repetition in the form of questions was out of order. Over a number of weeks we have had a repeat of questions before this House and the position I put down is clear and specific, and it remains.

### OLYMPIC DAM

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Will the Deputy Premier outline to the House the importance to the State of the expansion of the Olympic Dam project?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Stuart for his question. He has been a great supporter of Olympic Dam for a long time. The expansion of Olympic Dam is well and truly welcomed by the State Government and we sincerely congratulate Western Mining Corporation for its achievements at Roxby where, over the past 10 years, it has been responsible for developing not just a great mine site but also the township of Roxby. Anyone who has visited it knows that it is an excellent place to live and work, with its many young and vibrant people. Olympic Dam is now the biggest multi-national ore body in the world and the expansion is Australia’s biggest current infrastructure project. That is quite an achievement.

The establishment of Olympic Dam has created many permanent on-site jobs as well as important jobs in Port Augusta, where much of the prefabrication has taken place, and also in Whyalla. More than 1 300 construction workers have been on site at Olympic Dam. A further 120 workers are involved with the Port Augusta prefabrication yard.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Not all that long ago—back in 1977—the State ALP led the national debate within the Labor Party to establish a policy to prohibit uranium mining in Australia. At that time, the now Leader of the Opposition was certainly a leading anti-uranium activist in the South Australian ALP and was clearly not only anti-uranium but certainly anti-Roxby Downs. It was pleasing to see on Saturday the totally bipartisan manner that has been promised for a while.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections across the Chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will come to order.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** A bit of silence is the perfect opportunity to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his conversion. He has seen the light and now he has come out in support of Roxby Downs.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier will come back to the answer and not be provocative.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The project has a rocky past, largely due to the efforts of the now Leader of the Opposition at the time. From 1979 to 1982 he was Chairman of the ALP Nuclear Hazards Committee. In March 1982—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:**—the Leader of the Opposition produced a booklet entitled ‘Uranium: Play it Safe’, which included a claim stating, ‘No serious commentators are likely to join the Premier in trumpeting the economic impact of Roxby.’ So, we certainly welcome the bipartisan approach that came through. Western Mining is now nearing the completion of its \$1.6 million expansion of the gold, copper and uranium mine. It is the largest private sector development in Australia and will boost the population of Roxby Downs to around 4 000.

Following the expansion, annual exports will amount to a massive \$600 million, and the State Government will receive approximately \$20 million a year in royalties, which would never have happened if the current Leader of the Opposition had had his way, and if it had not been for the moral stand taken by Normie Foster when he crossed the floor to get the project up. I might say that a repeat of that moral courage—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:**—might see a couple come over this side and vote for ETSA.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for interjecting after the Chair brought him to order.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The Liberal Government has been consistent throughout in its strong support for projects of importance to the economy and for jobs in this State. We certainly congratulate Western Mining—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It has been a practice over recent sitting days for members to interject across the floor, which I have pointed out is just not on. For members to continue to interject after the Chair has called them to order personally is totally unacceptable and will not be tolerated.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** In wrapping up, I congratulate Western Mining on what has been a magnificent achievement at Roxby Downs.

#### NATIONAL COMPETITION POLICY

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):**

Does the Premier support moves to apply a rigorous public benefit test to any application of national competition policy in this State with such a test giving full weight to issues such as jobs, jobs security, social welfare and equity considerations, health and safety and regional development, as well as the interests of consumers?

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** With an electorate like Port Augusta, I think you should listen to this one, Gunny! The Queensland Parliament, including all Liberal Party and National Party MPs, as well as Labor MPs, has now voted in favour of a motion supporting a strong public benefit test being applied to competition policy and calling on the Federal Government to constrain the powers of the National Competition Council to protect jobs and services, particularly in rural and regional areas.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Let us not forget that it was the Hawke-Keating Government that established the National Competition Commissioner.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, I did. Let us not forget that it was a Labor Federal Government that pursued the introduc-

tion of National Competition Commissioner and principles. In relation to the introduction of those principles, some benefits have been borne by the Australian community. One only has to look at the very significant reduction in power costs in Victoria, for example, to work out what competition principles have borne to the benefit of every household and business in Victoria. That is but one example.

The need for us to review a whole range of legislation in South Australia to test its competitive base is applying considerable rigour to the Government in terms of meeting the time lines being put down by the National Competition Commissioner. Some of those time lines can be met but the physical resources mean that we simply cannot meet time lines in other areas. What we are attempting to do in South Australia’s case is ensure that we pursue the competition principles as laid down to ensure that we safeguard the competition payments to South Australia, because we do not want and cannot afford for there to be any discounting of those competition reforms.

To date, there has been no comment from the National Competition Commissioner that South Australia has been anything other than diligent in trying to meet some of those principles. However, there is another component of this, and that is the pace of reform: whether the pace of reform as laid down in the competition principles and the various legislative components is now testing administrations—indeed, it is—in being able to meet the requirement within a time line.

I believe it is timely for State and Federal leaders at an appropriate forum to look at what has been achieved to date under national competition principles, the pace of reform that is on the agenda for the next few years, and the best interests of the State (city and regional areas) and Australia in order to ensure that we are reducing the costs of goods and services here so that we can access the international marketplace.

Much of this reform has brought about a reduction in input costs. That reduction in input costs will to a greater extent attract international investment in Australia as an investment location for the production of goods and services which will then be exported to the global marketplace. That is an important thrust and direction for Australia.

I think it needs to be said that the national competition principles and reforms to date have delivered a more competitive Australia. They have delivered Australia as a better investment location for the future and, as a result, put in place greater job certainty for some industry sectors of Australia. However, the question remains about the pace of reform. It is legitimate for this question to be asked at the five year mark, half way through the 10 year time line that was established and agreed to between the Commonwealth and the States.

I note that the Federal Labor Opposition wishes to retreat from major reform in Australia. The Federal Opposition’s policies which were put down at the last Federal election go back almost to the 1970s in terms of industrial and other policies. Those policies which were put down by Hawke and Keating—and for which I give them some credit—have made Australia a more competitive base, particularly for international investment. That is what we must achieve in the longer term. Regarding the question of whether five years into this 10 year NCC program it is time to review, assess and look forward, the answer is ‘Yes’.

### OLYMPIC DAM

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg):** Considering the importance to South Australia of the Olympic Dam venture, will the Deputy Premier advise the House of what impact a 'no new mines' policy would have on the South Australian economy?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** If there were a 'no new mines' policy, the two significant developments in the north of the State at Honeymoon and Beverley would not be able to proceed. This Government's priority is jobs. If we were to lose those two projects because of a policy of no new uranium mines, it would cost us 400 jobs, \$50 million worth of investment and, importantly, \$85 million per annum in exports. However, we do not have to worry any longer, because the Federal ALP, like the 'no new mines' policy, was defeated at the recent election.

Whilst referring to uranium mining, I take this opportunity to inform the House that the State and Federal Governments have invited an independent expert on *in situ* leach mining, April Lafferty, to visit South Australia to inspect the Beverley uranium project as part of a rigorous and comprehensive assessment of the mining proposal for that area. The Beverley proponent, Heathgate Resources, agreed to a one month extension of the original time frame to enable the conduct of this visit, which has taken place.

April Lafferty brings additional expertise in ISL to Australia. There was a previous trial, but this has not been done for a long time. It is typical of the way in which the Government has taken a responsible approach to the Beverley and Honeymoon projects. It certainly has not stopped the regular critics such as David Noonan, David Sweeney and Gavin Mudd—the same names keep cropping up—from making misleading statements: I have heard some of their claims on the radio and have read some interesting information on the Internet. It is the same old fear mongering. Many of these arguments, which belong back in the 1970s and 1980s, ignore the developments of the past few years.

The Leader of the Opposition will probably recognise some of these statements. They are slogans from the late 1970s. Many incorrect claims and accusations have been made about this, although I will not go into quoting individual statements. We are getting there: the EIS is to proceed, and we look forward with confidence to the project at Beverley being conducted responsibly; and, in turn, the Honeymoon project proceeding, with a good EIS being produced.

### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given that the Modbury contract requires Healthscope to manage Modbury Hospital in accordance with policies that apply to public hospitals of a similar size, and given that the Lyell McEwin Hospital offers emergency surgery 24 hours a day, will the Minister explain his statement that cuts to emergency surgery services at Modbury Hospital do not fall within the scope of the Healthscope contract, and did the Minister approve a lower level of service at Modbury or has Healthscope breached the contract?

Although Healthscope has cut its emergency service hours in half to operate from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. on six days a week, the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which previously has been quoted as a benchmark for Modbury, operates emergency

surgery with specialist registrars on duty 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I say, first, that Modbury Hospital will continue to provide emergency surgery 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, as required under the contract. The contract sets out the specific services that need to be provided. Incidentally, I think the honourable member claimed that I said that this did not come under the contract. I am not sure where she obtained that information. I think she is referring to a quote that I made concerning certain services for the aged which did not come under the contract.

Certainly, the provision of emergency services is specified in the contract. As with all the services at the Modbury Hospital, the contract specifically provides that emergency services must be delivered. The price for those services is set by the contract and must be at least 5 per cent below the case mix price. As to how staff are organised to deliver those services, that is the prerogative of the Healthscope manager.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Well, its staffing arrangements are the prerogative of the Healthscope management. Healthscope is required to deliver the services, but certain constraints apply, including constraints in respect of staffing as required under accreditation. I think the honourable member attended the function at which Modbury Hospital was awarded accreditation for the next three years. That accreditation sets the standard for the quality of service, and it also takes into account types of staff and staffing levels. The matter of how staff are organised and whether or not they are on call—I understand that some will be put on call—is a matter entirely for Healthscope.

I assure the honourable member that we will carefully monitor the delivery of these services by Healthscope. If Healthscope fails to deliver the quality of service and the services that it is required to deliver under the contract, it will be penalised by the Government, and that could include a monetary penalty. So, the honourable member can be assured that we will make sure that Healthscope delivers the services that are required of it. In the meantime, I think it is fair to say that there is a high level of satisfaction among the people who use the Modbury Hospital in terms of the quality of service delivery.

### JOB WORKSHOPS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Will the Minister for Employment advise the House on the success and outcomes of the job workshops? I was fortunate enough to attend one of those workshops which have been running throughout regional South Australia and the metropolitan area over the past two weeks.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** I thank the member for Heysen and those other members who have bothered to come along to hear what the people of South Australia have to say.

Unemployment in this State has been above the national average for 30 years, and this has been a problem with which all Governments have had to deal. The Premier has said that unemployment is the number one problem for this Government. I would hope that it is the number one problem—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** —for the Opposition as well, and that we could work on this in a bipartisan fashion rather than turning unemployed people into a political football. It

is a serious problem. It is a problem which the Premier has asked me as his Minister to address and to talk to people about—and that is what we are doing. The summits are working very well, in concert with \$100 million worth of investment which the Premier has announced in job creation through his employment statement and in concert with the largest ever commitment to a strategy that will produce some 4 500 new jobs.

That is a great start, but it is only a start and it will not fix the problem. It is not a problem that the Government alone can fix. That is the very reason why we are not having some talkfest for the usual grey suited individuals in a hotel but, rather, talking to unemployed people and to leaders across all levels of our community through regional South Australia, through metropolitan South Australia and in the city of Adelaide. We are seeing many more people as a result of the Premier's strategy than we would be by having an isolated talkfest somewhere in the middle of the city.

We need the help of business; we need the help of workers; and we need the help of the entire community. We do not need a carping, critical Opposition. I would like to say to the Opposition that people are sick and tired of political bickering, sick and tired of agro and sick and tired of alibis, excuses and name calling. The Leader of the Opposition, Mike Rann, was reported in the *Advertiser* some time ago as saying, 'We will be a patriotic, positive Opposition.' He seems to have forgotten his words; he seems to have forgotten his promise to the people of South Australia to be positive and to work with this Government to achieve decent employment outcomes for South Australians and, in particular, our young people.

This cannot be done through a jobs summit. This is being done by a series of job workshops which give people on the ground, people at the coalface, a chance to offer more detailed grassroots suggestions and specific suggestions that meet the needs of the local communities. It could be said that the Government has chosen a micro rather than a macro approach; rather than holding a talkfest we are going out to the people.

The State Government is building on the job statement, building on the work of the previous Minister (Hon. Dorothy Kotz) and undertaking community consultation on unemployment throughout November. The job networks are just one part of this. Anyone who is unable to attend a local workshop can submit their ideas through a special web site or by writing to the jobs workshop or by using the freecall number. The Opposition might be interested to know that over 400 ideas have come in through electronic means—as the Premier has insisted, we are getting into the electronic age. We have seen over 200 people at our meetings and taken more than 100 calls. Yet all we get from the Opposition is stupid, puerile criticism.

Last Friday, the member for Elizabeth put out a press statement in which she said, 'My office rang the Minister's office on Friday to confirm that a meeting would be held today.' I have checked with staff at my office, and I categorically deny that my office ever received a telephone call from the member for Elizabeth. That is the advice of my staff, and I choose to believe them in preference to the member for Elizabeth. In addition, the member for Elizabeth claims that we wrote to people cancelling the date. I categorically deny the writing of any letters cancelling or changing the date. The *Advertiser* misprinted the date—not as one of our ads but, rather, as a story.

**Mr CONLON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If the Minister has a grievance, surely he should raise it at the appropriate time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** If the member has a sensitivity, surely he should listen. The fact is that we wrote no such letters changing the venue—

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 98. The Minister is clearly debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Earlier in his reply, the Minister did stray into debate. He has moved out of debate and back into fact. At the moment he is not straying from Standing Orders.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** As I said, I deny that we ever changed any date—and I challenge the member for Elizabeth to produce any letter to any person changing the date. As I said, in a story—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair wants to hear this reply.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:**—one figure was misprinted. Any intelligent reader would have seen that all those meeting dates were in chronological order and, in misprinting the figure, it was still in the right chronology. Someone of the member for Elizabeth's intelligence should have worked that out. I think she was somewhat sensitive—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing Order 127 relates to personal reflections on members. It is quite clear that the Minister is personally reflecting on—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth is in the Chamber. If she wishes to respond, she is present to do so.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** Sir, I do apologise if I gave her credit for having more intelligence than she deserves.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** No; I prefer to deal in the truth. While it is unparliamentary to call anybody a liar and I would not do so, I would say to this Chamber that what the member for Elizabeth spread was a tissue of lies, and I leave the House to judge her calibre as a result.

**Ms STEVENS:** Mr Speaker, I ask the Minister to withdraw the suggestion that I am a liar.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Whilst the Minister couched it in certain terms, he was skating very close to the wind on that one, and I do think that it would be appropriate if the Minister withdrew that statement.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** Of course, Sir, if it offends the member for Elizabeth.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Given the decision by the Women's and Children's Hospital to restrict access for birthing mothers to inner city postcode areas, is the Minister for Human Services aware that outside the new Modbury Hospital emergency surgery hours of 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. it would take at least 30 minutes to call in an obstetrician and ready a theatre for emergency surgery; and does the Minister believe that this is a satisfactory level of service for people living in northern suburb postcodes that satisfies his duty of care? The Opposition has been given advice by senior management that, even if the on call obstetrician were asleep in a building adjacent to the hospital, it would take a mini-

mum of half an hour to be ready for surgery. How does that sound to women in Modbury?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** First, I have already indicated to the honourable member that we are carefully monitoring the changes that are taking place at Modbury. In fact, negotiations are going on between the management of Healthscope and the Australian Nurses Federation later this week, and we will ensure that Healthscope, in fact, complies fully with the requirement for services to be delivered. I pick up the point in terms of the Women's and Children's Hospital. It has been pointed out to the Women's and Children's Hospital that under the Medicare Agreement it cannot impose a limit by way of postcode. Therefore, it will limit births not by area but by other means because it cannot do it by way of postcode; it is in breach of the Medicare Agreement. That has been pointed out to the hospital, so the board of the hospital is now working with the department to look at other ways of constraining demand.

The problem has been that a large number of people have been bypassing other hospitals and going to the Women's and Children's Hospital. That has put a delivery rate on the Women's and Children's Hospital that exceeds its capacity. The level of births at the Women's and Children's Hospital has been increasing because of the excellent facilities that it provides. Naturally, we have to be able to cap that, depending on the capacity of the hospital, and that will be done by other means; it will not be done by way of postcode.

#### DEFENCE INDUSTRY

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Will the Minister for Industry and Trade explain what recent initiatives have been undertaken to promote defence further as a key industry sector in this State?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I thank the member for Waite for his question and for attending with me the opening of the 1998 Australian Defence Technology Expo and Convention (ADTEC 98) in the past few weeks. It was a unique event in Australia, and it was very important for the defence industry in both Australia and South Australia. The conference itself in association with the RAAF at Edinburgh, the Maritime Patrol Group and the 1998 Fincastle Competition presented an excellent opportunity to showcase not only the South Australian defence industry but also the latest in surveillance technology. Indeed, it was pleasing that this expo and conference attracted the support of some 50 leading defence companies, including some of the biggest manufacturers in the world. Companies such as Boeing, British Aerospace, Rockwell and Raytheon Systems Company are just some of those that were represented.

In addition to the expo itself, the two day conference that was also held in conjunction with it—the Defence Vision Conference—attracted some 300 delegates from 20 different countries. So, it really was an opportunity to showcase the South Australian defence industry. I take the opportunity to congratulate Air Commodore Des Long and also CAMTEC Event Marketing on the way they put together this event. The defence industry in South Australia is very important to this State. It rates at about 2.3 per cent of our gross State product, which is around the same as our mining and wine industries, so it is a very important industry. For that reason the Government has set up the industry as one of the important industries

that we wish to continue to develop for the best interests of the State.

In conjunction with the defence industry, and working hand in hand with it, is the electronics industry and others such as the IT industry. If we can work properly the synergies that exist between those industries, we will be able to develop further those industries within this State. That presents the State with some very good opportunities. For example, over the next 10 to 15 years about \$30 billion is available to be expended by the Department of Defence, on major capital works and on equipment and acquisition projects, most of which will have a strong technology focus suited to the South Australian defence industry.

It is important that we have things such as ADTEC 98 in South Australia. It highlights the defence industry; it gives us a chance to get the electronics industry and the IT industry working closer together to build a critical mass so we have a launching base, if you like, for those industries. So, with 50 companies exhibiting their goods and some 300 delegates from 20 countries, it was a very successful conference. I congratulate those involved.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Premier agree with his chief economics adviser, Professor Cliff Walsh, that unemployment in South Australia could reach 11.5 per cent by June 1999 and that the number of people in jobs could fall by .5 per cent? The November report of the SA Centre for Economic Studies, delivered by Professor Walsh to business leaders last Thursday, forecast national job growth of 1.5 per cent and an unemployment rate of 8.2 per cent, while South Australia is expected to lose jobs and have an unemployment rate 3.3 percentage points higher than the nation. The report describes South Australia's labour market as 'miserable and fairly grim'.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Only last Thursday we had some good unemployment figures for South Australia, but it did not take Labor Party members long to get into this House to try to discount them. Here they go: within a couple of days and the first parliamentary Question Time they want to discount a positive sign at last on the employment-unemployment front. It is an encouraging trend line that has been there now for four months.

I am the first to concede, as I have repeatedly in this House, that our number one priority is employment, and that our number one task is to reduce unemployment. Why else would we have committed \$100 million in the May budget to job stimulation and job creation initiatives in this State? It is the largest commitment by any Government in this State's history to an employment creation program. I trust and hope that what we are seeing now is some of the benefits of that starting to unfold.

With investment such as ACI Glass today of \$65 million and its construction over the next 10 months, further possible investments by Christmas or at least in the first quarter of next year and very significant new private sector investment in this State, once again we can start consolidating our existing economic base and start building job prospects for the future. I say to the Deputy Leader that our task will concentrate on employment initiatives, focusing on the gains, and on recognising that there is one fundamental economic truth: if you do not have new private sector capital investment in this State, you do not have job creation in the State. It is as simple, clear and precise as that.

What we are attempting to do, with some degree of success I would argue, is turn around the investment drought and the escape of a range of head offices from South Australia, as we saw in the 1980s, while seeing a greater consolidation of new investment in this State. Much has been done, but much more needs to be done, and I can assure the Deputy Leader that we will maintain a single-minded focus on achieving the goal we have set.

### ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General in this House explain why the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission publishes its report in both soft and hard cover versions and, incidentally, why some members received the hard cover version whilst others received the soft cover version? Is this indicative of Government waste?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I did note that the Electoral Commission report came out today, and it is fair to say that it is a particularly interesting body of work.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** That might come later. I have made inquiries about why there are hard and soft covers, and I am able to make clear to the House that, first, both covers, whether they are hard or soft, contain exactly the same material; and, secondly, I am informed that there has been a tradition whereby Ministers and shadow Ministers receive hard cover copies and everybody else receives soft covers. This is a pretty important issue, so I intend to take it further. If the member for MacKillop chooses to write to me formally, I would be more than delighted to transfer his anger through the relevant Minister in another place, the Attorney-General, and I will make it a cause célèbre to see whether we can all have either hard cover or soft cover.

### WILLIAMS, Mr R.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** I direct my question to the Minister representing the Treasurer. Will the Government now take action to ensure that a State superannuant who is dying of the asbestos related cancer mesothelioma receives at least part of his lump sum payment now, before it is too late? On 5 November I raised in this House the tragic case of 58 year old Mr Russell Williams, who is gravely ill with mesothelioma. I have also written to the Treasurer on Mr Williams' behalf. Mr Williams has informed me today that all he wants before he dies is access to enough of his lump sum superannuation to make his home in Elizabeth Grove comfortable for his wife of 37 years and to take a last special holiday with her.

Mr Williams' fight to gain access to his superannuation has already taken two years, and meanwhile his health has continued to deteriorate, causing him to cancel plans to travel around Australia in a camper van which he purchased for the trip. Mr Williams' state of health is now so poor that he is not permitted to fly, which means that his special holiday with his wife will now need to be taken by bus. The House would be aware that we recently passed legislation, assented to today by His Excellency the Governor, to allow a judge early access to his superannuation.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I will refer that question to the Treasurer for a direct answer and report back to the House.

### TEACHERS, REGIONAL

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training make available to the House any current and future arrangements for attracting teachers to and retaining them in rural and isolated areas in South Australia? As a former teacher, I am well aware, as are country colleagues, of the problems associated with the retention of teachers in regional areas. What is the Government doing to attract teachers to and retain them in regional areas?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I am very much aware that the Government needs to operate a range of incentives to attract professional staff in not only the education area but also the health area in rural and isolated communities in South Australia. Not only teachers but also professionals in the health and other public sector areas require incentives to ensure that they can be attracted to and stay in the regional areas. In addition, not only the Government sector but also the private sector often has trouble in attracting people to the country. For example, country communities often have trouble attracting and particularly keeping professionals such as motor mechanics, panel beaters, maintenance fitters, refrigeration mechanics and the like within their country towns. Once we get those people to the country, one of the issues we have to look at is how we can keep them. Because of their isolation, some communities face somewhat of an uphill battle in trying to keep those professionals in their towns and districts.

Since 1987, teachers in country areas have been offered a range of incentives, and we spend some \$7 million to \$8 million each year to attract and retain teachers within our country locations. I will give the House some examples of what is undertaken in this area. Periods of leave up to one year with pay after 10 years of service in a designated location are worked out as follows: leave with pay after continuous service in a designated school or in two schools which together attract 5.5 or more isolation placement points: in these cases, one term's leave with pay is paid after six years of continuous service; two terms' leave with pay after eight years of continuous service; and one year's leave with pay after 10 years of continuous service. Many South Australian schools also attract locality allowances due to cost of living expenses and car depreciation. They range from \$319 to \$5 339.

In addition to that, we have cash in lieu of removal allowance for teachers in most country schools. For example, if you are a teacher in Port Lincoln, you would receive \$1 695 per annum as an additional bonus in your seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth year of service. We pay removal costs for contract teachers; up to \$500 may be reimbursed for specific study purposes for teachers; an additional .1 teacher time is available to support graduates employed in country schools; and teachers appointed to Aboriginal Anangu schools are entitled to one term's study leave with pay after two years of service.

Allowances for principals and deputy principals in Anangu schools include a four week induction program; an allowance of up to \$2 000 after three years of service; one term's paid training and development leave after three years; and guaranteed placement in a principal or deputy principal position within 150 kilometres of Adelaide for a period of two years.

I might add that these incentives do not include costs incurred for housing subsidies, which are a cost to the



Government of some \$3.8 million per annum, or the payment of locality allowances or reimbursement for medical and dental expenses through the teachers' non-metropolitan award. We are currently negotiating an enterprise agreement with the teachers. Part of that agreement is to hold discussions with the union over the next 12 months to consider a range of incentives to attract teachers to the country, and we look forward to undertaking them.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Is the Minister for Human Services aware of any services offered by the Modbury Hospital prior to the contract with Healthscope that are not covered by the contract? Recent announcements from the hospital have confirmed there will be a reduction in post-discharge domiciliary care for the elderly. Comments in the *Advertiser* tell us that this domiciliary care program was not part of the contract. My constituents would like to know what other services that they may be used to receiving are likely to be cut in the cost-cutting strategies which the hospital is putting into place.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this issue. One of the great benefits of the Modbury contract is that the State Government is delivering the same services more efficiently and is therefore able to increase the services delivered at Modbury. Let me point out to the honourable member—who has come in hook, line and sinker on this—that, in fact, that contract achieves a net benefit to the Government of between \$4 million and \$6 million a year. I am sure that the former Minister for Health will verify this: there is a direct cost saving of about \$2.4 million a year.

*Mr Conlon interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! And the member for Hart will come to order.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr Foley:** But, Sir—

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out that we save about \$2.4 million a year on the Modbury Hospital contract. There are other net benefits to the State as well, such as the leasing of the hospital and the fact that we get payroll tax, so there is a net benefit to the Government of \$4 million to \$6 million a year. I ask the honourable member to listen to the fact that, since the contract with Healthscope, the following services have been increased or introduced: ENT outpatient sessions have increased; ENT surgery has increased; hospice beds have been increased from six beds to eight beds; the booking list surgery has increased; the day surgery has increased in excess of 40 per cent of total elective surgery at Modbury directly as a result of the Healthscope contract; and, finally, general angiograms are now provided at the hospital but were not provided beforehand. So, there is a list of additional services now provided at Modbury as a result of the Healthscope contract that were not provided there before.

Clearly, the people in the north-east of the metropolitan area of Adelaide are getting increased services at Modbury because we are delivering them more efficiently and, therefore, we can increase the scope of the service delivered.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I know that members opposite just do not like to hear the facts, but the fact is that the services are being increased.

#### OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide an update on the effectiveness of occupational health, safety and welfare programs in Government enterprises?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am, indeed, grateful to the honourable member for asking me this very important question, which demonstrates the commitment of the Government to occupational health and safety. Last Friday night, the WorkCover Corporation presented its annual awards for health and safety achievements—and, indeed, it was the sixth awards night by WorkCover. These safety awards are the culmination of Workplace Health and Safety Week, and they were held in the Ridley Pavilion at the Showgrounds before a most appreciative audience, I would suggest, of at least 1 000 people. These awards were held on Friday the 13th, and the theme was 'Workplace safety is not a matter of luck.' And it is not: it is a matter upon which we all have to concentrate.

I believe that WorkCover needs to be congratulated for focusing so much of its effort on the recognition of excellence in safety performance and in continuing to demonstrate that, in fact, companies do not have an improvement because of good fortune or good luck: they work on it. WorkCover has developed a number of initiatives aimed at reducing the number of work injuries in South Australia, one of which is the New Worker Campaign, which is demonstrably raising the awareness of the general community in relation to work and safety issues for new workers. As I mentioned, the WorkCover awards night is another initiative designed to encourage the reduction of workplace injuries.

This year, the awards have been refocussed. Originally, the safety awards night recognised the achievements of employers in the Safety Achiever Bonus Scheme and self-insurers. This year, the awards focused on all employers, large and small, and particularly recognised innovation in industry in order to congratulate outstanding safety achievers publicly. I was particularly delighted to acknowledge SA Water as being a recipient of one of these prestigious awards in the category of the award for continuous improvement in safety. It is very important to acknowledge—as SA Water has done—that the most effective accident prevention in any organisation is the product of hard and sustained work across the organisation.

As the person who is lucky enough to present these awards each year, I note just how pleased the people are to receive them. Indeed, on Friday night I asked one of the major award winners how long he had been preparing for this award, and he said, 'Minister, we have been working towards this for eight years.' That means an eight year focus on better employment with respect to occupational health and safety. Clearly, that is something that has permeated everything that that company does, and it is all pervasive.

SA Water also has been acutely aware of its responsibility to do everything in its power to prevent workplace injuries, and it is fully committed to a comprehensive occupational health and safety program. I am delighted to inform the House that the number of injury claims made each year has reduced dramatically from more than 550 in 1994 to fewer than 100 in 1998. That is a great improvement. Whilst it is satisfying to see SA Water win that award, I am sure that that will not be the end of its efforts: it will, indeed, focus further, as will other Government business enterprises. WorkCover is doing a great job on behalf of all South Australians, and I know that we all have a great interest in achieving workplace safety. Indeed, last Friday's awards showed very well what can be achieved by people who are truly dedicated to the task of having safe workplaces.

I remind the House that this is in the context of the Government's recently announced decision not to sell or privatise WorkCover, and one of the things that was made evident by both the Premier and me was that there is a total cost to the South Australian community of \$2 billion annually from a poor workplace health and safety ethos in the community. So, we do intend to focus on this, acknowledging that it is extraordinarily important for companies to continue to work across their whole enterprise in a truly dedicated way, so that we are able to chip away at that \$2 billion cost. Last Friday's awards demonstrated very well what can be done, and I congratulate WorkCover for having focused the attention of the community on that factor.

---

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** A couple of weeks ago I had the pleasure of launching a new youth magazine which is the initiative of the Inner North East Youth Service Incorporated, and I would like to share that initiative with this House. The magazine is put together by young people who are all volunteers, and it will be distributed to local schools in my area and surrounding areas, local youth services and the Second Story, and some of the record shops have offered to display it. This is a magazine for youth, produced and edited by youth, with articles that are about youth. If the first edition of *Sound Off* (the name of the magazine) is anything to go by, I am sure that young people in the north-eastern area will find it interesting and informative. It will give young people a forum of their own in which they can voice their concerns, speak out on issues that affect them and just generally express how they feel about the changes that are taking place in our ever changing world. Often youth are excluded from the decisions that we make, and frequently many of these decisions directly impact on them, so through this magazine they can express their views about those decisions and tell us how they feel about them.

I have spent some time in the Hindley Street Youth Centre, and that certainly opened my eyes and gave me a greater insight into the difficulties that many young people are experiencing today—difficulties that I certainly never had to face in my youth and difficulties that my own sons just fleetingly experienced. Having to find work is a major

problem for our young people today, and constant rejection is quite demoralising for them.

One of the issues that I raised at the launch is a great concern of mine—youth suicide. When I made the comment that I believe that Governments and society have failed miserably to resolve this increasing problem, it was interesting to look around the room and note that many young people were nodding. In fact, some came and spoke to me afterwards and said that they had lost a friend to suicide. It was quite an emotional experience. In fact, some told me that they often had feelings of desperation: they had very little hope that there is a future or an alternative to the problems that we are experiencing now. I believe that that is a tragedy for our youth and for our society. *Sound Off* will be part of a listening process and a forum for young people to raise their own issues, to speak out on topics that affect them and generally to share themselves with others who understand what it is like, which I believe is very important—and this is particularly important in a society that does not often listen. The Inner North East Youth Service does listen, and always has, and it plays a valuable role within our community for young people by providing a variety of programs to assist them. Not only that, it helps develop skills and self esteem, and this magazine will play a part in that process.

The youth service also provides support for families who are struggling to understand the pressures that their young teenagers are facing. Through the involvement of *Sound Off* young people will be able to gain new and valuable skills simply by participating and putting the magazine together—skills in editing and layout, particularly in team work. They will find their horizons broadened and as they encourage others to become involved it will provide opportunities for their fellow youth. Most importantly, the magazine *Sound Off* will give young people the chance to share their thoughts and experiences and, in particular, their achievements. It is important to be able to share our successes and much more important to share them with people who understand, in so doing helping others to deal with their own problems.

I know that the young people concerned—people like Darren Andrews and Rosina A'Hang—will make *Sound Off* a great success and continue to raise issues that affect young people generally. I congratulate everyone involved in this much needed initiative. Comments we have received from around the community from parents in particular have indicated support for it and parents are pleased that there will be an opportunity for their children to share some of their concerns with their fellow youth.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** On a number of occasions I have received deputations in my electorate office from parents of young people with intellectual disabilities. I have been fortunate in having in my electorate people who are articulate and who understand the concerns of these young people very well indeed. I received further representation earlier this week indicating considerable concern on the part of parents with children who have intellectual disabilities.

I received representation from a person who brought with him information coming out of a meeting of CBS (Community Bridging Services Incorporated), an organisation providing specialist support in recreation choices, further education and job net employment programs for people with a disability. Having had the opportunity to speak on this issue with the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, I advised him that I would be raising this matter

today, and the Minister has given me a commitment that he will bring back a response.

It comes out of a meeting of CBS where, earlier this month at a one day planning and evaluation session for TAFE preparatory education staff across South Australia, an announcement was made by the Curriculum Manager of the human services program on behalf of the State Manager of Human Services Programs and Curriculum Unit. The summary of that announcement was a reduction of 20 000 student hours offered in preparatory education, which would mostly affect the nationally accredited programs, for example, the Certificate of Preparatory Education I and the Certificate I in Personal Management, which was only recently introduced.

It was then stated that these two programs were not to be offered on their own, and there is considerable concern about this. It is interesting that hours are to be cut from TAFE programs that are access programs, offered at the most suitable entry level for people with learning or intellectual disabilities. Programs in this area are already small in terms of student hours compared with other programs, for example, computer studies, business studies, and so on. This cut will have a profound effect on programs that have been significantly reduced in all institutes across South Australia in the past two years. Some institutes do not offer these entry level programs any more, which is very regrettable.

Social justice is important in principle but, when it comes to funding cuts, access programs for people with a disability are extremely vulnerable. Why should this be the case? I am informed that the teachers who have been involved with these courses are indicating that most of the young people who have been able to do the course would not be able to start at stage 2 and that they desperately need to be able to begin at stage 1. The concern I have is that it would seem that it is a resource issue and that there are just not enough resources for this certificate course to continue. I am very concerned about that. The question I put to the Minister is: Why are we finding that cuts are taking place from these small programs? There are social justice implications. They are small cuts, but they will have a large impact, particularly on young people with intellectual disabilities—young people who I suggest need all the assistance they can get. The Minister has advised that he will come back to me with a response and I ask him to do so urgently.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** I will speak today on compulsory voting, a matter that is the subject of ongoing debate within the community. There have been recent proposals to abolish compulsory voting, proposals blocked by members in another place. My view and the view of the majority of my parliamentary colleagues is that voting is a right—every citizen's right—and it should also be seen as a duty. If you accept the right to vote you should also accept the responsibility to your fellow citizens to exercise your right to vote sensibly and in the interests of the community. It is timely to speak about this issue as the Governor's speech opening this session of the Parliament referred to the intention to continue the attack on this democratic right.

Many people think that in a democracy it is an absurd position to have compulsory voting. After all, they say it is our right to vote and it should also be our right not to vote. In a system of voluntary voting Governments are less rather than more accountable to the people. In a system of voluntary voting Governments have to satisfy only the small majority of people who do vote. They do not need to address the needs

and views of people who do not vote. I will give some practical examples of how compulsory voting makes our electoral system more democratic and our politicians more accountable to the people.

In South Australia it is not compulsory to vote in local council elections and most people do not make the time to vote. As a result, to be elected to council requires a smaller number of votes. In Queensland, where voting in council elections is compulsory, people take an active interest in local issues and councillors must pay attention to the concerns of their residents. Because voting is voluntary in America, only 40 per cent of the population vote in presidential elections. This means that the victorious candidate only has to attract the support of around 21 per cent of the population. This surely is an undesirable situation.

More important than the fact that voluntary voting makes politicians less accountable is the fact that the system of voluntary voting is open to all kinds of rorts by political Parties, and I give an example. In the United Kingdom, where voting is voluntary, political Parties spend enormous sums of money driving their supporters to polling booths to vote. Both major Parties regularly charter buses to pick up supporters from aged persons' homes, housing estates and those sorts of places. This kind of activity is not something we want in Australia and we would get it if we abolish compulsory voting.

Under voluntary voting, lobby groups become more powerful. Whatever numbers they can muster would increase as their power to affect election outcomes grows. Members would be faced with the choice of satisfying demands of influential groups or losing their seat. Voluntary voting also provides a scenario where political Parties could direct their policies to the groups most likely to come out to vote. Elected Governments can and do require their citizens to undertake certain obligations and, although I do not necessarily support some of those issues, it is a minor obligation to participate in the process of democracy where once every three or four years we have to come out to vote.

Look at what is happening in other countries at this very time. Citizens in those countries are risking injury and death for the right to a democratic society where they want elections to be held and to be open to all. By voting, we do more than elect governments. Voters can show us when they are dissatisfied with our policies and performance. Remove compulsion and those who benefit most by expressing their dissatisfaction are most likely to stay away. Those who advocate voluntary voting should remember that compulsory voting serves—and has served—us well.

**The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism):** As we all know, South Australia enjoys a reputation as being winners and for winning, be it our sporting champions such as our Commonwealth Games medallists, our footballers the Crows, our basketballers or the Thunderbirds, or be it our widely acclaimed food and wine industry, our educational facilities that have produced the likes of Lord Florey and Andy Thomas, or our reputation as a centre for the arts. Many of these winning attributes have become special and unique South Australian icons, and they are certainly a real source of pride in our community.

One such icon and source of pride is the Kensington and Norwood Brass Band. With a very long and proud history, the Kensington and Norwood Brass Band—or K&N as it has become affectionately known—has entertained and enthralled many thousands of South Australians over the past 100 years.

It has played a key role in many South Australian celebrations, including a number of our openings, launches, commemorations and significant State ceremonies. In my view, the K&N is a truly special part of the soul of South Australia and I, along with many others, am extremely proud of it, its achievements and specifically its music.

This year, 1998, is certainly a special year for K&N. It is the band's centenary year and probably its busiest ever. K&N is a magnificent ensemble and has, during its long history, won all the major titles at State and national level. The band comprises members from all walks of life, ranging from President Olly Clark, a corporate managing director, to the Musical Director, Bruce Raymond, a well-known South Australian sporting, musical and promotions identity. It includes finance managers, doctors, nurses, artisans, retirees and students. The only common criterion that we can see among them all is their enormous desire to play music at the highest standard.

Other members of K&N include, on the various cornets, Mark Smith, Andrew Gower, Julie Dorey, Chris Bowman, Joel Walker, Andrew Gaetjens, Patrick Thiele, Alison Forde, Phillip Windsor, Peter Fletcher and Malcolm Davey. On the different horns are David Griffiths, Eric Nicholls, Diana Gaetjens, Jenny Suthers and Raymond Torry, whilst John Price plays principal euphonium and Anthony Rogers is on euphonium.

The trombone section includes Peter Doherty, John Slater, Peter Lillywhite, Kevin Seaman, David Blakey and Allan Moore. Blowing the tubas for K&N are Phillip Kilford, Ollie Clark, Robert Nicholls, Dan Gordon, Paul Beames and Evonne Clark. Playing baritone are Janet Carey, Kelvin Wearn and Amy Keane, whilst the percussion section comprises Simon Hewitt, Michael Holland and Joan Clark.

Just recently this group of committed musicians again won the title of South Australian's champion band, with a fabulous performance at the South Australian State Championships. I am delighted to inform members that on 19 November K&N departs for 10 days in Malaysia, as guests of the Penang Government, where it will be attending the PESTA Festival in Penang, a major annual event in Malaysia. Then, as guests of the University of Malaya, it will travel on to Kuala Lumpur.

A very full program of public concerts and workshops for both fledgling and experienced musicians has been planned to maximise the opportunities for the tour members and, indeed, the Malaysian community. Concerts will be held at the Penang Park Royal among many other specific venues that have been organised. K&N will also travel to smaller villages where performances in factories will take place, providing a unique opportunity for interchange between band members and the people from many local villages.

On Sunday evening, the Penang Chief Minister and the Penang State Executive Councillor with responsibility for tourism, culture, the arts and women's development will host a most important State dinner for all members of the band. The University of Malaya will also host a concert and dinner in Kuala Lumpur, where the special guests will include the Minister for Culture, Arts and Tourism and the Vice Chancellor of the University of Malaya. Australian business representatives who work and live in Malaysia have also been invited to the functions to facilitate introductions which may help them in the development of their business.

K&N members have diligently and actively fund raised and are very proud of the fact that they are financing the tour themselves. I know that K&N members are honoured to be

taking part in this trip, and I have every confidence that they will act as great ambassadors for our State. I hope all members will join me in wishing them a successful, exciting and melodious tour of Malaysia.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** The Hon. Dean Brown, Minister for Human Services, reiterated today in the House that South Australian taxpayers were getting—and I quote from an *Advertiser* article that appeared a couple of days ago—‘the best deal in the country from Modbury Hospital’s private manager, Healthscope’. I find that very interesting. When we look at the Auditor-General’s Report, we see that the Auditor-General has a few other things to say about the Healthscope contract at Modbury Hospital. In particular, he is highly critical of the Government in terms of lack of probity and due diligence in relation to that contract. In fact, he questions why the Government would have renegotiated a contract simply to pay the contractor more for the same level of service. So, this strange statement by the Minister claiming that we have the best deal in the country is of concern when we consider it against those other comments. I noted also in the same article that Mr Brown is quoted as saying:

Despite all the reports that they [Healthscope] have made a loss on the contract, they are having to still deliver the services.

This almost has overtones of his predecessor’s ‘Hooray! We’ve out-negotiated the private sector—whoopee for us!’ Can we actually say that a good deal for the taxpayers is something in which the other party to the contract is making a loss? How confident can we be then that we are not in for yet another renegotiation of the contract? How confident can we be that this thing will stand up? After all, this was the sort of information we were getting before the Government decided to bail out Healthscope the first time around. Here we have the Minister stating it again—that they are reported to be making a loss on the contract at this time. So, where does it leave the taxpayers of South Australia? I think it leaves us up in the air. I do not think it is a good result at all.

I note also that the Minister has at last said that there will not be any more outsourcing of the management of public hospitals in this State. Well, that is good. I am glad that, at last, we have had the official backdown on this ridiculous path that we set upon under the former Minister and the present Minister when he was the Premier of this State.

We know that right back in 1994 the then Chief Executive of the Health Commission, Ray Blight, told people at a conference in Sydney that we were about to embark on this brave new experiment, that Modbury would be the first hospital, to be followed by the Queen Elizabeth, and that other hospitals would follow suit. I am pleased that the Minister has finally acknowledged the facts and told us we will not be going any further, because obviously it has not worked. I find it quite amazing that he could still be saying it is a good deal for South Australia. If it is such a good deal, why are we not going ahead with the original plan? Quite clearly it is not a good deal at all.

With respect to service levels and the health care provided to the citizens in the north-eastern suburbs, what we have seen over recent weeks is one program after another recording and reporting cuts. There were concerns and uncertainty about intensive care services; diabetes waiting lists were blowing out; there was curtailment of emergency surgery services; and there was the cancellation of an aged care program. I think we are standing by for more cuts.

It is not good enough for the Minister to say that it is not his obligation to reassure the people of South Australia that this hospital is delivering the services that are required for that area. All we have heard is someone saying, 'Bad luck, this is the way it's going to be, and I do not have any say over what they do.' I do not think that is good enough. This is the Minister for Human Services. This is a public hospital which has a responsibility to deliver services which other public hospitals in this State deliver and at the required standard.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Last Friday, on behalf of the Government, I presented a cheque for \$50 000 to the Norwood Payneham St Peters council and a cheque for \$20 000 to the City of Campbelltown. I was pleased to hand over this money to Mayor Laurie Fioravanti and Steve Woodcock. Also present was Les Dennis, who was the Community Services Manager for Payneham council before the amalgamation, and together with Alderman John Kennedy he was pivotal in establishing a crime prevention committee in September 1995.

A small but dedicated group of police officers, elected members of the City of Campbelltown and concerned residents, primarily from local Neighbourhood Watch groups, gathered in the old Payneham Police Station, which has recently been relocated to Firlie. By way of general consensus, the meeting recognised the need for a group to fill the gaps that Neighbourhood Watch was never intended to fill. This initial meeting provided the stimulus for the organisation of a fete at Campbelltown and a ball at Payneham—two local government areas. More importantly, there was the formation of the now famous anti-graffiti trailer, a strategy which has been implemented in the Norwood area.

In March 1996, the first meeting held at Campbelltown moved to establish the Campbelltown Crime Prevention Committee. The mission was to make the City of Campbelltown a safer place in which to live and work or to visit. The objectives were: to develop community safety plans; reduction of the fear of crime; solving of community problems; a security initiative; and targeting both youth and elderly participation in the crime prevention initiative. There is no doubt that this has been most successful.

What happened last Friday involved recognition by the Government of the hard work of volunteers and community initiatives in the area. This is part of a \$210 000 State Government grant to fight crime. It was pleasing to witness at first hand as the local member the cooperation between local government, community service groups, police officers, Neighbourhood Watch and interested residents. Cooperation is important because, no matter how much funding is put into crime prevention, if you do not have the community behind these initiatives nothing will happen.

I commend both councils and the key players: Alderman Kennedy, Ms Rosa Gagetti, and Les Dennis, who is now with the Norwood Payneham St Peters council. This is an example of cooperation between councils. Councils do not have to be amalgamated to work on these important community issues: they do work together when something important for the community is involved. I know for a fact that these councils are not territorial: their main aim is to deliver services as they have in the past with EMRHA, which has been functioning for a long time. So, cooperation between councils is not a new thing, and it does not take place only in amalgamated areas. As the member for both these local government areas, it is pleasing for me to see that sort of cooperation which is aimed at the well being of the community.

### AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 November. Page 189.)

**Mr WRIGHT (Lee):** The Opposition supports this Bill. I would like to make a few brief comments. The Bill seeks to remove all references to 'Grand Prix' and 'Formula One' within the Act but to retain the necessary special powers under the Act to stage a motor sport event on an Adelaide street circuit. The South Australian Motor Sport Amendment Act 1998 will facilitate the Sensational Adelaide 500 on 9, 10 and 11 April next year. We welcome this event to Adelaide. The attraction of the V8 Supercar Endurance, a 500 kilometre race, will be a vital part of the calendar, and it will be held on the revised Adelaide Grand Prix circuit.

The Opposition has consulted widely and received certain assurances with respect to community consultations, in particular—and we take these on trust. The Opposition has received a briefing from Mr Andrew Daniels of Major Events, which it acknowledges and for which we thank him. We have also spoken to the Adelaide City Council, the United Trades and Labor Council and some of the local residents in the near vicinity of the track.

This Bill makes minimal change. It is the Grand Prix replacement Bill. The Bill will amend the financial year of the board to conclude on 30 June of any one year—a sensible and practical change. We look forward to asking a number of questions in Committee. We welcome the V8 event and look forward to its being an outstanding success for South Australia. The Opposition wishes the event every success in the future. We hope that it will be a major success and an event that will quickly gain a reputation for outstanding value in major entertainment for not only South Australians but also the people whom it draws to Adelaide. We look forward to the Sensational Adelaide 500 being a major drawcard which will bring significant economic benefits to South Australia.

I will now raise some general questions to which I hope the Premier will respond in his reply. These include: what will be the total exposure to the State of an event of this type; what will be the net benefit to the State and how will this be tested; if our expectations are not met, is there a let-out clause in the contractual arrangements; and will there be a cost benefit analysis to the State after we stage the first event in April next year?

In conclusion, I indicate that I will move an amendment to section 5 of the Act regarding the composition of the board to provide for at least one male or one female always to be a member of the board. With those few remarks, the Opposition supports the Bill.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I rise briefly to congratulate the Premier and the Government in relation to the concept of a V8 event for Adelaide. We suffered a great shock in South Australia at the loss of the Grand Prix event. Adelaide was just getting used to the idea, and the Grand Prix had grown on Adelaide. None of us realised what it meant to us until the previous Government had lost it.

I was privileged to attend the last two Grand Prix events, and I believe that the last Grand Prix was one of the best ever held. I know that the public of Adelaide will welcome an event back on the same Grand Prix track with open arms.

People who live near the track will always have concerns about noise and disruption, but generally the public of South Australia will welcome the news.

The V8 event is unique, and it could be made a unique race for South Australia. We have major manufacturers of motor vehicles in South Australia—General Motors-Holden and Mitsubishi. In relation to V8s, particularly Holdens, I noticed the interest that was drawn by the Bathurst race which was held last Sunday—and I note that Holden came second to Ford. Certainly, there is a lot of interest in the big V8 touring cars. We make these cars in South Australia and we have had many people in South Australia involved in the sport.

I do not know the exact detail of the final route but, if it takes in part or whole of the Grand Prix track, I think it will be well accepted. I would ask the Premier to inform the House what has to be put back in relation to infrastructure and whether we have to put back the same amount of concrete barricading as was required for the open wheelers given that we sold off some of the infrastructure to Melbourne. I think it is great that we keep the racetrack fires burning. I am confident that when Melbourne has run its race—pardon the pun—and, if we stage the V8 race successfully, we will see the Grand Prix return to this magnificent track.

In my younger days I used to go to Mallala to see the big cars. Norm Beechie and many other names, such as Bob Jane, were linked to the industry and are now household names. Peter Manton was a fan of mine, and he was certainly into—

**Mr Hill:** A fan of yours?

**Mr VENNING:** I was a fan of his, I should say, because he was into racing minis, and I had a racing mini. That mobile brick could certainly be very active. I would hope that, alongside the V8 race, we have a full program over several days. I would like to see some of the high performance smaller cars, particularly front wheel drive vehicles, on the program—and there are some very good cars on the market today. Likewise, I hope we can run a celebrity event in conjunction with the V8 race—and I think the Premier ought to feature in that because I know that he can drive a very mean vehicle, particularly a Mitsubishi.

I foresee South Australia getting back on the map with this V8 event. I believe this is a good move because South Australia has shown, quite clearly, that it appreciated the Grand Prix which became a major event in South Australia. Also, I believe that the economy of the State benefited more than we realised. When we lost the Grand Prix we realised what it meant to our economy. The many knockers out there swallowed their words when they realised what a benefit it was to us.

A race such as this certainly will not get the media coverage of the Grand Prix, but people across Australia and within certain parts of Asia and other motor racing areas of the world will look upon the V8 race in Adelaide as a big event on the national calendar. I congratulate all those who had the idea and who brought this event to fruition, particularly the Premier and Major Events and I hope to attend the first race.

**Mr HILL (Kaurna):** After that bit of crawling I am sure the member for Schubert will be invited to the premier event. The Opposition, as the shadow spokesman has said, does support the Bill before the House. As the former speaker said, the Grand Prix was great for South Australia, for tourism and for the local economy, but in more ways than that it was great

for the local psyche. People felt that they were living in an important place. It gave Adelaide a cosmopolitan feeling; there was a good feeling of festivity when the Grand Prix was here, and I think it is unfortunate that it was stolen by the Victorians in a dirty deal.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr HILL:** I had hoped that you would not get into that. Just remember who was Premier at the time and who was—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kaurna will continue with his comments.

**Mr HILL:** Thank you, Sir; I will not be sidetracked. Having said that I supported the Grand Prix and I support Adelaide 500, I want to make it plain that not everyone in the community supports it. Some people have concerns about the environmental impact. I have received a letter from the Catholic Earthcare Commission from the Archdiocese of Adelaide. The letter is signed by Mr Terry McDevitt, who is the deputy chairperson and who wrote on behalf of the commission. He raises a number of problems that he envisages will arise as a result of Adelaide 500. I would like to put them on the record and then invite the Premier to let us know whether the problems have been or will be dealt with, whether they are real concerns, or whether he is concerned about nothing in particular. The letter states:

Members of this, our economic and environment commission, would like to express their concern and displeasure at the proposed resumption of car racing in whatever form in the streets of Adelaide.

The letter lists a number of things which, he thinks, are of concern to the local community, such as the smell, that it will be loud and intrusive, that it will inconvenience the city's residents greatly, that it will interrupt schools adjacent to the course, that it will use inordinate volumes of non-renewable fuel, that it will produce literally tonnes of greenhouse and toxic gases, that it will promote consumption, aggression and velocity as virtues, that it will disregard healthy pursuits and natural attractions, and that it will perpetuate outmoded transport alternatives.

As I said, I do not necessarily agree with the letter, but the Catholic Earthcare Commission has genuine concerns. I ask the Premier when he addresses the issue to say whether or not some of those concerns have been considered. Will Adelaide 500 be an improvement on the Grand Prix in terms of minimising interruption to local residents and interfering with the peace and enjoyment of their community? Will there will be a reduction of noise compared with the Grand Prix?

The issue of greenhouse gases and the use of carbon based fuels is interesting, given the concern that everyone has about reducing the dependence on such fuel. Perhaps there is some way that those issues could be addressed so that the Catholic Earthcare Commission and others can have their concerns taken into account.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg):** I rise today to congratulate the Government on attracting this V8 race to Adelaide. It is a race that has been on the drawing board in the Australian scene for some two to three years. It was put together initially because of some of the discontent at Bathurst, but it has grown its own legs and become an event in its own right. One of the fascinating things about the announcement of this event is that it received some of the highest level of support in the community for any event that we have had in this State for a long time.

That is an exciting position to be in, because it recognises that, again, South Australians will support a motor racing event after we had here for some 11 years the Grand Prix. It

really is tremendous to see not only the support from the community but, initially, some quite fantastic support from the business community. Over the next few months we will see whether that enthusiasm generates into corporate dollars, and I suspect that it will.

As we know, in its 11 years in this State the Grand Prix was a very special event. It was an event which put Adelaide and South Australia on the world map as far as motor racing was concerned but, from a tourism perspective, when I first became Minister I was staggered at the number of people who referred to Adelaide as 'the place where the Grand Prix is held'. The tourism potential of the Grand Prix was enormous. I shall divert for a moment by referring to the Major Events Group, because it arose from our losing the Grand Prix to Melbourne. I will not take up an earlier side comment. In the short run, the Major Events Group has had some pretty fantastic results, some of which I shall put on the record again because we in this place do not talk enough about the good things that happen in our State, as we should.

In excess of about \$100 million of economic activity has been created by the Major Events Group, and I shall list a few events to refresh the memory. Tasting Australia, a fantastic wine and food event, has been developed by the Major Events Group. There is the Barossa Music Festival, which was already in place but which was developed, encouraged and supported further by the Major Events Group. There is a guarantee that the Australian Hard Court Tennis Championships will stay here in Adelaide until 2002—and hopefully past that—because of the support in the last two years from the Major Events Group. I note that last week the Premier turned a sod at Memorial Drive for the upgrading of the courts, but there is also the fantastic private sector development by the Lloyd company.

There was the introduction into South Australia of the Australian Golf Open—the first time it has been held in South Australia for 27 years. It would not have happened without the significant sponsorship support of the Major Events Group and, consequently, this Government. The South Australian Golf Open, which has been supported now for the last three years, is probably the most spectacular event we have had in terms of turnaround on a support basis. At the previous South Australia Golf Open, some 25 000 people attended but, after the very first tournament in which Major Events became involved, some 70 000 people attended, and this was due primarily to that fantastic Australian athlete, Greg Norman, competing. But because of the Major Events Group's sponsorship, that was possible.

This week, a marvellous arts event, the *Ring*, commenced. Major Events sponsored this production, initially to make sure it happened, but in the end it will virtually become self financing. There is the Tour Down Under, and this year marks the first time the world cycling event has come to Australia. It is a tremendous event which I had the privilege with the previous Premier to start to organise in France some three to four years ago. The Classic Adelaide Motor Rally, which also is on this week, is sponsored by Major Events. It is another motor event which, if the current projection is correct, will be one of the major events here in South Australia in the future. There is the Masters Games Rowing, a huge success for rowing in South Australia, and next year there will be some 27 sporting events at the Masters Games.

Of course, on Saturday last there were two very significant local events. First, because of Government involvement, we were able to keep the pageant here in South Australia. Some \$700 000 to \$800 000 a year by way of Government support

is put into that particular event. The pageant would not be held if the Major Events Group, supported by the Government, had not put the money into the event. On Saturday afternoon there was the fantastic International Horse Trials. Next year it will become a four-star event, and there are only three of these in the world. All those events, some 13 in total, develop economic activity in excess of \$100 million for this State, and this would not have been possible without the Major Events Group. Major Events is run by a small group of people who have been able to produce fantastic outcomes.

We should remember the Grand Prix not only for its tremendous economic activity but also for the excitement it generated in our State. All of us, whether we were in government or opposition, enjoyed the smiles on people's faces and their general sense of enthusiasm and community during the 11 years. Yes, we in opposition questioned the way things were done, but that is very similar to the way the Opposition acts in this House today. At the time we believed our questioning was valid and I believe most of it was, as are most of the questions about these events today. I remember my involvement in the last two years of those events for two reasons: first, the last event was the biggest Grand Prix in the world. Some 500 000 people attended that event in the last year, which was absolutely fantastic. The other thing I remember it for most of all was the initiation of the 'Sensational Adelaide' theme. We have now seen that flag and that image projected right across Australia in relation to all these events, particularly that last Grand Prix. It was a tremendous event and a catalyst.

We will remember former Premier John Bannon for establishing the board, which has very extensive powers in terms of the ability to close streets and to carry out a whole lot of issues which a board would not normally be able to do. It is a unique board. One of the things we should remember about the Grand Prix is that the board, at the end of its year, was always able to say, 'We did the best we could; the community in principle has supported it.' There have been a few hiccups but, fundamentally, its public relations with the community and the way it ran its operations was absolutely first class.

This Bill extends the role of the Grand Prix Board into another era. It will now be able to run once a year an event in South Australia for V8 motor racing. As members would have seen from diagrams in the newspaper, the V8 course is slightly smaller than the Grand Prix track but, fundamentally, the existing Grand Prix track will be used, which means that Pit Straight, the developments within Victoria Park and all the pluses that we were able to get out of development in Victoria Park will be maintained. It was a fantastic venue, and I am quite sure that the new event will be able to capitalise on a lot of that history.

The Bill itself changes a lot of the nomenclature from the Grand Prix Board to the South Australian Motor Sport Board. It purely and simply recognises that change of name. It still recognises the ability to control titles, the sale of goods and proprietary interests and to run a series of events. The V8 carnival is over four days, and it will enable us again to showcase South Australia. While we will have the V8 event, which is what it is all about, I suspect there will be another 30 to 40 side events at the same time, some on the same venue, some elsewhere, particularly in the East End of our city and, again, showcasing South Australia not only to Australia but to the world. A tremendous deal has been arranged with Channel 10 to broadcast the event nationally

and internationally. So, the Sensational Adelaide banner will again be projected on a world wide basis.

In my view this will be a magnificent event. It will be a return of motor car racing to the streets of Adelaide—something that I know historically we were proud of. I think that in five years we will be able to look back as a Parliament and say that it was good to be part of the development of a brand new event here in South Australia. It is good to see the Opposition fundamentally support the Bill. We have talked about some minor amendments which we were not able to arrange, but I am sure that we will be able to handle those sorts of things as this event and, more particularly, motor racing develops in our State. I congratulate the Government. Having been given the privilege of being on this board *ex officio*, I look forward to working not only with the Government but also this Parliament to make sure that again we have a fantastic event here in South Australia.

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** The Opposition supports this Bill. I will also make some comments about the Formula One Grand Prix and its impact on not only South Australia and Adelaide but also my local community. As most people know, Dequetteville Terrace or Brabham Straight is the dividing line between the Adelaide City Council and the city which is now Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, formerly the Kensington and Norwood council. Obviously, the council had a lot of input into the organisation and I would hope that there will be a lot of consultation with the council and the local community concerning this new event because of the impact of some of the issues that have already been raised with regard to traffic management, noise pollution and the environment.

The Formula One Grand Prix was certainly very beneficial to South Australia. As the Mayor of Norwood, I had the opportunity on six occasions of launching Grand Prix Week, and the last time was when the former Minister for Tourism, the member for Bragg, came along. I think Mr Ingerson would attest to the fact that we always had a good function in Norwood and certainly supported the event. In addition, I remember that many of my friends overseas to whom I had spoken about Adelaide never knew where Adelaide was until the Formula One came to South Australia.

**Mr Clarke:** Do they come and visit us?

**Ms CICCARELLO:** They do, actually. Many of the mechanics with the Minardi team are from the Emilia Romagna region in Italy and in particular from the town of Faenza. Many people are coming from Faenza to South Australia because they really enjoyed Adelaide as the last port of call in a very arduous year. The joys of Adelaide they thought were particularly good; they did not have the opportunity of being in any other city where the track was right in the centre of the city and they could walk from their motel to the race track every day.

Notwithstanding that, I have had representations from many people in my local community who are concerned about the impacts of particularly the traffic and parking issues, and they hope that there will not be too much of a disruption before, during and after the race. Whilst even my colleagues talk about the silvertails in the eastern suburbs and say that we have things very easy, for a couple of months before the Formula One event it was difficult going through the eastern suburbs. Many people found it extremely difficult to park in front of their houses and sometimes even to get into their own driveways because of the inconsiderateness of some of the motorists who came to the area.

**An honourable member:** From the western suburbs.

**Ms CICCARELLO:** I am not casting any aspersions on the western suburbs. With that, I add my support to the event and hope that all the appropriate requirements are put in place to make sure—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Ms CICCARELLO:** The bike riders might—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Has the honourable member concluded?

**Ms CICCARELLO:** Do you want me to finish, darling?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Has the honourable member concluded her remarks?

**Ms CICCARELLO:** I will just say to the member for Schubert that bicycles may play a part in the event, and they certainly featured in the Formula One Grand Prix program. I refer back to the very first time that I launched Grand Prix Week. The late Ian Cox, the Chairman of the board and Mal Hemmerling's jaws dropped when I said it was quite an anomaly for me to be launching Grand Prix Week when I did not like cars and I was a cyclist, but I supported the event and will continue to support any event which is of benefit to the South Australian community. As the member for Kaurna said, it certainly helped the psyche of South Australia. We have a wonderful climate and environment, but unfortunately the people have not come out to enjoy it in the past. Now we see the benefits of people dining al fresco on Norwood Parade, in the East End or on Unley Road and enjoying the ambience and lifestyle which have been promoted overseas and which we will continue to enjoy here in South Australia.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I also support this Bill. It is pleasing to see that members both of the Government and the Opposition are participating in the one race—the race to get South Australia on the map and promote the carnival atmosphere that we were used to with the Formula One Grand Prix. As the member for Bragg has clearly stated, we are at the next stage. I commend the Government on its work since staging the most successful Grand Prix Formula One in 1995. Again I commend the member for Bragg, who was Minister at the time; there is no doubt that that was the most successful Grand Prix world wide—

*Ms Ciccarello interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** Yes, Sam Ciccarello was involved; I give credit where it is due. It is pleasing to see that we have moved from that. The Formula One Grand Prix event went to Victoria, but we have moved from there and this Government has successfully staged many major events which together have produced more than \$100 million of economic activity. Members would be aware that the economic activity generated by the Formula One was about \$40 million a year. It was sad to lose the Formula One Grand Prix, but this Government did not sit on its hands: it went out to look for alternatives—and it found them. The member for Bragg has outlined many of the major events, including golf, cycling and so on, that South Australia has been able to attract. So, in reality, when you put all those events together, you see that the economic activity that was generated by the Formula One Grand Prix has doubled.

The pleasing thing about staging the Australian V8 Supercar Endurance Race for five years with the option of a further five years is that we are seeing motor racing back in the streets of Adelaide and we will again experience that carnival atmosphere which Adelaide was noted for and



excelled in. As the member for Bragg said, the Sensational Adelaide signs, the fact that it will be broadcast Australia wide and throughout the world, will be a big plus for South Australia because, really, no one did it as well as South Australia. I am sure that, by having this V8 Supercar Endurance Race in the streets of Adelaide, we will prove once again that no-one can do it better. So, I support the Bill. I am pleased that we are all together in this—Government and Opposition—promoting South Australia in a bipartisan way, and I look forward to attending the race and being part of the carnival atmosphere.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** I am more likely to get in a sports car than the member for Ross Smith or the member for Peake—and I will challenge him to a race at any time.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** Of course, under safety conditions, and we will make sure that we wear our seat belts, and so on. As I have said, I look forward to enjoying that atmosphere. I can tell my constituents, and especially my relatives, who kept on blaming us for losing the Grand Prix—and that was both sides of politics—that at least we have done something about it, and that we have another race back in the streets of Adelaide.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake):** How times have changed! Now that this Australian Formula One Grand Prix Bill has been introduced in the House, we have both sides supporting it, rather than hearing words of dissent, as was the case when the Grand Prix was first introduced by Premier John Bannon. I cannot wait to see V8s thundering down Dequetteville Terrace again, after watching Bathurst at the weekend—and it was disappointing to see a Ford win, but you cannot have everything you want. I believe that this is a great initiative for South Australia, and I congratulate the Premier and his Government. It is good for South Australia and it is good for motor sports.

I would like to see the promotion of motor sports in South Australia and also the promotion of young drivers—that is, building an infrastructure for young South Australians who want to be motor racers, whether they be in touring cars, V8s, or whether they go on to Formula Ford and Formula One racing. It has been far too long since we have had an Australia Formula One world champion racing around the streets of Monza and Silverstone. The last Australian world champion we had in Formula One was Alan Jones. Of course, we have all seen the great success of Mick Doohan in the 500cc motor cycle Grand Prix, but I would like to see some of our great touring car drivers make the jump to Formula One. I believe that the more domestic races we have here in South Australia and in the rest of the country the more we will promote motor racing as an excellent sport for our young people to be involved in. We only have to talk to police officers on the street to hear about the many young lads going out in their cars and breaking the speed limit. They are having a bit of fun in their cars, which is dangerous for the community, but if we can encourage these young people—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** They have not been talking to me, no. If we can encourage these young people onto a motor racing track rather than endangering public safety on the roads, it will benefit us all. I am really excited about this and I hope it is not just the V8s thundering around: I hope that we have a few other events as well. We had the Grand Prix, the touring cars, the go-carts, celebrity races and different classes

of motor sports going around the track, and I hope we see that in Adelaide when Adelaide comes alive again.

One of the great initiatives this Government had when it was running the Grand Prix was the Sensational Adelaide sponsorship. Something we missed out on, however, when we were in charge of the Grand Prix was promoting Adelaide as much as we should have. When the Government introduced Sensational Adelaide we had the problem of not being able to find sponsorship for the Grand Prix. It was a great initiative, because all these people who watched the event world wide—in China, Europe, South America and North America—

**Mr Clarke:** Plenty came and visited us.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Plenty came and visited us, and people watching overseas saw Adelaide's name there and saw what a great place it was for a race. Unfortunately, we lost the Grand Prix to Victoria and the Premier's mate, Jeff Kennett. I was very disappointed to see the Grand Prix go to Victoria, and I was also disappointed when I saw the former Premier, Dean Brown, sell all our infrastructure to Victoria almost as a concession that we would never have the Grand Prix back here in South Australia again.

I believe that we can, and will, get the Grand Prix back in South Australia again, with the future Rann Labor Government doing all it can to make sure that we hear the thundering F1s rumbling around Adelaide streets again, and I will be lobbying the shadow Minister very strenuously when he is the Minister in 2001 to make sure that we get Ferrari, Benneton and McLaren back here to South Australia where they belong because, in terms of staging a race, South Australia has proved and shown that we can do it better than the Gold Coast and Victoria, and that we can also do it better than most places in Europe. You only had to ask the Formula One teams, the commentators, journalists, and the thousands of support staff who come out for the Grand Prix which was their preferred site, and all of them unanimously said that it was Adelaide. We had Italian teams saying that they preferred racing the Grand Prix in Adelaide to racing it in Italy. We had the British team saying that it preferred Adelaide to Great Britain.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Sorry, that just quickly diverted my attention. I commend the Government for its initiative. We have shown here today what we can do with a bit of bipartisan support, with the Opposition standing arm in arm with the Government in terms of promoting motor racing. Hopefully we can do that with the jobs summit and other economic initiatives. I commend the Premier and the Government, the shadow Minister and the Leader of the Opposition for their support of this great event.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to support this Bill as a proud South Australian and a keen motor racing enthusiast. I join the chorus from around the House in welcoming the event, which I believe will be a fantastic success for Adelaide and for South Australia. I attended as many of the Formula One races here in Adelaide as I possibly could in the years in which they were conducted, and I also went to the very first Formula One event in Melbourne after the race was moved to Victoria. Although I felt that the Melbourne race was well run, as an event it really fell short of the event in Adelaide.

There is no doubt that Adelaide knows how to turn it on when it comes to a major event of this type. Adelaideans

embrace the Formula One race in a way in which no-one else could possibly embrace such an event. It was a great party, it was a great race and it was a great feeling for Adelaide and South Australia. That is what it is all about, in my view—making Adelaide and South Australia a sensational place and giving South Australians a feeling that they are living in a warm, vibrant and happening State. Adelaide is not a tired town and it is not, as some people would argue, a town of older people: it is also a town of young people.

I endorse the member for Peake's remarks in respect of the need for young people to have some action, excitement and something to do with their lives. I believe that these sorts of events really provide for that. They are exciting, colourful, noisy and good fun. That is what we need in South Australia. I also look forward to seeing the involvement in this event of the Australian Defence Forces, as occurred with the Formula One event. I look forward to seeing the Air Force provide some form of fighter aircraft display—perhaps some sort of helicopter support or a fly past—and I hope that the aircraft that provide that display are Australian. I also look forward to the Army being involved and hope that we see armoured vehicles in use. I would like to see attractions such as aerobatics, parachute displays and a range of other events that underpin the V8 Super Car event as a fantastically exciting and colourful action event for Adelaide and for South Australia.

I also hope that staging the event helps put to rest the sentiments of negativity that were evident in the final days in Adelaide of the Formula One Grand Prix. If people are full of negativity and complain, create unfavourable impressions about events, squash ideas, depress the State and argue that exciting and colourful events have no place here, they want to be very careful that they do not get exactly what they seek, which is absolutely nothing happening in Adelaide and in South Australia. I hope that the people who are negative about these sorts of events keep their head low during the V8 Super Car race or else support it, because everyone needs to get behind it. A positive attitude is the only way to go for Adelaide and for South Australia, and I give full points to the Government for getting this event back on the agenda. I hope that the Opposition, as it has indicated today, fully embraces this and other initiatives designed to get South Australia moving. Like so many others, I hope that one day we again see this event develop into a return of Formula One racing to South Australia. I believe that this State puts on one of the best Formula One events that has ever been known anywhere in the world, and I hope that one day we see it returned here.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I thank the Opposition for its support for this legislation.

**Mr Clarke:** You only have to ask politely.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In acknowledging the support of the Opposition, I reiterate that this is an important event and that it can contribute significantly to South Australia in terms of economic activity while, in addition, creating a focus for South Australia nationally and internationally. I thank the honourable member leading the debate on behalf of the Opposition for his support, which is appreciated.

I also acknowledge the contribution of a range of other members in support of this matter in a bipartisan way. That is also acknowledged and appreciated by the Government. It is important to demonstrate to AVESCO and these companies that will be undertaking significant underwriting costs and

investment in South Australia that they have our bipartisan support to ensure that it is an outstandingly successful event.

The member for Bragg in his contribution referred to Australian Major Events. I put on record, at this appropriate time, the efforts of the member for Bragg as Minister in working with Australian Major Events both here and overseas to secure a number of events. If one looks at next year's program for sporting events in South Australia, one will see that we will have a real feast in a range of events with the Tour Down Under, the V8 event, Tasting Australia, the Masters Games, and the list goes on. That in itself will add quite an economic stimulus for tourism and hospitality in South Australia.

When we lost the Grand Prix we sought through Australian Major Events to bring in its place a series of events that would not just give a fillip to our economy for a week, fortnight or three weeks but would spread the benefits of tourism-related economic activity across the year, and 1999 will bear the fruit of much of that work. I thank the member for Bragg and acknowledge the significant work he did in putting that program together and establishing, particularly for the tourism and hospitality industries, a further initiative.

I will attempt to respond to a series of questions asked by members in their second reading contributions on the Bill. The member for Lee requested an indication as to the extent of the Government exposure. Our anticipated exposure is of the order of \$900 000. It will depend on the level of ticket sales, but the business plan demonstrates a \$900 000 exposure. We would anticipate, if ticket sales continue at the current rate, that there will not be an exposure of \$900 000.

We put the chicane tickets on sale on Saturday and they were all sold by Wednesday. We have arranged for additional seating to be installed on the chicane corner. If that is an indication of the level of interest in the event, there is no doubt that we will get the 50 000 people we want over the couple of days involved. If we do better than that there is no exposure at the end of the day. We are currently negotiating with a couple of major sponsors for the event, which again will give further impetus to ensuring that this is not a cost but that it will at best be revenue neutral and possibly revenue plus.

The level of economic activity was requested by the member for Lee. We anticipate the economic benefits of the race to be of the order of \$13 million. We will do an economic cost benefit analysis after the event to test the assumptions and work out the value of the race to South Australia. The member for Kaurua posed a series of questions in relation to local residents. The AME and board people associated specifically with this event have undertaken a survey of local residents in the East Terrace precinct and nearby, with all but two people supportive or encouraging. I understand that two or three people are opposed to the event. That indicates overwhelming support for the event.

In relation to the noise level, I understand that V8s are not as noisy as the Formula One cars. You do not get that high pitch whine in the V8s that you get with the Formula One vehicles. The noise level or impact will therefore be less with the V8s than with the Formula One vehicles. The Formula One vehicles were on the circuit for four days, whereas this event will be over three days, with practice on Friday and the race days Saturday and Sunday. They do 250 kilometres and the endurance nature of this test is that the same driver has to complete both 250-kilometre parts of the race.

With regard to the impact on residents, the circuit will be shorter. I believe it is reduced from 3.78 kilometres to 3.22 kilometres, so it is half a kilometre shorter because Bartels Road rather than Rundle Street East is involved. The shorter route means less impact for the area. Questions have been raised in relation to other areas and I will canvass them in Committee. We are attempting to put a range of events around the three day V8 event.

**Mr Clarke:** The next State election.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have experienced a State election hard on the heels of the Formula One Grand Prix, with great recall. The event follows the weekend after Oakbank, and Tourism SA will be looking to put forward tourism packages that will pick up the Oakbank carnival, the V8 race and the Barossa Valley Festival the week after. Hopefully we can put together a package for a variety of interests. We have raised with the AFL's Wayne Jackson the possibility of having a night match on Friday or Saturday night here to coincide with the event. There will be the after race free concert, which was a great success previously.

**Mr Clarke:** Your greatest fans.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes. You have good recall this afternoon. A range of other events such as twilight drag racing will take place on the track—a new and significant event that will stop in plenty of time so as not to disrupt those in the vicinity who go to bed relatively early on Saturday night. So far some of the expenditure is coming in under that estimated. The concrete barriers, to which the member for Schubert referred, and some other equipment left over from the Formula One race, had been stored for several years and was deteriorating. We had an offer and sold some of it. However, the tender for the concrete barriers has been let, I am advised, and the price for the barriers was well under the anticipated contract price. If that is the order of the day, the cost of staging the event might well be under that previously anticipated.

Again, I thank members for their contributions and for their support of this event. It will be an exciting event for South Australia. The Government is pleased to have been able to secure this event. We had negotiations last year in relation to Bathurst, although they were unsuccessful. However, we opened up and continued dialogue with the respective parties and this offer arose this year. Following a business plan and due consideration, the Government has agreed to proceed with this event.

The Opposition has put on notice an amendment to the legislation. The Government will have no difficulty in accepting the amendment because the net effect is that it is couched in terms similar to that in place in respect of the composition of the current board that has been appointed to—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am sure a member in another place keeps reminding you guys of that, too. With those comments, I thank members for their support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1.

**Mr MEIER:** In relation to this clause which sets up the Act, recently I attended a medal presentation for the Adelaide Plains Football League at Mallala. Whilst we have heard many positive comments here in the Chamber this afternoon about the proposed race, there was not the same enthusiasm at Mallala for the race, because Mallala has been hosting the V8s for at least the past two years or even longer, and they

are very disappointed that the race will go from Mallala to Adelaide.

In fact, shortly after my attendance in Mallala, the local *Plains Producer* newspaper, which covers the area, ran an article headed 'Mallala in a \$31 000 write-off.' Amongst other things, the article states:

The Mallala community has been dealt a huge financial blow after losing one of the town's biggest drawcards. Mallala Motor Sport Park has lost the V8 touring car round to Adelaide Street Circuit, meaning a staggering total of \$31 000 could be lost to community groups which cater on the day.

The article then quotes various people who were interviewed, including Clem Smith, the Mallala proprietor, and representatives from the local football and other sporting clubs, as well as a representative from the Mallala Lions Club and even the Mallala Primary School. Basically, what they have to say is all very similar: that the race at Mallala is a big money spinner for them because they cater for it on the day or days of the race, and all that money is retained in the local community.

As a result, I ask the Premier whether the situation as it applies to Mallala was taken into account in setting up this Grand Prix race in Adelaide and whether any consideration is being given to offset the obvious loss that Mallala will suffer as from April next year. It is recognised that other races are run during the year but, as Clem Smith said, it is the V8s that bring in the big money, and they also bring in the large crowds. I assume they will therefore lose that because this will be the only time during the year that the V8s will appear in South Australia.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has been very tolerant in enabling the member to speak to this issue under clause 1. I am happy for the Premier to respond.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In responding to the member for Goyder, I indicate that this race does not replace the race at Mallala. This is a new V8 endurance race over two days. It is a completely new event on the calendar put forward by AVESCO. The sprint race at Mallala could still well be staged at Mallala if appropriate arrangements are made between AVESCO and Mr Smith. So, it is not true to say that we have taken his race away. This is a totally new two day 500 km race, and it is different from that staged at Mallala previously.

It is up to Mr Smith to continue negotiations. We understand his concern and that of some of the community groups in Mallala in respect of fundraising events and the like. Efforts will be made to ensure that the Mallala community groups know of the catering or other opportunities that might be available here at the Adelaide track. So, there might be some way—I do not know specifically—that we will be able to meet their needs.

In addition to that, I understand that discussions have been held between Mr Smith, the board and officials in relation to hiring some of his equipment to be used as part of the Adelaide event, which would amortise part of the cost that he incurs in relation to the maintenance of the Mallala event. So, in that context, I think some regard has been had for Mr Smith and his facility at Mallala, and where, within the bounds of being reasonable, we have been able to assist, we have done so and will continue to consider how we might be able to help even further in the future.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I thank the Premier for his reply to the second reading debate in which he was able to answer some of the questions I raised in my contribution. I acknowledge and welcome the information that the Premier shared with us. The figures certainly sound extremely encouraging, and we all welcome the sale of the tickets taking off as quickly as they have and certainly welcome the information with regard to the underwriting of this event. If the rate of ticket sales continues, perhaps we will have no financial underwriting at all.

I also welcome the economic projection and look forward to those benefits accruing to the State. In addition, the Premier also acknowledged that there would be a cost benefit analysis after the event is held. What information can the Premier share with us with respect to the declared period for the event? The Premier has already explained that the event will be held over three days, but in terms of its effect what are we talking about in respect of the lead-up to the event and after it is over?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** My understanding is that it will take five days to set up the track and obtain authorisation and a licence for the staging of the event, and then the event will be staged.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

**Mr WRIGHT:** What conditions and salary apply to the board?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Members of the board are appointed for three years. The Chairman receives remuneration of about \$13 000; the Deputy Chair, \$11 000; and members—*ex officio* members excepted—\$8 500.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Are there any other conditions which apply to the board which should be shared with the Committee, and do the salaries vary from those which applied to the previous board?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The directors will have the normal fiduciary responsibilities of all directors. A few of those responsibilities have become rather onerous for some. I think we are reaching the stage where, because of the legislative responsibilities that we put on the shoulders of directors, some people are apprehensive about becoming a director. Having said that, they have their normal fiduciary responsibilities. The Commissioner for Public Employment sets the salary base. There is a formula for determining the rates and, apart from CPI adjustments, that is similar to that which previously applied to Formula One directors.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I do not think those figures are unreasonable. If we are to have good quality occupants of the positions of chair, deputy chair and board members, these are responsible positions and I think the figures which the Premier has shared with the Committee are reasonable. The board will now be known as the South Australian Motor Sport Board. This name makes the board sound like an umbrella organisation for South Australian motor sport, which of course it is not. What discussions have taken place with CAMS and its affiliated clubs regarding the name that is to be used?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Australian President of CAMS, because of his position, was invited to be a member of the board, and he has accepted. Apart from that, there has been no specific discussion with CAMS or others regarding the name.

**Mr CLARKE:** During his second reading speech this afternoon, the member for Bragg referred to himself as an *ex officio* member of the board. I do not know whether this has been officially announced yet. I may have missed it, but if

that is the case I do not begrudge it. His speech sounded very much like a valedictory speech as though he would be leaving the House soon. I am sure the Premier would welcome Ms Vicki Chapman as a suitable replacement for the member for Bragg.

Dealing with this clause with a bipartisan approach, what powers does an *ex officio* member of the board have? Under the principal Act, the board consists of two members nominated by the City of Adelaide, one by CAMS, and the balance nominated by the Minister. I take it that they are full board members. There is no reference in the principal Act to *ex officio* members. So, from where does the Premier draw his power to appoint *ex officio* members? Are they bound by the same rules and terms of conduct in respect of their duties as are board members, and why is this not spelt out in the legislation?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I suggest that the honourable member look up the term '*ex officio*', because, in respect of its application to a whole range of boards and committees and appointments to many bodies and instrumentalities, it effectively means 'non payment'. If the honourable member and the Labor Party would like that to be corrected so that the member for Bragg is paid for his services, we would be happy to accommodate that. We wanted the member for Bragg's involvement on the board effectively to be a link between the Government and the board.

The member for Bragg also has responsibilities in respect of subcommittees of the board for heading up a number of the events and their management. My understanding is that the board has been divided into a number of subcommittees each with responsibility, in accordance with a time line, to deliver programs and suggestions for complementing those programs as far as this and associated events are concerned.

**Mr CLARKE:** I am not arguing about whether the member for Bragg or, excluding him, any other member of this Parliament who serves on a committee should be paid. That is not the issue. My concern involves their status as *ex officio* members of a board. Are they bound by the same legal liabilities and obligations as a full board member, and what voting rights do they have? I am concerned that we not find ourselves in the same situation which the member for Coles got the Government into when she somehow or other appeared as the chairperson of a task force that gave us a \$30 million Hindmarsh Stadium redevelopment when the Government of the day still does not have ownership or control of the land even though it has forked out \$30 million for the privilege.

There can also be a real problem with a former Cabinet Minister being an *ex officio* member of the board acting almost like a de facto Chief Executive Officer. Because he has easy entree to Ministers of the Crown and the Premier directly, the Government could be setting up different poles of authority or power within the structure, which I do not think would be particularly helpful. Will the Premier provide the Committee with more information on what the role of the member for Bragg will be?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The honourable member will not have a vote. He has been invited by the board to participate in discussions and to undertake a specific task regarding the development of the program.

**Mr CLARKE:** What about the question of liability and the obligations of *ex officio* members?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** *Ex officio* members do not have the same liabilities and responsibilities as have directors.

Clause passed.

New clause 6A.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I move:

Page 2, after line 29—Insert:

Amendment of s.5—Membership of the board

6A. Section 5 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) At least one member of the board must be a woman and at least one must be a man.

This is a very sensible and practical amendment, and I note that the Premier has acknowledged support. The Premier made the point, correctly, that already this board meets that criteria and I acknowledge that one female, Ms Jan Turbill, is on the board, but it is important that we ensure that we do not find that, if Ms Turbill is to leave the board for any reason, she is replaced by a man. Of course, some members on this side of the Committee—myself included, being a champion of women's rights—would prefer more females. I know the member for Hart would support that as well. We would prefer more females to be on the board, but the amendment probably goes as far as we can at this stage.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As I indicated, the Government accepts the amendment proposed by the Opposition.

**Mr CLARKE:** This amendment relates to the composition of the board. Whilst I will not move an amendment, because it is not in the principal Act, I am wondering about the Premier's views with respect to representation of unions involved in this area or representatives from the United Trades and Labor Council. Whilst it was not a requirement when the current principal Act came into law back in 1984 for anyone to be nominated specifically from the UTLC, for a number of years when Labor was in government a representative from the UTLC was on the board and at various times proved extremely helpful in ensuring that the Grand Prix ran on time and without any industrial hiccups. Jeff Kennett could well have followed our lead in terms of the problems that he struck with respect to the bussies and tammies a couple of years ago in that area.

There were problems with respect to industrial relations issues surrounding the Formula One Grand Prix, as it then was, and I was involved in some of those things as secretary of my union. For example, when you needed to import a special type of high octane fuel, it needed a calming influence and wise heads to ensure, in fact, that people saw that this event was good for the State and that industrial disputation did not arise. There were some critical issues for the union movement at the time when perhaps industrial disputation could have broken out that would have disrupted the Grand Prix. Fortunately, that did not occur because of the good work done by a range of people behind the scenes and, in particular, by the fact that a union representative who was on the board was also in regular contact with the United Trades and Labor Council to ensure that everyone knew what was going on so that industrial disputation did not break out. It was similar with respect to the setting of wage rates and working conditions for the hundreds of casuals who worked for those few days.

My question to the Premier is: whilst you have your ideological predisposition against members of the trade union movement serving on Liberal Government boards, if you apply your practical hat, will you give an assurance that if a vacancy arises you will not have a closed mind with respect to appointing an appropriate person from the union movement or a nominee from the UTLC to serve on the board, which I think you will find will be of extreme help to you?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** First, regarding the member for Ross Smith's allegation that I have a personal disposition opposed to members of the trade union movement, that is not the case. Why did we give a position to John Lesses after his retirement? It was this Government which made the appointment of John Lesses, so at least give us credit for not applying that predisposition. And, in my younger days, I was a member of a union.

**Mr Foley:** Which one?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Australian Bank Officers Association. I have been a paid-up member of a union for a couple of years, so the assumptions made by the honourable member are not accurate. Having said that, I point out that we wanted the board not to be a large board. I take on board the honourable member's comments in relation to representation. I have no opposition to that as a matter of principle and look at people on merit, and that will be something which will be given consideration next time around.

New clause inserted.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8.

**Mr WRIGHT:** With the advent of national competition policy, what would be the impact if the Government Business Enterprises Act 1996 were to apply to the board or the activities of the board?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** When the original Act was put in place for the Formula One, national competition policy was not even born, let alone being a policy direction. Since then, national competition has come into play and we would not want the National Competition Commissioner applying the rules relative to that to a range of functions that might be applicable to this particular sporting event. We take the view that it is not an event that ordinarily would have a competitive base within South Australia. Secondly, associated events need to be able to plan without the constraints of the national competition principles.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I agree with that, and that is why I asked the question. There can never be total certainty or surety with this but, to the best of our knowledge and advice, can we be confident that it will not be applied?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** With reference in the legislation, if the Parliament passes this legislation that clearly expresses the will of the South Australian Parliament, it strengthens our arm considerably in our negotiations with the National Competition Commissioner.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Does this clause mean that Mums and Dads will not be able to take their cameras to the circuit to take photographs, or does it simply relate to the selling of the television rights to television stations?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Private photography has absolutely no restrictions on it. This is solely for broadcast purposes. AVESCO has broadcast rights as part of the package that has been signed off. That will give us eight hours of national direct telecast time. I do not know whether the honourable member was able to see any of the Bathurst 1000 on Sunday, but that is, in effect, the sort of coverage we will see around Australia over the two days. In addition, it will be packaged up to go to Eurosport and to New Zealand and Asia. It will be packaged up as highlights from both days for that international audience.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12.

**Mr WRIGHT:** What level of consultation has occurred with respect to the declaration of areas and the period involved for Sensational Adelaide 500?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As I said previously, local residents have been consulted. I think circulars have been put out to local residents, and I am told that all but two support the event. The Adelaide City Council was consulted prior to the Government's decision to proceed. We did have discussions with representatives of the Adelaide City council, and they have given their support for the project. CAMS and AVESCO have also been involved in the consultation process. So, representative bodies, the Adelaide City Council and local residents have been involved.

**Ms CICCARELLO:** Has any consultation taken place with the Burnside council and with the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** A transport committee has been established which will include negotiations with both Burnside council and the new Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I welcome the comments about consultation; it is obviously an important component of this issue. With regard to the Adelaide City Council, is the Premier advanced enough at this stage to share with the Committee what cost sharing arrangements are envisaged between the Government and the Adelaide City Council?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am told that agreement was reached with the Adelaide City Council last night in terms of the road work construction. Negotiations will ensue now between AME and the Adelaide City Council in terms of the sharing of the cost of some of those road works.

Clause passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Does this clause mean that construction on the site can continue for 24 hours a day, outside the usual working times that local councils apply in residential areas?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It gives the power to enter public land for the purposes of carrying out certain works, but I am advised that a clause is inserted in each subcontract so that the requirement is for the undertaking to be during normal working hours.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 18 passed.

Clause 19.

**Mr WRIGHT:** What attempts have been made to attract a naming rights sponsor?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Considerable effort has been put in place. Discussions have ensued with several interested parties, and I hope that we are not too far away from having a naming rights sponsor.

Clause passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 passed.

Clause 22.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I have been told that this clause will allow for the transfer of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre from the control of the Grand Prix Board to another body under the control of the Minister for Tourism. However, the Auditor-General's Report says that regulations under the Public Corporations Act need to be promulgated to give effect to the Cabinet decision of 24 August to establish the Adelaide Entertainments Corporation as a subsidiary of the Minister. What is the current situation regarding the Adelaide Enter-

tainment Centre and why did Cabinet move before passing this legislation?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Cabinet can make policy decisions. This is now enabling legislation. That means that at any time following the passage of the legislation the policy can be implemented.

Clause passed.

Clause 23 passed.

Clause 24.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Under the Grand Prix Act the insignia was enshrined in the legislation as a schedule of the Act. How will this matter be dealt with from now on?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Under clause 28 reference is made to the official titles that might be used.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (25 and 26), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT SAFETY

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That the Joint Committee on Transport Safety be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence and documents presented to the joint committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament.

#### NON-METROPOLITAN RAILWAYS (TRANSFER)(NATIONAL RAIL) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I do not know whether the Premier has a couple of minutes to spare, but I want to address one of the issues to which he referred last week in the Parliament, about the location of the Government's proposed new power station at Pelican Point.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I'll send you the *Hansard*; it's all right. The community of Port Adelaide was made aware of the Premier's decision to locate the new power station at Pelican Point some weeks ago now. My initial reaction was to reserve my position, talk to the Government and understand exactly what was proposed for that site at Pelican Point, a very substantial tract of land within my electorate. In fairness to the Government, it was most approachable on this issue and allowed me to be briefed on certain aspects of the proposal. I indicated to the Government at the time that it was not something that I particularly wanted for my electorate; however, I was prepared to hear the arguments. I wanted to talk about alternative sites, to know why Pelican Point was selected and to get a feel for the impact it would have on my community. I indicated to the Government that until then my most significant problem with that land in the northern part of my electorate on Le Fevre Peninsula was another proposal that had been the focus of my attention, to create a ship breaking industry, which I most vehemently opposed and

would not allow to occur under any circumstances in my electorate.

My comments then were that, whilst a power station was not wanted, it would certainly not be of the magnitude of the ship breaking industry. I was keen to ensure that the ship breaking industry would not proceed in my electorate, and I would then address the issue of the power station. I must say that in the weeks that have gone by it has become clear to me that not only is my community concerned about the ship breaking industry but also there is overwhelming opposition to the location of the proposed power station. My office has received numerous telephone calls and correspondence, as I have at home and in discussions with a variety of community groups in my electorate, and there is no doubt in my mind that the community in my electorate is vehemently opposed to the construction of a power station at Pelican Point. That is not to say that there are no other sites in my area or in South Australia, and I will refer to them shortly.

For those members who do not know the area, Pelican Point is the northern part of Le Fevre Peninsula bounded by the Submarine Corporation at one end and the container terminal at the other. It is a very large area. There is no doubt that some issues of contamination need to be addressed there but, if we can be a little lateral in our thinking and a little adventurous, it is perhaps the prime piece of waterfront land available in metropolitan Adelaide and should be preserved and maintained as open space until we can exhaust all opportunities to develop that land in keeping with the community. The people of the Port of Adelaide—my electorate, my home—have received and housed more than their fair share of industry in this State, and the area should not continue to be viewed as a dumping ground for industrial development.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I will ignore the interjections from members opposite, who are clearly intent on deriding the community of Port Adelaide. You may do that: it may not be the leafy suburbs such as Burnside that Liberal members opposite represent, but I will stand and defend the good people of Port Adelaide at every opportunity. I want to say to the Government that as a Labor Party we may have other views about the generation needs of our State's electricity industry—there may be other options, such as Riverlink or other proposals—but, from a local MP's point of view, I beg the Premier not to locate the power station at Pelican Point. You do have this extraordinary power called the Crown development power. All members should listen to this, because I was not fully aware of what this power means. I understand that, in matters concerning electricity or water infrastructure, section 49 of the Development Act allows the Government to completely override community consultation, planning processes and environmental impact statements and simply do it.

This is a significant power. I note that the member for Waite obviously finds this issue funny, but the honourable member, who represents the leafy suburbs of Mitcham, may never need to worry about a power station; he may never need to worry about a smoke stack industry, and so he need not fear section 49.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Stuart interjects. I would have thought that, of all people, the member for Stuart would have some empathy in respect of the encroachment of industry on residential areas. The honourable member is a senior member of this establishment Party, the Liberal Party—this Party of privilege that represents the elite in this

State. Quite frankly, we are concerned about this particular Government power and we do not want to see it used in our communities. I plead with the Government. The community represented by my colleague the member for Giles wants the power station. Why? There are a couple of reasons and I should let the honourable member speak for her own community.

Clearly, that community has a designated industrial area which is well away from population and households and which will not interfere with the lives of families. It is an ideal location. That community also has large consumers of power, be it the Whyalla steel works or the development at Roxby Downs. A large catchment of heavy industry in that area could access that power which would give the community of Whyalla a good marketing edge to develop that important region of South Australia. I believe that, should it be a requirement to build this power station in suburban Adelaide—and, as I said, I believe there are more than enough reasons to suggest that Whyalla is the prime location—other areas in Adelaide are available.

I am told that to construct the power station a short distance away at Pelican Point on Torrens Island, which as we know already houses the quite mammoth Torrens Island power station, would not be cost efficient. I have seen the proposals and we will have to build of the order of 14 to 15 massive transmission towers along the LeFevre Peninsula, extend the gas pipeline—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** You would not need any of that infrastructure cost if it were built near the present Torrens Island power station and connected with the existing infrastructure. If that were done it would save on the capital cost of those transmission towers, which would surely more than offset the construction costs of pipelines running water out to the head of the river. I am told that one reason the power station cannot be built at Torrens Island is that the water temperature is such that any additional warm water from the power station would mean that the overall water temperatures around Torrens Island would exceed EPA standards.

I say run some pipelines to the head of the river. I was told that the recurrent operating costs of that would amount to many millions. Quite frankly, I do not believe that. Advice given to me is that that is an over-inflated figure.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** A furphy.

**Mr FOLEY:** 'A furphy' as my colleague the member for Peake so rightly says. At the end of the day no-one is arguing with the need to generate more power in this State. It may be that members on this side of the Chamber would like to see more work done to prove the business case for the Riverlink but, at the end of the day, the member for Giles, representing the community of Whyalla, is begging for the power station. Torrens Island has more than adequate land with existing power assets. South Australia has much land well away from communities. Surely this State will not, on the eve of the new millennium, the twenty-first century, put industry next to houses where it is not needed. Mr Premier, I beg you not to put the power station at Pelican Point.

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

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to address the House on the matter of the recent offer by the Crown to purchase Brown Hill in the hills face zone, which sits within my constituency of Waite. As all members would be aware, the hills face zone is a vital asset to South Australia, and

specifically to Adelaide. Brown Hill is a very historic part of the Adelaide Plains, having been used by Colonel William Light as a navigation mark in the early days of the opening up of South Australia and its discovery and development. It has a vital link to Mitcham Village; and the whole history of Brownhill Creek, Brown Hill, Mitcham Village and the Lower Mitcham foothills is a quite interesting read for any member of the House who might like to peruse that local history.

Many people in my local community were involved in lobbying on behalf of the hills face zone, and specifically on behalf of Brown Hill. The aim was to encourage Mitcham council to take action to secure for the Crown that vital piece of land known as the Telecom block, which was owned by the University of Adelaide. I would like to mention some of the people who were actively involved in securing that piece of land for the community. I mention in particular the Mitcham Foothills Action Group, a very alive and active group of local residents who are tireless in their efforts to promote the value of the hills face to the local community and to argue its cause.

I want to make specific mention of Reverend Andrew Cheesman and his wife Mary Cheesman, who are tireless advocates for Brown Hill and for the hills face zone, and whose knowledge of the history of the area is extremely impressive. I also mention Mr Colin Butler, another tireless worker for the foothills, and Mr Geof Weaver, and Mr Robert Hill Ling, along with all the other members of the Mitcham Foothills Action Group. They have certainly informed me, both through their explanations of the hills face history and also by taking me on a walk through the hills face and through the key features in the Mitcham area, just how vitally important this piece of natural heritage is to Adelaide and to South Australia.

I would also like to thank the Mitcham Village Arts and Crafts and Historical Society for the work they have put into preserving both Mitcham Village and the Mitcham foothills. I make particular mention of Pam Oborn, a very well known local historian, and Trish Cosh, whom I can only describe as a Mitcham activist, along with all the members of the Mitcham Village Arts and Crafts and Historical Society. They are totally dedicated to Mitcham and totally dedicated to the hills face zone, and I take my hat off to them for their determination and vigour.

I must also mention the Brownhill Creek Rotary Club, which threw its interest and its effort right behind Mitcham in its determination to secure Brownhill as open space and for the community. A number of the people I have mentioned have gone to the extent of putting their hand into their own pocket to make a contribution so that the land could be purchased for the community. I should also mention the Friends of Brownhill Creek, another active group of local people within my constituency, and may I mention specifically Mr Luke Frankham and Mr Mark Beresford, who are tireless advocates for the hills face and for the preservation of Brownhill Creek. And, of course, it goes further than that.

The Friends of Urrbrae House have also been active in promoting Mitcham, the hills face zone and Brownhill Creek, and I would like to make specific mention of Jennifer Gardiner and Yvonne Routledge, two people who are tireless in their dedication to both the architectural heritage of Mitcham, specifically Urrbrae House, but also the foothills that overlook Urrbrae House and the rest of Mitcham. The

Friends of Carrick Hill have been extremely active in supporting the hills face zone, and I take my hat off to Mr Alan Smith, the Director of Carrick Hill, who has really made Carrick Hill come alive in his short tenure as Director of the site. He has maintained it as a jewel at the base of the foothills, which we can all admire.

Mitcham council is also to be congratulated, particularly Mayor Yvonne Caddy and Acting CEO Chris Catt, who put in the leg work coordinating the effort to secure Brownhill's Telecom block as open space to be held in trust by the Crown. They are tireless. I want to ensure that we do not forget the effort of the dozens of people who contacted my office both by telephone and in writing to argue the case for the Mitcham foothills.

Last and not least, and perhaps most important of all, I congratulate Minister Di Laidlaw, whose interest in the hills face is second to none and who has demonstrated, through her cooperation with the council, that the Government is listening to people, is wanting to take care of the environment and is dedicated to the hills face zone. It made me considerably proud as the local member to see such active support coming from Minister Laidlaw and also from Minister Dorothy Kotz, Minister for the Environment and from the Premier. It was a pleasure to see the State Government, the local council and the community working together to secure a valued outcome for all in our community. Open space is vital to our future in South Australia and to the future of the young people coming along behind.

The hills face is already scared with quarries. I recall as a 17 year old, and I think it must have been 1970 when I was doing the selection board for the Royal Military College Duntroon at Keswick Barracks, I was called upon to give a short three minute address to the selection board, along with all other candidates. I gazed out the window at that time and saw the scarred hills face and was immediately inspired to make that the subject of my address. It has been in my mind ever since because I also recall as a young boy playing in Brownhill Creek, having grown up in the area, how much more alive it was in the days of my youth; how much more water was flowing in the creek and how much more natural vegetation there was and how much fun a young person could have there. Today I go to Brownhill Creek and see a lot of non-native trees, far less water than there should be in the creek which has been degraded.

I am pleased that, as Brownhill and the area surrounding it has been secured for the Crown as open space, it will help us to protect the creek in the years ahead. Once the hills face zone and natural treasures like Brownhill Creek are gone, they are gone forever: we cannot bring them back. I hope that development applications in future seek to enhance the environment as well as develop it and create jobs. There is no better example of that than the eco-tourism development of a five-star hotel on Fraser Island where creative developers have shown that you can have an environment and job creating developments: you just need to find the magic formula that preserves our treasures and creates jobs. We need to value the hills face zone and we need to find ways to make it pay for itself so that we can promote its merits. It is such a State treasure that this task should not be difficult. Let us work together to find a way. I look forward to playing my part in helping to preserve that valued asset.

Motion carried.

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 18 November at 2 p.m.



