

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday 5 June 1997**

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

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:
HIV/AIDS AND HEPATITIS B**

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I move:

That the final report of the committee on the HIV/AIDS hepatitis B inquiry, part 2, be noted.

The third report of the Social Development Committee, 'AIDS: Risks, Rights and Myths', was tabled in Parliament in 1993 and comprised part 1 of this inquiry. This report, part 2, deals with the rights of infected and non-infected persons, especially in the context of health care, schools and contact sport. Between 1994 and 1996 the Social Development Committee completed and reported on several other inquiries. The committee started taking evidence in February 1996. At this time, on advice from the medical profession, the terms of reference were expanded to include hepatitis B infection. As the inquiry progressed, it became obvious that hepatitis C infection is now an important blood-borne communicable disease in this State as well as the rest of Australia. Relevant information on hepatitis B and C is included in the report. During the course of the inquiry the committee heard evidence from a range of people working in the area of HIV/AIDS, many from the health profession as well as educators, lawyers and those working for organisations seeking to prevent the spread of this infection. The committee thanks these people for their participation in the inquiry.

In the past 10 years HIV/AIDS has had a devastating global effect, and this infection has become one of the most important public health challenges of the twentieth century. Australia is one of the few countries in the world which have demonstrated considerable success in containing the spread of the human immuno-deficiency virus which causes AIDS. Indeed, in the past few years a declining incidence of this infection has occurred both on an Australia-wide basis and here in South Australia. Australia's success in containing the HIV epidemic was acknowledged in the third National HIV/AIDS Strategy, which was released by the Commonwealth Minister for Health in December last year.

The national strategy recommends that, in the future, educational and prevention programs designed to limit the spread of HIV infection be developed in a broader public health context which takes into account other communicable diseases. The most important of these diseases are the blood-borne viruses, in particular, hepatitis B and C, which also pose serious public health risks to the South Australian population. Although it is pleasing to note our past successes in relation to HIV/AIDS, the committee agreed that we should not become complacent. The infection still occurs at an unacceptable rate in Australia, with a total of 827 new cases diagnosed in 1995 and a total of 45 in South Australia last year.

As most members of this House would know, AIDS remains a life-threatening condition and there is little hope of a cure or vaccine being developed in the near future. HIV is a virus that occurs in blood and other body fluids. In

Australia it is primarily transmitted from person to person through intimate sexual contact or the sharing of HIV contaminated needles and syringes. In South Australia, as in the rest of Australia, the majority of those infected are homosexually active men and they remain a priority for the future prevention strategies.

The committee also heard of the alarming rates of hepatitis C infection being diagnosed in this State as in the rest of Australia. Currently in Australia it is estimated that at least 100 000 people may carry this virus; however, medical science still has much to learn about hepatitis C, and the high numbers diagnosed in the past few years are almost certainly a reflection of the recent availability of a laboratory test, plus an increased awareness of the disease by both doctors and the community. Importantly, about 75 per cent of people testing positive for hepatitis C infection have a history of injecting drug use.

The incidence of hepatitis B infection is uncertain. Hepatitis B differs from either HIV or hepatitis C in that there is a vaccine available. The Social Development Committee supports a recent recommendation by the National Health and Medical Research Council, namely, that universal infant immunisation programs be implemented in South Australia as soon as possible. The committee has recommended that comprehensive programs be undertaken to vaccinate staff working in situations where they are likely to be exposed to blood or body fluids in the course of their employment.

The rights of infected and non-infected persons, particularly in relation to HIV/AIDS but also other blood-borne communicable diseases, provided the focus for this report. In relation to the rights of HIV infected persons, the committee was told by witnesses from the AIDS Council and the South Australian Equal Opportunity Commission that the current legislation has served the State well in terms of preventing discrimination. The South Australian Equal Opportunity Act 1984 prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex, sexuality, disability, age, marital status or pregnancy in the areas of employment, education and the provision of services. Although impairment or disability is included as one of the grounds whereby discrimination is prohibited, it would appear that people with HIV infection who have not yet progressed to AIDS may not be covered by the current definition.

A major area of concern for the committee related to infection control procedures in the health care setting, with particular reference to HIV, hepatitis B and C infections. Since the advent of AIDS, much attention has been given to developing and implementing infection control strategies for Australian hospitals, medical clinics and other health care settings. The committee heard evidence that suggested that hospitals had widely adopted these measures. However, several witnesses expressed concern about other health care settings—medical clinics in particular.

An infection control accreditation program has been established as a joint venture between the South Australian branches of the Australian Medical Association and the Australian Dental Association. Although approximately 60 per cent of dental clinics have complied with this program, only 5 per cent of medical practitioners have, and several witnesses expressed concern at this low participation rate. The committee also agreed that this was one of the more important aspects covered in the inquiry as it was fundamental to protecting the rights of uninfected people in South Australia. As a consequence, we have made several recommendations covering both medical and dental practices to

ensure their compliance with standardised infection control procedures.

Another aspect considered by the committee in relation to health care specifically focused on the rights and responsibilities of workers in relation to HIV, hepatitis B and C infections. The committee looked again at the vexed problem of pre-operative testing of patients for HIV and other communicable diseases and found that, overwhelmingly, the relevant organisations and professions in this State had established guidelines and procedures that had succeeded in gaining the compliance of patients where necessary.

The South Australian Health Commission guidelines and those established by the Royal Australasian Council of Surgeons recommend that medical practitioners always obtain the consent of patients before testing for HIV. Information provided to the committee suggests that members of the medical profession have not encountered problems in persuading high-risk patients to undergo voluntary testing before surgery.

The final aspect covered by the report relates to education and prevention and the role that South Australia can play in future Australia-wide strategies to combat HIV infection and related communicable diseases. As mentioned already, the majority of new HIV infections in South Australia continue to occur among homosexually active men. They remain a high priority for future prevention programs. The committee agreed that the work done by the South Australian AIDS Council and other organisations in preventing the spread of this infection was commendable, and funding of education and prevention programs for homosexually active men should continue. However, the content of such programs should include an integrated approach to the blood borne viruses, especially hepatitis B and C as well as other sexually transmitted diseases.

Evidence presented to the committee also suggested that there is potential for an HIV/AIDS epidemic among Aboriginal people. So, this population is a high priority for funding as well. In addition, the report emphasises the continuing importance of education and prevention strategies for injecting drug users. The committee was told that successful implementation of prevention programs to date may have contributed to a lower rate of HIV infection among injecting drug users in this State. Since 1990 only eight cases have been reported where injecting drug use was cited as the sole risk behaviour for acquiring HIV. However, the emerging high rates of hepatitis C infection indicate the importance of maintaining programs so that this infection is also contained.

I now refer to one of the more difficult areas considered by the committee. This concerns the potential for an epidemic of the blood borne viruses among the prison population in this State. Although South Australia has done a particularly good job in preventing the spread of HIV among injecting drug users, generally, as one witness explained, the prison system presents a different picture. The witness said:

HIV infection remains prevalent in the South Australian prison system, although it has declined over the past four or five years. However, within prisons you have all the circumstances for a flash epidemic to occur. We estimate that between 40 to 60 per cent of prisoners may have a history in their lifetime of injecting drug use, and our research indicates that 50 per cent of those inject while in prison.

The committee's deliberations on the problems relating to our prisons were the most divisive, and we were unable to reach a unanimous position on future prevention strategies. The committee discussed specific problems related to establishing

a needle exchange program in prisons, as evidence suggested that such programs had prevented the spread of HIV infection in the general community. However, this proposition was not supported by the majority of the committee. In a dissenting statement in the final report I said:

Prison officers do not have a duty of care to protect prisoners who harm themselves while taking part in illegal behaviour. With regard to needles in prisons, the provision of bleach could also be harmful. Bleach is, by nature, a corrosive agent that could cause serious injury if thrown into the eyes of a prison officer or fellow prisoner. There is evidence that even the highly caustic phenol used to sterilise dental instruments does not eliminate the HIV virus—only autoclaving in super-heated steam is fully effective. If Government-provided bleach fails to sterilise prisoners' illegal needles adequately, does the Government become liable for breach of duty of care?

Injecting illegal drugs is not okay. Prison must be a place where prisoners can detoxify and have the chance to break the habit. This avenue should be addressed, rather than options which reinforce the addictive behaviour. South Australian prison officers do have a duty of care to protect inmates from rape and assault. The provision of condoms would not protect against rape. Prisoners with rape or assault tendencies should be separated from other prisoners, and so should the prisoners with HIV/AIDS. The provision of condoms also sends the message that sex among prisoners is okay, yet abstinence is part and parcel of the prison sentence.

In relation to the work being done in our schools to prevent the spread of blood-borne communicable diseases, the evidence suggests that extremely good progress has been made since the terms of reference for this inquiry were first developed. The committee agreed that school-based education appears to be yet another link in the State's successful response to HIV infection.

In relation to management codes of practice, the major occupational health and safety issues surround the appropriate management of blood and other body fluids. The committee heard that all the education sector in South Australia had developed adequate codes in relation to HIV. The recommendation of the committee therefore was that the Department of Education and Children's Services, the South Australian Commission for Catholic Schools and the Independent Schools Board ensure that these codes of practice now also include hepatitis B and C. Finally, the committee also heard evidence suggesting that the sporting community in this State had developed a code of practice that would protect players from blood-borne viruses.

In conclusion, although the committee heard a great deal of evidence to support the notion that Australia in general and South Australia in particular has been successful in preventing a major epidemic of AIDS, we would warn against complacency. We have recommended the continuation of targeted programs to prevent any further spread of this disease and programs that are inclusive of both hepatitis B and C infections.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I also rise to commend the report to the House and in so doing thank the research officer and the secretary for their hard work in providing this comprehensive report to the House. I also commend all the witnesses who gave evidence and provided vital information to give us an update of the state of blood-borne diseases and HIV in South Australia. There is no doubt that health authorities in South Australia, and in Australia in general, ought to be congratulated on the work that is being done in order to protect the community from epidemics such as HIV and blood-borne diseases. However, blood-borne diseases will

always be a challenge to the health authorities and the community in general. We must not be complacent.

I agree with the member for Hanson and other members of the committee that we must have a holistic approach to blood-borne diseases and HIV. Although there has been a lot of progress, there has been a decline in the number of new cases of HIV diagnosed in the 1990s. With between 30 and 50 new cases being diagnosed each year in South Australia, the control of other blood-borne diseases is still a challenge. If we look at these statistics in comparison with other countries, there is no doubt that Australia is a leader in dealing with HIV and blood-borne diseases.

We must also bear in mind that the general health of the Australian community must be taken into account, and we have heard evidence that where you do have generally good health standards the risk of these diseases is very much less than in other areas. So, it is important to make sure that we maintain the general health of the community and be forever vigilant on the spread of these diseases. However, as the member for Hanson pointed out to the House and as the report clearly outlines, there is a problem with hepatitis, especially in the prison system. There is no doubt that we have to keep a close watch on the spread of hepatitis B and, in particular, hepatitis C. We know that viruses do change and blood-borne diseases will forever be a challenge to the community. I support the recommendations of the report. However, I put on the record my dissenting statement with regard to blood-borne diseases in the prison system.

I am realistic enough to know that, despite all the preventive measures taken by the prison system, prisoners can still be exposed to the risk related to drug and sexual abuse. However, I cannot condone measures that allow human rights abuse of prisoners. I cannot condone the distribution of condoms for unwanted sex nor support measures such as bleaching, which would facilitate drug use in prison, however minimal it might be. I also do not accept tattooing practice in prisons and, for this reason, cannot support the proposed tattooing project. I do support measures that will contribute to better assessment and possible solutions of prisoners' drug problems, and I consider the proposed methadone maintenance program to be an effective medical solution to these pressing problems.

I would like to put on record why I have made this dissenting statement. There is no doubt that drug taking and unwanted sex will always be a problem in the prison system. However, I believe that, as a society and as a Government, we cannot condone the abuse of human rights in the prison system and, for that reason, I have made this dissenting statement and feel very strongly about that. That does not mean that I believe that condoms should be confiscated in the prison system and that there should be searches, and so on; but I do not believe that the authorities should distribute condoms for the reason, for example, that someone is going to be raped, so they should have a condom so that, if they are raped, they will not get HIV or hepatitis. I think that is the wrong way to go about things and it is condoning human rights abuses.

A person should not be violated outside the prison system or inside it and it is the responsibility of the community and Governments to make sure that abuses do not take place and, when they do, that people who have violated the rights of another human being should be brought before the law, whether inside the prison system or outside. I find the notion 'it takes place so here are the precautions' wrong. If something is wrong outside, it must be wrong inside. If people are

put into prison for violating others' human rights, they should be accountable, whether or not they have an addiction. I believe that, in defence, addictions and so on should be taken into account, and I do support better assessment of prisoners' drugs problems. I believe that extra funding should be going into assessment and support for people who have problems.

The proposed methadone treatment is a medical solution, and I support that. If someone has a drug problem, it should be treated. It is the responsibility of the community to make sure that someone has help. I also believe that there should be a better screening of prisoners so that young prisoners are not put at risk. That is the responsibility of Government and the community. Bandaid solutions, such as saying, 'They have drugs in prisons: here are the needles and here are the condoms,' is an easy way out; it is a cop-out, and I do not support that. I believe that if we look at the problem seriously, in the proper perspective, we have to do something about it. It is no use saying, 'We have lost the war; therefore, let us put a bandaid on it.'

If something is fundamentally wrong, if human rights abuse takes place in the prison, we have to deal with it. I certainly would not stand by here and allow one of my loved ones to be violated in the prison system and say, 'Well, it happens.' It is not good enough. I cannot believe that we can have all the screening processes at airports that detect whether a person has keys in their jacket yet we fail to ensure that things which can be of danger to other human beings are kept out of prisons. They are prisoners but they are human beings and their rights should not be violated.

I commend the overall report. I believe it is an excellent report. It brings us up to date. I congratulate the medical authorities again in this State. They have done an excellent job in keeping these diseases under control, and South Australia has an excellent record. For those reasons, I support the committee and I commend the report to the House.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): In the past I have been somewhat critical of some of the reports and actions of the Social Development Committee, but I have to say in the past few months I have had a conversion on the road to Damascus. I have been following some of the work it has been doing and I have to commend it on what are some truly enlightening investigations and results. I heartily commend the Social Development Committee for the report it has brought down on this matter. However, I am pained to be once more at variance with the member for Hartley and another of my Liberal colleagues in their dissenting report.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know it is the member for Hanson, thank you. I will now challenge some of the assertions put on the record by the member for Hartley. I understand why the honourable member has taken the stance that he has, but I do not think this House should necessarily concur with it. The matter that the Social Development Committee addresses in this report largely centres around duty of care in prisons. The fact is that people transgress the law and for transgression of the law they are punished, but in their punishment the Government accepts a duty of care. I do not know how other members would feel in this House but, if I had a son who went into prison because he had not paid a speeding fine or some other minor transgression, and came out with one of the very nasty and virulent STDs—perhaps the most notable of which is AIDS—I would not be very happy nor, I venture to say, would he. People go to prison to serve a sentence: they

do not go to prison to come out with a life sentence. One of the things that is germane—

Mr Lewis: Do not play around while you are in there—keep your pyjamas on.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ridley says, 'Do not play around while you are in there.' That might be true, but I had a very interesting conversation, which I can repeat because Ms Sue Vardon is no longer in charge of the prisons system. She said that there is no way that you will stop sexual activity in prisons, nor is there any way to stop the use of drugs in prisons.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: She is someone who should know. The member for Ridley is entitled to his opinion and he is entitled to speak next. Perhaps he could let me speak and stop braying in the background.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I may have to help the member for Ridley come to an understanding of Standing Orders if he keeps it up.

Mr BRINDAL: If we cannot stop it, the question remains whether we have a duty of care. I say, 'Yes.' This Government will be forced to a realisation of that fact, because in New South Wales at present a person who went into prison free from disease and who is now suffering from the terminal stages of HIV is taking the New South Wales Government to court over duty of care. I believe that it has tried desperately to settle the case, thus far without success, because he does not want the money. He has said quite clearly to the court, 'This is not a matter of money: in effect, it is a matter dealing with the fact that the State has helped me to lose my life opportunity.' He really wants to get a judgment in his favour to say that the State of New South Wales is negligent.

This Parliament should consider this because, if the judgment comes down in his favour, the way that we approach prisoners and our prisons can and will change. I think it should change. I commend the committee for the report for this reason. I do not condone drugs or what may go on in prisons, but I do say that, if the State is unable to control it, the State has some reasonable ability to make sure that it comes within bounds of public health.

Mr Lewis: Is there contributory negligence by individuals?

Mr BRINDAL: There may well be contributory negligence from the individual. The member for Ridley knows that in a different world we used to put bromine in everyone's tea to suppress sexual desire, and that was done not only to prisoners but also to members of our armed forces. We do not do those things any more; we actually say as a State that it is not our right—and this is what I find a bit bizarre—to suppress the sexual urges of prisoners. So, instead, we create a new problem, which is that we perhaps now need to supply condoms, and God knows about the drugs. I do not want to delay the House any more.

I commend the committee for its report. It is intelligent, enlightened and it is the direction in which, whether we like it or not, we should be going as a responsible Government. I am sure there are those who will rush out and say that those on the committee, people like myself, favour licentiousness and unbridled practice. That is not true.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: As the member for Spence rightly interjects, if you want to be licentious and have unbridled practice, there are a lot better places to do it than prisons; it is a lot easier out in the public domain, I would suspect at

present, than in prisons. However, we do have a duty of care. Therefore, I commend the committee. I observed yesterday that the committee is now pursuing the matter of gambling. I do not know if you, Sir, saw it on the television, but I did, where a couple of people were talking about their gambling addiction. Again, an inquiry pursued by the Social Development Committee which I and others will watch with great interest.

I commend the committee for its work and I am sorry that the members for Hanson and Hartley have again a view with which I disagree, but I acknowledge their right to express their view. It is just a pity that I always seem to be at variance with the member for Hartley on this matter. Nevertheless, we will continue over many years, I am sure, to debate it, and perhaps one day I and others in this Chamber may be able to convince him of what we see as the error of his ways.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CHRISTIES BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the fifty-first report of the committee on the Christies Beach High School redevelopment be noted.

The Christies Beach High School was built in 1965 as a dual campus secondary school to meet the growing secondary education needs of the southern metropolitan area of Adelaide. Currently, it is the only school in the southern region specifically designed to meet the broad needs required of senior schooling, adult re-entry programs and vocational training. The Department for Education and Children's Services proposed to restructure and redevelop the school from a dual campus school to a single campus, currently the east campus, and upgrade the existing east campus to meet the needs of the school community. The estimated cost of the work is in the vicinity of some \$5.5 million and the anticipated completion date is December of this year.

In summary, the work for this project includes the refurbishment of the current solid structure buildings within the east campus, the construction of new performing arts, general classroom and student activity buildings to meet the needs of middle schooling, removal of all hazardous materials, including asbestos, and the relocation of three transportable buildings from the west campus and within the east campus to meet the legislative requirements.

The Public Works Committee acknowledges the importance and urgency of the proposed works to address the current unsatisfactory condition and nature of the school, to enhance the image of the school from the local community's perspective and, in particular, to provide an educational environment conducive to student learning.

In addition, the committee notes that this redevelopment will eliminate the duplication and inefficiencies associated with the operation of a dual campus. Further, the amalgamation of the two campuses will enable the disposal of the west campus for an estimated amount of \$950 000 and there will be a significant reduction in the substantial maintenance liability which will continue if the school stays on its existing sites.

The members of the committee generally agreed that this project will provide a unique facility that will cater for the overall needs of students with disabilities in the region and will complement the special facilities available for students

with disabilities that exist in other similar, neighbouring schools.

The committee considers that, at completion, the redevelopment of the Christies Beach High School will provide significant educational benefits for students, staff and the local community. In particular, the project will make a significant and positive contribution to families in the district by supporting middle and senior schooling and providing opportunities that will ensure that the physical, emotional, intellectual and social needs of younger students, as well as students of post-compulsory school age, are addressed. Consequently, the committee endorses the proposal to redevelop, refurbish and upgrade Christies Beach High School and recommends to the House that the proposed work should proceed.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The Opposition supports this proposal and fully agrees that the work is needed and should be expedited.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): It is with pleasure that I rise to support the redevelopment of Christies Beach High School, and I point out that this project is long overdue. I describe this school's redevelopment as a project in the broader sense with continual input from the staff, students and parents of the school alongside the departmental people. The total school community was kept fully informed and consulted throughout the planning process. Special newsletters were written and distributed to all students, and a public meeting for the school community was held.

For those not familiar with Christies Beach High School, I will explain. The school is 31 years old. It is built on two campuses and houses years 8 to 12, a special education unit and an adult re-entry program. The school is divided by a rail line and a public road. The two campuses are a kilometre apart. The school grounds are extensive, covering approximately 80 acres. I should also add that students in the special education unit, years 11 and 12 students and adult re-entry students are on the west campus, whilst years 8 to 10 students are on the east campus. A total of 1 200 students and 300 adult students attend the school.

The need for the restructure has provided the opportunity to consider the long-term future of the school and the educational needs of its community. I mentioned earlier that this project was driven by the school community. It was in May 1994 that a meeting of selected representatives of the school community discussed the possibility of restructuring Christies Beach High School and, as a result, and with the approval of the Chief Executive Officer, a project officer was appointed and work commenced on an education brief for the school.

Our technical team has put together a concept, a design built on a framework created by the school community, and I would like to acknowledge Mr Chris Biggs for his commitment to Christies Beach High School. Chris and his team have worked closely with the school to develop the best possible resource for Christies Beach under a very constrained budget and the vision that the school plan is built on.

As a school, Christies Beach has looked at its future and its framework and focused on the philosophies of issues such as:

- life in the twenty-first century and its educational needs;
- DEC's vision for the future;
- the national schools network;
- middle schooling;

- senior schooling;
- vocational education;
- social justice issues; and
- the regional needs of students with disabilities.

The Christies Beach High School restructure provides us with many opportunities, such as:

- establishing the first school specifically designed to meet the needs of senior schooling, adult re-entry programs and vocational training;
- incorporating the technology required to enhance student learning into the next century;
- establishing the first secondary school designed to provide a coordinated human services facilities for the school community; and
- incorporating facilities specifically designed to address the broad needs of students with disabilities in the region.

This project is of major significance to my electorate and on behalf of the school community I would like to provide you with some of the recommendations put by the school. The new Christies Beach High School is to be developed on the eastern campus in such a way as to ensure it can continue to cater for educational needs of its local community through:

- the provision of middle schooling to meet the needs of young adolescents;
- the provision of senior schooling to meet the needs of the continuing and re-entry students;
- encouragement of other service providers on the site, for example, health agencies, local government and community welfare groups;
- the learning needs of 15 to 19-year-olds at risk; and specifically:
 - the students of the middle and senior schools occupy and function in separate areas of the school;
 - specialist facilities generally from part of a central spine (where desirable or necessary, both sub-schools share joint facilities with dual entrances to avoid unnecessary duplication);
 - it supports the development of independent learning teams working in small clusters and teaching areas; and
 - there is sufficient flexibility to cater for changing combinations of student groupings, particularly at the transition points of primary-secondary and middle-senior, as required to service local needs.

The redevelopment is to include a unique facility to address the needs of secondary aged students with disabilities in the region. It will encompass the current excellent programs available at Christies Beach High School and extend them to include students with multiple disabilities, thereby complementing the special facilities for students with severe multiple disabilities included at Seaford 6 to 12 School.

Christies Beach High School is fairly unique. The restructure proposal is also unique. It is exciting and it is the culmination of a lot of work by many people and truly reflects the ethos of Christies Beach High School and its motto, 'Education for All'.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I support the redevelopment of Christies Beach High School. Christies Beach High School is in the electorate of Reynell and I put on record my appreciation for the work that the member for Reynell has done; she has worked constantly over the past four years towards the reconstruction of the Christies Beach High School which is, as she said, well and truly overdue. This project aims to restructure and redevelop the high school and to amalgamate the two campuses onto the one site at an

estimated cost of \$5.5 million. We hope the completion date of December 1997 will be adhered to for the benefit of staff and students at the high school.

As the member for Reynell said, according to many judgments the school is an older school now, having been completed in 1965 as a dual campus. In those days dual campuses were fairly popular and served a good need in those times. As we have moved on, the needs of the community and the school have changed and the amalgamation into one site is applauded. The feasibility study undertaken has now given advice to the committee about the sort of redevelopment, refurbishment and removal of asbestos and other hazardous materials that needs to take place and, most importantly for the school, about the construction of new performing arts classrooms and children's services into one solid structure for the process of middle schooling. This is important for the students.

The member for Reynell also mentioned the special education unit. I congratulate the committee for the feasibility plan which provides for a special education building that, indeed, as the member for Reynell said, will complement the special unit that is being proposed for Seaford 6 to 12 School. For too long now students with disabilities in the southern area have, as they have reached an older age group, had to continue in a primary school setting, which is inappropriate for children of that age, miss out, or travel great distances to access students of their own age group. That is a very important part of this program. I would like to congratulate the committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: TANUNDA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the fifty-seventh report of the committee on the Tanunda Primary School relocation be noted.

The original Tanunda Primary School was built in 1864, and I am looking forward to the contribution from the member for Custance who I am sure would like to put on the record some of the history of the old school. It must be borne in mind that that primary school has been meeting in the Barossa Valley since 1864, and I am sure that the school is steeped in a lot of history which would be of interest to members of this House. The Department of Education and Children's Services proposes to relocate the Tanunda Primary School from its current site in Bushman Street to a new site on Research Road. This project involves the construction of buildings to accommodate about 360 students, including a component for special education. The overall cost of the project will be in the vicinity of \$4.4 million. The work to be conducted for this project includes the construction of a new administration, general classroom, special education, and staff and student service facilities. In addition, we will see the construction of a new car park facility and the development of new grassed and hard surfaces for recreational use.

The committee acknowledges that the school has exceeded its current site capacity and, as such, no further reasonable opportunity exists for the future expansion of the school to predict any anticipated growth in junior schooling in the area. It became quite obvious that the time had come for them to look for new fields, and this is what they have done. The committee notes that there are a number of students with a wide range of disabilities currently being transported to Elizabeth and other locations in the metropolitan area for

their schooling. Quite clearly, this has huge disadvantages not only for the parents and guardians who have a responsibility to get those children to and from schools but also in respect of costs involved in transporting students, costs that will be alleviated by moving to this new site.

It is envisaged that this new development will provide these students with suitable education facilities and accommodation within the Barossa Valley, and that is of benefit to the whole the community. In addition, members generally agree that the proposed development takes into account the potential benefits of collocation with the Barossa recreation centre. During our tour, we had the opportunity of inspecting that centre. It is a great asset for the Barossa Valley; to think that it can be linked in as a resource of the school will be a huge bonus to the students.

In this regard, the proposed work encourages the sharing of the facilities between the school and the recreation centre. In that recreation centre you have every conceivable type of recreational activity you would normally have in such a centre. Outside the recreation centre there is the outdoor playing fields, car parking, and pedestrian and bike paths, and all that will be integrated with the school. The committee understands that the relocation of the Tanunda Primary School is overwhelmingly supported by both the school and local communities, and that came through strongly when the council delegation also attended our site inspection and left us in no doubt at all that the school community and the broader community wants to get on with this project as soon as possible.

The proposed works will enable the sale of the current site for an estimated amount of about \$520 million. Consequently, it will result in a significant reduction of the substantial maintenance liability which, of course, is ongoing in the old school, as long as it is there and being used. Moreover, the committee considers that the completion of this project will provide a substantial educational benefit to students, staff and the local community. It is envisaged that this project will make a significant positive contribution to families in the district by supporting junior schooling and, more importantly, ensuring that the needs of students of primary school age and students with severe disabilities in the Barossa Valley are met.

It is worth highlighting the role of the Public Works Committee with regard to the final design solution of this project. Because rare native vegetation was discovered on the site, changes were made to the original design of the school and its positioning. While the committee understands the need to protect such rare species of vegetation, members were concerned that the revised plans resulted in loss of amenity for the school, particularly regarding the use of grassed areas. When the committee visited the site, it observed the strip of vegetation that was in dispute. Because of that strip of vegetation, the school site had been repositioned.

However, there was still a problem with the final positioning of the school and the car parks so that the administrators of the school could have visual access to the playing fields and so that, as far as the general layout was concerned, there would be a more aesthetic linkage between the school and the playing fields, which were obscured by this narrow strip of native vegetation. A couple of walkways through the vegetation had been planned, but they would not have been wide enough to be of practical use in a school environment when you have dozens of children going from the playing fields through the native vegetation strip back to the school building.

The committee was able to sit down with the representative of the Native Vegetation Council, representatives of the local council and officers of the department to talk through the issue and come to a compromise which allowed for the school again to be repositioned and 20 metres of the western strip of native vegetation that was in dispute to be removed. At the end of the day, we came away from that meeting feeling very satisfied with that compromise, which allowed the project to proceed immediately. The Public Works Committee therefore endorses the proposed location of the Tanunda Primary School and recommends that the work proceed. I am sure that it will be a wonderful asset for the Barossa Valley when it is completed.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The Opposition fully supports this project. We note that this is one of the school capital works programs that has appeared on many capital works budgets of this Government. However, we support and accept the necessity for the new school. We are pleased to note that the issues regarding native vegetation and the positioning of the school have been resolved. During a site visit, the member for Taylor and I together with the Presiding Officer took part in the discussions which enabled some of those tricky issues to be resolved finally.

I am particularly pleased that the native vegetation issue has been able to be resolved. This school has been given the opportunity of an important curriculum potential. It has within its grounds an area of native vegetation that it can play a part in preserving and, of course, by way of that process teach the children about conservation and the environment in this open air classroom which is right at its feet. I believe that is something that many other schools in our State would be very keen to achieve, and Tanunda Primary School will benefit from having it there. It was very important to strike a balance between the conservation needs in relation to that native vegetation allotment and the position of the school, providing adequate playing space and visibility from the road so that maximum benefit could be achieved.

I am particularly pleased to hear that within this program there will be a unit to support primary school age students with severe and multiple disabilities. One of the real issues for parents of young children with disabilities is that having to travel long distances is but another burden on the extra burden they already carry in having to care for a child with special needs. I know that at present many of those students have to travel to Elizabeth, which is a long way to have to go every day. So, I am sure that a unit catering specifically for their needs is welcomed by families with disabled children in the Barossa area.

The Opposition supports this project and looks forward to its progress, and we will watch with interest to see whether the Government turns over a new leaf this year and puts its capital works program into effect. I will watch with interest to see whether the Tanunda Primary School is on next year's capital works program, or whether it happens in the third year after first appearing on the program. The Opposition looks forward to this school's quick establishment in Tanunda.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I support this motion. I congratulate the committee on two grounds: first, on the report; and, secondly, for playing a vital part in the finalisation of the negotiations. As has been said, we had an environmental impasse which was causing embarrassing continual delays. It makes me very cross to listen to the member for Elizabeth, who just said that the Government has

been playing politics with this announcement. However, she contradicted herself as she was telling the House what the delays were all about, particularly regarding the environmental problem; and then, in the next breath, she turned around and said that the Government has been playing politics by announcing this project over three years. It has been very difficult for me, as the local member, in trying to have this project placed on the agenda, and it makes me cross to hear the shadow Minister for Education, the member for Elizabeth—and, indeed, the Leader of the Opposition—playing cheap politics in this matter.

I appreciated what the Chairman said a few minutes ago when he referred to the Tanunda Primary School, which was built in 1864—only 10 years after the German families arrived in the Barossa. They had their own schools, and this school was built for people who wished their children to have a public school education. It was built on a very prominent site—adjacent to the main street and the historic Chateau Tanunda—which will play a major part in the future of the Barossa.

We will all be very interested to know what the future use of the site will be. I am very pleased that the committee chose to go to Tanunda to look first-hand at the new school site. I also appreciated the opportunity to appear before the committee and be part of the resolution of the problem, to which the member for Morphett alluded, as did the member for Elizabeth, contradicting herself. I am also pleased that the committee, by statutory requirement of this House, had to investigate this proposal, as the project had been upgraded to over the \$4 million mark. It is now a \$4.4 million project.

This increase from \$3.6 million was brought about by the addition to the original concept of a special education unit to the campus, which is a very welcome addition, giving students with special learning problems the opportunity to have specialist education in their own region. They will not have to drive to Adelaide or Elizabeth but will be able to share the campus with other children, their friends, who do not have those difficulties. So they will not have to go to a 'special school' as such with a certain stigma which is often attached by children, but will attend special classes within the community primary school. It is a very welcome addition. The community is very grateful and it will alleviate the problems we are having, both in our existing primary schools in the Barossa region and in relation to those children who have to currently travel elsewhere for special education.

I am very pleased that this is the final chapter of what has been something of a saga. This new school was announced two and half years ago, as the member for Elizabeth just stated, but local problems—not the fault of the Government or DECS—have caused many embarrassing delays. These problems were mainly in three categories: first, the controversy as to the site of the school. The District Council of Tanunda had set aside an area in its town plan for the school, which a section of the community did not want because of so-called problems. Secondly, the school council and others wanted the school to be cited on the Chateau Tanunda site, which did not satisfy either the heritage authorities, the district council, a large section of the community or DECS. Thirdly, when the compromise site was chosen (to which all parties agreed), and it looked as though we had a firm decision, this environmental problem arose.

After two years of negotiations, we have finally arrived at a decision. I despaired at these delays, and it has been of no help to the situation to have the Leader of the Opposition in this place playing politics like he did last Tuesday. It is

certainly of great concern. I went to the site and looked at the so-called threatened native species, which was just a disused roadside with a few bulbs and a bit of grass growing. I could not believe that this would be brought up at the ninth hour and further delay the project. I was pleased to be able to appear before the committee, for the committee to go to the site and to be able to solve the problem. We were just drowning in bureaucracy, and the community was in despair.

I was disgusted to hear the Leader of the Opposition refer to the problem in his reply to the budget on Tuesday. Yet again he endeavoured to play cheap politics by accusing the Government of causing the delays. Nothing could be further from the truth. The member for Elizabeth tried the same trick. That is cheap politics. As the members know, these delays were caused from within the community, and it is there for all to see. It is the plain truth of the matter, and it makes me sick to see both of these members, who should know better, playing cheap politics. We know that we have divisions in the community, and no good is achieved by prominent people making those sorts of comments.

I only hope that this problem that we have had will not resurface when, hopefully in the near future, the Barossa is granted a new hospital. I fervently hope and pray that the community will learn its lesson from this problem and that it does not surface again when we talk about a new hospital, which I am confident is not too far away. The new site is a very good site; it is across the road from the Faith Secondary School, which has been in the news in the past week with the opening of the Faith Convention Centre. It is a very good area, with native bushland on three sides, and it is an ideal education precinct. There is still room there for yet another school, and there was talk of locating another private primary school in the area. It is an idyllic education precinct.

The only problem remaining is the busy major intersection of Minge and Magnolia Roads near both these schools. That will have to be addressed in the future. I am assured that now all is resolved and that this project will commence immediately, that is, this month, and will be ready to use in March 1998. I was pleased to hear of the extra \$1.2 million in the budget granted to the Nuriootpa High School. I was afraid that the delay in this project was affecting the Nuriootpa High School project, but I am very pleased that not only will this project now be off public works spending (because it will have been spent) but we also have the new \$1.2 million Nuriootpa High School's eight new classrooms. It has been long awaited and is certainly appreciated. I congratulate the committee on the report and I certainly commend it to the House.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Thursday 3 July 1997.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION (CASUAL VACANCIES IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

REHABILITATION OF SEXUAL OFFENDERS BILL

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr ATKINSON: I refer to subclause (3)(d), whereby a reference to release on parole is to be read as a reference to conditional release from detention under section 41(2) of the Young Offenders Act 1993. Surely it is not a reference only to that. Surely a reference to that includes conditional release from detention under the Young Offenders Act.

Mrs ROSENBERG: The difficulty might be that the member for Spence is reading paragraph (d) in isolation. Subclause (3) provides that a youth be treated as a youth, that is, not an adult, under paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d). Does that explanation clarify the position for the honourable member?

Mr ATKINSON: I thank the honourable member for that explanation.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr ROSSI: I move:

New parts, pages 3 to 7—Leave out parts 2 and 3 and insert new parts as follows:

PART 2 ESTABLISHMENT OF REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Establishment of rehabilitation program

5. (1) The Minister must establish a program for the medical treatment, using drugs prescribed by regulation, of persons to whom Part 3 or 3A applies, for the purpose of assisting those persons to control their sexual instincts.

(2) A rehabilitation program established by the Minister must comply with the requirements of this Act and the regulations.

6. Subject to this Act, the provision of prescribed drugs to a person for the purposes of a rehabilitation program, including any medical consultation or treatment required for that purpose, will be at the expense of the Crown.

PART 3 MANDATORY ORDERS TO UNDERTAKE REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Mandatory orders for sexual offenders to undertake rehabilitation program

7. (1) Where a person to whom this Act applies is convicted of a sexual offence committed after the commencement of this Act, the sentencing court must, by order, require the person to undertake a rehabilitation program.

(2) An order under this section constitutes a penalty and—

(a) cannot be reduced, mitigated or substituted by any other penalty or sentence; and

(b) must not be taken into account in determining any other penalty or sentence, whether for the sexual offence or otherwise.

(3) However, a court cannot make an order under this section unless it is satisfied that the offender does not have a physical illness or condition that would result in the offender being exposed to a risk of death if he or she were to undertake the medical treatment involved in a rehabilitation program.

(4) The sentencing court must furnish the CEO with a copy of an order made under this section and on receipt of that copy the CEO must fix a time for the offender to commence a rehabilitation program.

8. (1) Where, in relation to a sexual offence, a court—

(a) makes an order requiring an offender to undertake a rehabilitation program; and

(b) suspends a sentence of imprisonment for the offence on condition that the offender enters into a bond, compliance with the order must be made a condition of the bond.

(2) A condition imposed under subsection (1) may not be varied or revoked.

(3) Where—

- (a) compliance with an order is made a condition of a bond; and
 - (b) the offender fails to comply with the order,
- the offender will be taken to be in breach of the bond condition and not in breach of the order

Compliance with order to be condition of parole

9. (1) If—

- (a) a rehabilitation program that an offender is ordered to undertake is not completed by the offender while he or she is in prison or on home detention; and
 - (b) the offender is to be released on parole,
- compliance with the rehabilitation program order must be made a condition of the offender's release on parole.

(2) A condition imposed under subsection (1) may not be varied or revoked.

(3) Where—

- (a) compliance with an order is made a condition of parole; and
 - (b) the offender fails to comply with the order,
- the offender will be taken to be in breach of the parole condition and not in breach of the order

Commencement of program where offender serving period of imprisonment or home detention

10. Where a person convicted of a sexual offence is ordered to undertake a rehabilitation program and the offender—

- (a) is also sentenced to a period of imprisonment for the offence (and that sentence is not suspended); or
- (b) is serving a period of imprisonment or home detention at the time the order is made.

the CEO must, wherever practicable, fix a time for the commencement of the program that is at least 14 days (or such other period as may be prescribed by regulation) prior to the release of the offender from prison or home detention.

Application of Part

11. This Part applies despite any other Act or law

PART 3A

APPLICATIONS TO UNDERTAKE

REHABILITATION PROGRAM ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS

Persons may apply to undertake program

12. (1) Subject to this section, a person who believes that he or she may commit a sexual offence may apply in writing to the CEO to undertake a rehabilitation program.

(2) Unless the CEO otherwise directs, an application may not be made under this section by a person—

- (a) who has been assessed under this Part as unsuitable to undertake a rehabilitation program; or
- (b) who has completed such a program.

(3) On receipt of an application under this section, the CEO may, by notice in writing to the applicant, authorise the applicant to undertake a rehabilitation program and specify a time for the commencement of that program.

(4) The CEO must not authorise an applicant to undertake a rehabilitation program unless the CEO is satisfied that the applicant—

- (a) has been counselled as to—
 - (i) the medical treatment involved in the program, including the physical and psychological effects (and any known possible side effects) of any drug to be used in the program; and
 - (ii) the duration of the program; and
- (b) has been assessed to determine whether or not the applicant is physically and psychologically suitable to undertake such a program; and
- (c) has been given any written information prescribed by regulation; and
- (d) consents to undertaking the program; and
- (e) has read and signed a notice in a form approved by the CEO acknowledging the matters referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d).

(5) The CEO must not specify a time for the commencement of a rehabilitation program that is more than six months (or such other period as may be prescribed by regulation) after the applicant was last counselled and assessed for the purposes of this section

(6) Counselling and assessment for the purposes of this Act will be provided by persons, or persons of a class, approved by the CEO.

Applicant to comply with directions

13. (1) Despite section 6, if an applicant, without reasonable excuse, fails to comply with all reasonable requirements and directions made by a person engaged in the administration of this Act for the purposes of—

(a) counselling and assessment under this Part; or

(b) any medical consultation or treatment, or any other service, forming part of a rehabilitation program,

the applicant is, if the CEO so requires, liable for any administrative costs incurred by the Crown in providing for that counselling and assessment or service.

(2) An applicant is not liable for costs incurred in relation to a service forming part of a rehabilitation program unless the applicant was authorised by the CEO to undertake the program and consented to do so.

(3) An amount due under this section may be recovered from an applicant as a debt due to the Crown.

I believe that the original Bill does not provide sufficient punishment for a person found guilty of an offence but involves voluntary medical treatment. My amendment seeks to differentiate between a person who voluntarily seeks treatment for having particular sexual desires and a person who commits an offence that causes a victim to be distraught. My amendment will allow the courts to differentiate between voluntary treatment and compulsory treatment when a person commits an offence.

Mr ATKINSON: I find it extremely odd that we have a clause before the Committee, moved by the member for Kaurna, about which the Opposition would like to comment and make some remarks. But, instead of the Opposition being allowed to consider that clause as it stands, we have been railroaded into considering an amendment straight away. Surely the Opposition should have an opportunity to comment on the clause as it stands before we consider the member for Lee's amendment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Bass): I understand that the Committee should consider the amendment first, vote on it and then consider the clause.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I shall make some comments in relation to the amendment moved by the member for Lee. The main change is the removal of the word 'voluntary' which would impose a mandatory requirement for assessment and chemical treatment. As I explained in depth when I introduced the Bill, a lot of consideration was given to the voluntary nature of this rehabilitation program. It is very well documented by psychiatrists, psychologists and medical officers that rehabilitation depends on the offender's wanting to be rehabilitated. Therefore, I still want this program to be voluntary. The only mandatory part of the Bill as proposed is that an offender is mandatorily assessed as to whether a rehabilitation program of this sort will suit them. I understand completely the member for Lee's wish to make this a mandatory program. Therefore, I will discuss his amendments with him; however, I will not move from my position that for rehabilitation to work it must be voluntarily accepted by the offender.

Mr WADE: I disagree with the member for Kaurna, because modern psychological evidence shows that rehabilitation can occur whether or not the person wishes to be rehabilitated. It can be mandatory; in fact, the first stage of rehabilitation in a psychological sense is for someone who denies their guilt or their crime to start to undergo psychological appraisal. However, I do agree that we are dealing with chemicals that will affect someone's body and mind. It is not a psychological situation but one which involves chemicals. On the basis that we are affecting someone's bodily functions, I agree with the member for Kaurna that the prime requisite must be voluntary consent.

Mr BRINDAL: I support the member for Kaurna in opposing the amendment. I remind members that when this Bill was first introduced the member for Kaurna suffered considerable angst, because it was wrongly labelled by the media as the Chemical Castration Bill. As I pointed out in my second reading contribution, it had nothing to do with this. But, in typical fashion, the member for Lee with his reactionary approach to the political process wants to compel all things.

It is a wonder that the member for Lee does not introduce a compulsory gelding clause: it would seem to be in line with his political thoughts. If we are to try something that is new, the approach of the member for Kaurna, as outlined in this Bill, is reasoned, reasonable and a small step towards a new approach. If it works and if it is found to work well, perhaps the House could come back and reconsider making it more difficult for people to say 'No' to going into the process. We could do that, but it should be done as a second step. This is a fine first step. I wish the member for Lee would concentrate more on his door knocking and less on the legislative process of this Chamber.

Mr LEWIS: My contribution is in two parts. First, it is proper for the member for Lee to put his opinion before the Chamber in this matter. He obviously sees the situation as more serious than do those others who have made a contribution to the debate at this time. However, if it remains voluntary, we will have, over time—say, a period of a decade—a number of instances in which people who are guilty of those offences and have accepted the treatment voluntarily compared in results with the other people who have refused to accept the treatment voluntarily. As a society then we will know how effective the treatment has been.

Surely there will be some predisposition in the mind of the person agreeing to the treatment different from that in the mind of the person refusing the treatment or not seeking it. That of itself is not a variable of great consequence in determining the effectiveness of the treatment for those who have had it, and had it voluntarily, as against those who chose not to have it. I am therefore saying that, in comparison of each of the two groups of sexual offenders—those who are accepting the treatment with those who are deciding not to take it—we will be able to determine more clearly whether an amendment to the law of the kind that the member for Lee is proposing is appropriate.

The second point I make is more about procedure in relation to debating this matter or any matter before the Chamber, such as the procedural concern raised by the member for Spence. This is a Parliament. This Bill is a private member's Bill. In any Westminster Parliament, each and every member separately is responsible, at least in the public eye, for the decisions they make. What the member for Spence needs to recognise is that it is not the Government that is pushing this matter. It may have strong support philosophically from members of the Government to a greater extent than from members of the Opposition, but that is coincidental.

This is a private member's Bill and it ill-behoves the member for Spence to take umbrage as though it were on behalf of the Opposition, because it is not intended that the Opposition see itself as opposing a private member. It is about time all members in this place, particularly the Opposition, accepted their responsibilities constitutionally and properly were accountable as individuals for the views they express, the views for which they vote and the laws which arise in consequence of the passage of the Bills that

come through this place. The Labor Party has gone too far down the track of saying, in the cop-out context, 'I cannot go against my Party.' It is about time members opposite accepted responsibility. They are elected, after all, as individual human beings.

Mr ATKINSON: The Parliamentary Labor Party has a broad range of matters on which members may follow their individual conscience, and they are well known. They concern abortion, euthanasia, sexuality, the Licensing Act currently before another place and all matters concerned with gambling. So, the scope of the Parliamentary Labor Party's free vote is well known. However, on the question of criminal justice and on the question of paedophilia and how to suppress it, we as a Party present a united face to the public, so that voters can understand where Labor, as an alternative Government, stands. Not everything in private members' time—

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Can I have some protection from these people, Mr Acting Chairman?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes. I would appreciate it if the members for Davenport and Mitchell would desist. The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: So, the Labor Party will present a position on sex abuse that is united and intelligible to the electorate. Although many matters in private members' time happen to be conscience votes, just as some matters in Government time are conscience votes, so I tell the member for Ridley that not all matters in private members' time are conscience votes or free votes. This is not a free vote for the Parliamentary Labor Party. It is interesting that there is this division of opinion today between those who support the member for Lee and those who support the member for Kaurna, but the members of the Government from whom we hear nothing are the 10 Ministers of the Crown. All those 10 have resolved in their recent budget deliberations, reflected in the budget Bill before the House, that they will give no funding whatsoever to the member for Kaurna's proposal. Those 10 have decided that, should this matter become law, there will not be any funding for it, so it will not happen.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I did not believe that under Standing Orders we could debate another matter that is currently before the House in the context of this Bill, and the Appropriation Bill is currently before the House.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Give me your point of order again.

Mr BRINDAL: I said that I thought that under Standing Orders it was wrong to, first, refer to a debate that has taken place—and the Appropriation Bill, if it has been dealt with, is the debate that has taken place in this Chamber—or, alternatively, if that Bill is still before the House, I thought that it was wrong procedure to refer to a debate that is currently before the House.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can refer to it but he cannot re-debate it.

Mr ATKINSON: I am not quite sure what that ruling means, Sir, but I note that, although the Appropriation Bill has been before the House for something like four days, nearly every question in Question Time seems to be about the budget and none of them has been ruled out of order. I asked a parliamentary question of the Minister for Correctional Services about what the current Government does to treat sex offenders, and her answer was as follows:

Whenever child sex offenders are imprisoned they are assessed, and a sentence plan is prepared by the Prisoners Assessment

Committee (PAC). This plan will normally deal with the prisoner's location within the prison system and the sorts of remedial action which may be necessary. This may include individual counselling or group work in relation to issues such as anger management, interpersonal relationships, domestic violence, past abuse (as the victim), victim awareness, substance and alcohol abuse, literacy, numeracy and other educational issues. In the last three months prior to release on parole—

the last three months only—

the prisoner is referred to the Sex Offenders Treatment Assessment Panel (SOTAP) for assessment as to suitability for treatment in the SOTAP program, which is run by the Health Commission. The outcome of that assessment is made available to the Parole Board, which normally imposes, as a condition of parole, that the offender attend remedial group work at SOTAP during his parole. Child sex offenders are not permitted to participate on the home detention program.

Now we are clear on what the Government does to treat sex offenders. The summary we can draw from that answer is: not very much.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Unley says, 'Nothing.' That is a summary, from a Government member, of the Minister's answer. It is a very fair summary by the member for Unley and I thank him for it because he took the words right out of my mouth.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADELAIDE RAMS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I move:

That this House congratulates the Adelaide Rams for their outstanding win against the Hunter Mariners at their first home game and for providing South Australians with a most exciting introduction to Super League.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, indeed they are, but they will improve. It pleases me greatly to move this motion not simply because the Adelaide Rams are based in my electorate at Ram Park, Oakden, but for the many benefits that the Rams have brought to our community and in particular the young people of Torrens. Like most people who attended the first home game which was played under lights and which drew a crowd of some 27 000 people, I believe this game generated a new and ongoing interest in rugby league. Certainly the spectacular entertainment was an exciting addition.

Having played together for only one season—with players coming from Fiji, New Zealand, the ACT, Queensland and Papua New Guinea—the Rams have done remarkably well winning four games and drawing one. No doubt, the seven losses are due to the fact that they are in their early growth phase and are still learning to work together as a team, getting to know each other's styles and tactics.

The most noted victory was against Cronulla at an away game and, with Cronulla being regarded as invincible on their home ground, I believe this shows that the Rams teamwork is quickly developing. The first half of the game last Sunday against the Canberra Raiders confirms that their level of skill is rapidly developing.

As yet there is no reserve side but there is an under 19 team and, having witnessed them play, I think there is no doubting the talent that we have in South Australia. I know that the development of rugby skills amongst South Australian youth is of major importance to the Adelaide Rams and the South Australian Rugby League for future national, State and international competitions.

In 1997 there will be 12 home games, some of which will be played against the visiting English teams. This will most certainly promote this State's sports and tourism opportunities, and with the games being broadcast on free to air and pay TV, South Australia will certainly benefit from this nationally and internationally.

Having the Rams based in my electorate, as I said, is of great benefit. For example, we have access to their barbecue facilities, and the players have become involved in our community fun days and our schools. They offer not only sporting opportunities and leadership skills to our youth but also encourage our children to participate in a healthy lifestyle activity, all of which are invaluable at a time of high youth unemployment. This time is given most willingly, and their involvement in our community infrastructure is most welcome.

Our community has received indirect benefits as well. The Rams have spent a considerable amount of money on the training ovals which were unusable in winter because they were constantly waterlogged. This required the removal of a considerable amount of topsoil and relaying of the turf to make the grounds an all-year training facility. I understand that the topsoil which was removed was used in landscaping in the new school grounds of the Oakden Baptist Church. Rugby League is not new to South Australia and was first played here in the 1950s, and was formally developed into the South Australian Rugby League structure in 1976.

Currently, there are nine affiliated rugby league clubs in South Australia with some 650 young players in the under 7s to 18 year bracket. The introduction of Super League to South Australia has generated a greater public interest in rugby, and the South Australian Rugby League's longstanding commitment to developing regional youth programs to promote rugby league in regional and metropolitan Adelaide is to be highly commended.

It is worth noting that the South Australian Rugby League was instrumental in working with schools to develop the South Australian Primary Schools Sports Association. In working with the South Australian Rugby League, the Rams have been involved in developing sports clinics for youth, visiting my local schools such as the Gilles Plains Primary School, the Hillcrest Primary School, the Wandana Primary School and Klemzig Primary School, as well as the Windsor Gardens High School—all of which are within the vicinity of Ram Park. The Rams have joined with the South Australian Rugby League to support our local club, the Northern Districts Rugby League Club, which is based at Klemzig.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Rams, not just for that great win at their first home game but also for the commitment that they have displayed in working with my local community and in particular their involvement with our young people. I must say that I have developed a renewed interest in rugby league, having come from New South Wales many years ago, but I must confess that I am still rather rusty on the rules. I wish the Rams every success in future matches and look forward to their continued support in our local community.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): On Friday 14 March a new era of sports entertainment was launched in this State. Rugby League—Super League—made history in this State. I must admit that being a life-long supporter of rugby, rock and roll football was not what I expected but, like the 27 435 people present, it did not take me long to catch on, and I must say that I thoroughly enjoyed this new extravaganza in sports

entertainment. The minute Jon Stevens launched into Super League's theme song 'Two Tribes', Adelaide Oval came to life and those who have been starving for rugby for much too long sang and cheered and really set the scene for what was to be Super League's night of nights. Seven hundred dancers, Foxtel characters, the Balfours pie and pasty, fireworks, fast cars, and I should mention Mega Ram, all set the scene for a night of fantastic family entertainment.

On a more serious note, giving the game real status, some of rugby league's most respected legends did away with mouth guards and took control of the microphones. Wally Lewis—a former champion and many times Australian captain and probably the greatest player in rugby league ever—was present. There was Steve Mortimer and his brothers who, I must admit, were heroes of mine not that long ago, and then there were international stars Peter Jackson, Gary Freeman, Brent Todd and Gavin Jones. Commentary from these guys adds a certain class to rugby.

At 8.4 p.m. under the Adelaide Oval lights history was made. Driven by a thunderous reception, the Rams gave Adelaide and South Australian fans exactly what we wanted to see, with a home game victory over the Hunter Mariners, a 10:8 triumph. I must say that we really deserved this win. We the fans have remained very patient whilst we awaited the launch of Super League and, through the frustrations of having a game, not having a game, having a team to not being sure of having a team we were well rewarded.

The Rams displayed a striking and committed defensive display that enabled the club to win the hard-fought encounter. The two sides finished with a try each, but two successful penalties by centre Kurt Wrigley proved the difference. I could relive the commentary, but I am sure most members would have followed the game move by move. It took until the thirty-third minute mark before the Hunter Mariners had an impact on the scoreboard. The defences dominated the match, limiting scoring opportunities, but the Rams played within these limitations and got the points.

It is important to acknowledge Rod Maybon, whose participation was in doubt because of a calf injury, but he was there rock solid at the back and illustrated his importance to the team. Our front rowers, Mark Corvo and Kevin Campion, as well as Cameron Blair and Dave Boughton, refused to buckle under pressure. With improved movement and control, our play became more enterprising with the first decisive scoring opportunity five minutes from the half-time break when winger Joe Tamani dropped the ball with the try line wide open. Our team played with intensity. It was tight football and it would be remiss of me not to mention the man behind the victory, a legend in his own time, Rod Reddy. In my opinion he was St George's best ever export. He is the machine behind our team. We do not fully appreciate what our Rams coach can and will do for rugby league in South Australia.

Earlier I mentioned the entertainment extravaganza that brought Adelaide Oval to life, and I would like to acknowledge those who provided us with a spectacular performance, bringing to life many rock and roll favourites. The entertainment was provided by Marden, Valley View and Clovelly Park calisthenics clubs and by drama classes from Scotch College and Charles Campbell Secondary School. SA Rugby League and Volleyball SA and the contingent of drummers, who consistently beat a rhythm, made things difficult for the Hunter Mariners. Scott McBain ensured the crowd got involved. I would especially like to thank the South Australian Police and St John Ambulance for their efforts on the

night. TransAdelaide deserves a special mention for catering for the transport needs of many fans. We should all thank John Hart, Liz Dawson and all the dynamic people behind our team.

I have missed only one home game—that against Canberra—and I have enjoyed the extravaganza of all the games: Perth, Brisbane, North Queensland and Canterbury, and I will be there for the rest of the season. I have viewed the games from all over Adelaide Oval, and the drive and enthusiasm is present all around the ground. Having the Rams in Adelaide is a real boost for our local rugby league teams, and, as patron and No. 1 ticket holder of South Adelaide Rugby League, I would like to see our Super League side work with the local teams to give the local league the status it truly deserves.

We all acknowledge that our future Rams should be our local boys, and we do have some very talented local players. Super League is here. It is a great game that seems to get even better. We have fantastic players, the latest technology and the means to give the crowd the ultimate in sports extravaganza.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): It is important that, when people talk about rugby, they talk about the right game of rugby. I appreciate the great support of both the member for Torrens and the member for Reynell for rugby league, especially the member for Reynell, being a great supporter of the red and white from St George, but I point out that rugby is the game that is played in heaven. Rugby is definitely not rugby league: rugby is rugby union. Some people say that it is the barbarian's game played by gentlemen whereas rugby league is the gentlemen's game played by barbarians. So, when people talk about rugby, they talk about the game that is played in heaven, which is rugby union.

As the member for Torrens said, the introduction of the Adelaide Rams has been very good for South Australia. For Adelaide to be part of the national competition of rugby league is great. It gives South Australians a great opportunity to see a good game of football, a good contact sport, a sport that is played by men who enjoy the running game. It is a pleasure to see it and to see it played on Adelaide Oval. It will be great for tourism and it will be great for opening up the city. We look forward to the continuing success of the Adelaide Rams and to their winning a premiership flag in the near future.

I appreciate that it is only early days, but 'Rocket' Reddy is a very good coach, even though he comes from St George, and I am sure that he will lead the Adelaide Rams to many successes in the future. I commend the member for Torrens for her motion.

Motion carried.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Andrew:

That in the interests of long term rail jobs and a strong viable future for rail in South Australia, this House notes the support for the sale of Australian National from Rail 2000, Trades and Labour Council, Port Augusta, Corporation of the City of Port Augusta, Spencer Regions Development Association, Northern Regional Development Board, SA Farmers Federation, Australian Barley Board, Australian Wheat Board, Senator Bob Collins and Australian National.

(Continued from 29 May. Page 1483.)

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Last Thursday, I had the pleasure of moving this motion with respect to support for the future planned privatisation and sale of Australian National. Of course, it was moved on the premise and with the reasoning that it has been supported by many organisations and many individuals to be in the national and State interests and the interests of the rail workers in South Australia.

Time eluded me last week (I think the luncheon adjournment took place), so I would like to continue my remarks and place on record some of the very strong, supportive comments, many of which have been formally recorded in the Brew report to the Commonwealth Government. That report concerned the Australian rail industry.

Last week, I concluded by quoting support for the privatisation of Australian National from the Port Augusta council. I reported that Mr Ian McSparran, the City Manager, had said:

Council favours the privatisation of Australian National.

I want to conclude with a few other supporting statements. Joy Baluch was recently re-elected as Mayor of Port Augusta and has made some very direct comments in relation to Port Augusta's support for the privatisation of AN. She said:

You would have to be deaf, dumb and blind and with a labrador dog to suggest that AN should continue to be operated by the Government. . . We had Laurie Brereton here [Port Augusta] on a number of occasions and he lied to the work force. What we need in this enterprise here in Port Augusta is people from the private sector who are entrepreneurial and who are not tunnel visioned and got blinkers on.

Last Friday, I was driving along the road and listening to country 539 ABC on the car radio. I cannot quote the Mayor specifically, but I noted that she was again very public and very adamant in using terminology which implied, 'How dare the Federal Government tell Port Augusta rail workers what is in their best interests without consulting them or listening to their requirements.' Colleen Hutchinson, CEO of the Northern Regional Development Board and well known for her Labor connections, said about the Federal report:

If AN had been handled correctly over the years, particularly from that period 10 to 12 years ago, it could have been a viable operation but, because of decisions that were made both politically and in management terms for AN, AN was set up to fail over that period. I have had both a personal view and also a business view that rail needed to be much more competitive. In the past. . .neither AN nor NR has been sufficiently competitive.

Mr Allan McNeil, Vice President and Organiser of the AWU (SA) said:

Even though we could understand that technology would take over some of the jobs, there just seemed to be a blind focus that the only way to reduce costs was to get rid of people and dig up infrastructure that was not being used.

Charles Morton, Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, Port Augusta—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, member for Ross Smith.

Mr ANDREW:—said:

The decision by the Minister for Transport [the Federal Minister of the day] to give everybody a redundancy package has made things easier. . .It has made the acceptance that privatisation is not such a bad thing.

I reinforce the benefits of privatisation of AN and the immediate requirement for it to happen.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APEX AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Evans:

That this House congratulates Apex Australia, its current and past members, on 60 years of service to the South Australian community.

(Continued from 6 March. Page 1203.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I wish to support the motion strongly. I am pleased that the member for Davenport has moved this motion because, while I have heard of Apex over many years, I have never really known of the organisation's activities or the enormous extent of them. I note that the member for Davenport is a member and also past national President of Apex. I have a high regard for the member for Davenport and his involvement, and other young people like him, in organisations such as this. This explains why Apex is such a wonderful community based organisation. There are many wonderful service clubs and organisations, but Apex is the only one which was formed in Australia. Apex was formed in Geelong in 1931 and established in South Australia in 1937—hence the sixtieth anniversary this year. The organisation is so successful that it has now spread throughout the whole world.

The member for Davenport lent me a couple of books on the history of Apex in Australia. I found them most enlightening, and I appreciate being given the chance to read about Apex. The member for Davenport and other members have quoted many examples of the outstanding things Apex has done over the years. I will not go into them again, except to mention a few absolutely wonderful initiatives and outstanding achievements made by Apex. In 1947, Apex was involved in a national campaign to promote compulsory X-ray tests for tuberculosis. As a result of an enormously large and vigorous campaign throughout Australia by Apex, the then Federal Government introduced compulsory X-rays soon after the 1947 election. Since that time, because of this initiative, tuberculosis virtually has been conquered in this country.

Apex played a major role in the establishment of the Spastic Centres Association. It also gave valuable assistance to Reverend Flynn to establish the fabulous Royal Flying Doctor Service in Australia. I was interested to find that the member for Davenport rode a bicycle from here to Perth, raising \$8 000 for the Flying Doctor Service. It is a long way, and I wonder how long it took the honourable member. I was a racing cyclist for many years, but in those days, even though I was young and fit, it would have been a pretty daunting task to ride from here to Perth. The establishment of the Guide Dogs Association was also greatly assisted by Apex in Western Australia. We all know of the tremendous value of this wonderful concept and the service it provides to people who need guide dogs because their sight is failing.

One of Apex's most successful schemes in South Australia was the setting up of the craniofacial surgery unit which does unbelievable work and which is internationally recognised. These are only some of the many and varied achievements of Apex in the area of community service. The organisation and its past and current members deserve the highest possible thanks and praise from the whole community and certainly from this Parliament. I am therefore pleased to support the motion.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I shall detain the House but briefly. In commending the member for Davenport for his motion and endorsing the remarks of the member for Price, I want to put on the record that, during the past 12 months,

I was privileged to be a guest of Unley Apex at its thousandth dinner, and I want to make the following contribution. In commending the member for Davenport and acknowledging his role as a past national President of Apex, I would also like to mention the Hon. Angus Redford from the other place who also held national office.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Davenport tells me that he also was a national President. I believe that the Australian community is indebted to Apex for two reasons, one of which has been mentioned by members opposite but they have been too modest to mention the other, and that is the calibre of the leadership that has come out of Apex. It is a young person's organisation, which has done much valuable work, as the member for Price said, but the interesting thing about the thousandth dinner was seeing former Apexians and knowing what their role in life was. It is an invaluable training ground for the leaders of this nation.

If Apex had not done the extraordinary work that it has done in the community but had produced only those people who today lead the Australian community and are former Apexians, it would have performed a valuable service. That it has done both stands to its considerable credit, enhancing the organisation itself and benefiting the community as a result. Therefore, I have great pleasure in commending the member for Davenport for his initiative. I support the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mitchell.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The member for Ross Smith says that I left there a long time ago, but that is not exactly true. If the member for Ross Smith had been a former Apexian, he would realise that you are required to leave at the age of 40, which was not that long ago as far as I am concerned. I support the motion of the member for Davenport. I would like to point out the members of both Houses who are former Apexians. The member for Unley rightly pointed out that the member for Davenport was a former national President of Apex in 1989. The Hon. Angus Redford is also a former member of Apex, and he is not only a life member but a life governor. The President of the Upper House (Hon. Peter Dunn) is a former member of Apex and a life member. The Hon. Julian Stefani is also a former member of Apex, as am I.

As the member for Unley said, Apex is a great breeding ground for leaders of this country. I am sure that it comes as no surprise to members that the current Premier of this State is also a former Apexian of great standing. I must point out the ideals of Apex. They are: the ideal of service, which is the basis of all enterprise; to develop by example a more intelligent and aggressive citizenship; to provide a means of forming enduring friendship, rendering an altruistic service and building a better community; and promoting international understanding and friendship. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

CRICKET, AUSTRALIA DAY TEST

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.D. Rann:

That this House condemns any steps to move the Adelaide test cricket match from the Australia Day weekend and calls on the Australian Cricket Board to reinstate the Australia Day test to Adelaide Oval for next year and seeks a commitment from the ACB that Adelaide will continue to have its test at that time in future.

(Continued from 6 March. Page 1204.)

Mr BASS (Florey): I support the Leader of the Opposition's motion. The Adelaide test on Australia Day has been with South Australia for many years and has always been well attended. When we talk of great sporting events in South Australia, the Australia Day test at the Adelaide Oval always comes to the fore. I have friends in England who have come to Australia simply to attend the Australia Day test in South Australia.

I believe that the ACB should ensure that Adelaide not only has the Australia Day Test returned to it for next year, but forever, because by having a set program and knowing many years ahead that there will be a test match on Australia Day, people from all over the world can make arrangements to come to South Australia. People visit the Adelaide Oval. One of my friends from England visited me and even in the middle of winter all he wanted to do was to walk down and stand on the Adelaide Oval. This is the sort of popularity that the Adelaide Oval has amongst cricketing fans throughout the world, and I believe that the Adelaide Test on Australia Day helps to keep the oval, Adelaide and South Australia on the map. So, I support the motion of the Leader of the Opposition.

Motion carried.

CARNEVALE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Cummins:

That this House congratulates the Coordinating Italian Committee, its President (Dr A. Cocchiario) and all participating clubs and organisations for the very successful Carnevale and acknowledges the splendid contribution of the delegations from Lazio Region, Campania Region and the Salerno Province.

(Continued from 27 February. Page 1070.)

Mrs HALL (Coles): I support the comments of my parliamentary colleagues who have already recorded their support for this motion proposed by the member for Norwood several months ago. I join them in congratulating the members of the Coordinating Italian Committee led by the then President, Dr Antonio Cocchiario, and all other individuals and organising groups for participating in and supporting the recent Carnevale. The Carnevale has an energy with an impressive style which makes it a magnificent event and provides a perfect example of the benefits of the heritage of our immigration program over many years. Immigration has had a profound economic and social impact on Australia, particularly in the period since the Second World War. The post-war migration wave from the nations of Continental Europe—and, in this State, Italy and Greece in particular—has borne fruit in the evolution of contemporary Australia's extensive diversity. This diversity is both highlighted and celebrated by events such as the Carnevale, the Glendi Festival and the Schutzenfest, just to name a few.

More recent immigrants from South-East Asia have brought their own distinctive festivals and celebrations to our State. Whilst the various regions of Italy were coming together as a nation at the Carnevale, many thousands of people from our Asian communities were engaging in traditional celebrations to mark the arrival of the Chinese New Year and the Year of the Ox. It is fitting, therefore, that leading up to these festivities marking our cultural and linguistic diversity, this Government has embarked on an immigration strategy for our State called 'Immigration SA'.

Designed to increase South Australia's share of settler arrivals, it will provide new migrants with practical assistance in finding housing and employment, whilst also helping with the basics, such as qualification recognition and general orientation. Our Government is clearly demonstrating its commitment to attracting to South Australia young, highly skilled migrants who are able to meet our specific labour market needs.

Young potential migrants with targeted skills and expertise will be encouraged, hereby increasing this State's appeal as a destination, and reducing the impediments to immigration and successful settlement. In particular, our Government has targeted migrants with qualifications, skills and expertise relevant to the growing information industry sector. This sector is already a major contributor to the State's economic development and currently employs in excess of 10 000 South Australians. Recent studies have indicated that there are shortages of suitably skilled and experienced people in various skill categories and our Government has put in place a range of measures to address this in both the long and short term.

These include: the promotion of the information industry sector to young people as a viable career option through the release to all secondary schools of the IT careers CD-ROM and web site; the creation of the Research and Development Centre of Excellence in IT involving our three universities; and attracting appropriately skilled and qualified people from interstate and overseas through the Adelaide Advantage Promotion conducted by the Information Technology Workforce Strategy Office.

The recent promotions in Canberra, the UK and Hong Kong have been enormously successful in attracting interest from this group in the advantages that living and working in South Australia has to offer. In addition, the promotion of the Immigration SA strategy has provided further incentive for people to choose South Australia as their preferred destination. The interest in this scheme is evident by the recent figures showing that more than 4 500 inquiries were recorded by the Agent-General's Office in London since the campaign launch. Recently, the Premier said we would probably be following up the promotional activities of Immigration SA in Italy, where Olivetti, based in Milan, has laid off numbers of software engineers.

Other services provided under Immigration SA will include: orientation, airport meet and greets, referrals and the provision of concessional information. These will all help to make the transition to a new life in a new country easier, whilst giving our State every opportunity to build on the benefits that immigration brings. This decision to actively pursue additional skilled migrants for South Australia has become necessary due to the years of neglect by Labor. Under the decade of neglect by the previous disgraced Labor Government, the proportion of overseas migrants who chose to make South Australia their home dropped from 8.8 per cent to 3.8 per cent, a figure that is clearly unacceptable, and Labor should be ashamed of its miserable efforts in this and so many other areas.

Despite the Leader of the Opposition's comments that multiculturalism fosters tolerance and diversity, and his shallow rhetoric that it can be 'an engine room of economic growth', the Government in which he served as a senior Minister ignored the needs of immigrants throughout its term. Typical of this hypocrisy, the Leader and his colleagues were full of hot air, but fell a long way short on the delivery of the benefits of immigration to South Australia.

New migrants will provide additional links with the increasingly globalised world economy, generate new opportunities for employment, and stimulate additional demand in our growing information technology industry, as well as the building and service industries. However, the benefits will flow far beyond those purely economic. Maintaining and expanding cultural and lingual links from all around the world will add to the multicultural base of our diverse society. It will help to increase the levels of tolerance and understanding of our many different cultures and beliefs. It will increase our children's knowledge of our heritage and of our place in the world. Most significantly, it will give people from around the world an opportunity to contribute and become an integral part of our society and the quality of life we enjoy here in South Australia.

I applaud the work of our multicultural communities and those who support them. Figures from the Bureau of Statistics show that nearly 30 000 Italian born people are here in South Australia, and more than 80 000 people with an Italian heritage. Additionally, the figures show that Italians are the largest non-English speaking background group in our State, and that Adelaide has the second highest percentage of Italian born people in Australia after Melbourne. With more than 180 regional Italian community organisations in South Australia, the success of the Carnevale had a very solid base, as the more than 30 000 people who joined in the February festivities demonstrated.

History shows us that Italians are great builders. The organisers of Carnevale South Australia have ensured that that international reputation will continue not just because of the grand monuments crisscrossing the landscape of Italy. The Carnevale has grown way beyond a purely Italian festival. It is a truly South Australian festival of our Italian culture and heritage. The promotional literature of the Carnevale says it is, 'a perfect excuse to indulge'. Well, the menu of authentic foods, wines and the Monteverdi Singers, the Carnevale atmosphere and the heat of South Australia's summer made Carnevale 1997 a spectacular and special event.

The major sponsors of Carnevale deserve special tribute, and in particular: Sensational Adelaide, Renniks Hire, Agostino Mitsubishi, Adelaide City Council, Alitalia, Greenhill Galleries, Fairmont Homes, 5AD FM, Blackwell Funerals, Coopers Brewery, the award winning Maglieri wines, Commonwealth Bank, Coca-Cola and the hard working and dedicated members of the Italian Consulate. The then President of the Coordinating Italian Committee, Dr Antonio Cocchiario, his staff and hundreds of volunteers provided South Australia with a dynamic, spectacular and impressively well organised event in an ideal Australian location. Rymill Park was a unique venue for this year's Carnevale, and the shelter of the majestic gum trees provided much needed shade as Adelaide sweltered through one of its longest and hottest heat waves of the year. I say to them, 'Well done; we thank you and hope that you and your enthusiastic new President, Antonio Tropeano, allow us to share many more festivals in the future.'

Mr De LAINE (Price): I have pleasure in supporting this motion and the comments made by various speakers, except some of the political comments made by the member for Coles. I also congratulate the Coordinating Italian Committee, especially the past President, Dr Tony Cocchiario, who is an excellent person and whom I know well. I have much pleasure in congratulating and thanking him on behalf of this

Parliament for the job that he and his coordinating committee have done in organising the successful Carnevale festival. I also pay tribute to the contribution of the delegations from Lazio Region, Campania Region and Salerno Province. I take this opportunity to thank once again, congratulate and pay tribute to the whole Italian community of South Australia for the contribution it has made and continues to make to the arts, culture and traditions of our State, and its contribution to ongoing multiculturalism here in South Australia. I strongly support the motion.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I thank the member for Hartley for his comments in relation to this motion. He is of Italian heritage, so his contribution obviously comes from the heart. I know of his strong links with the Italian community. I also thank the member for Coles, who plays a very active role indeed in the multicultural community here in South Australia. Both she and the member for Hart are members of the back bench Committee on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs of the State Government. I also thank the member for Price for his contribution to this debate.

In closing the debate I should record that since I originally moved this motion some time ago Dr Tony Cocchiario has retired as President of the Coordinating Italian Committee. I particularly thank him for the contribution he has made to the Coordinating Italian Committee, to the Italian community in South Australia and to the general community. As has been pointed out by the member for Coles, his position has been taken by Mr Tony Tropeano, whom I know well as an Adelaide legal practitioner from my time in the law.

I should mention again not only the importance of the Coordinating Italian Committee in terms of Carnevale but also the important role it plays in relation to the Italian community, particularly the elderly in the Italian community. We all know that many in the Italian community came to South Australia in the 1950s. It is an ageing committee and therefore the role of the Coordinating Italian Committee will become more and more important as these people grow in age. I am happy to say that this Government has supported a welfare worker for the Coordinating Italian Committee. As I view their need as growing as time goes on, I hope the support from this Government will continue and increase, because the need will certainly exist. I am looking forward to the next Carnevale, because when it went to Rymill Park last time it was a turning point in the history of the festival.

I believe that it will become an international Carnevale. It is clear also from the delegations from the Lazio, Campania and Salerno regions that it is an international festival. I have no doubt at all that the Government will continue and increase its support of the Carnevale. South Australia therefore can look forward to further exciting times with the Carnevale. I certainly look forward to it and congratulate all those involved. I believe it is appropriate that the House vote on this motion today.

Motion carried.

GREENER SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Cummins:

That this House congratulates the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and the Premier on the successful release of a 'Greener South Australia policy'.

(Continued from 7 November. Page 487.)

Mr BASS (Florey): It gives me great pleasure to support the member for Norwood's motion on World Environment Day. On my recent trip to the United Kingdom I was amazed at the attention and detail some private companies give to the environment. I must admit that, during my time as a police officer, the environment was not something I ever considered.

An honourable member: Why?

Mr BASS: I do not know; I was too busy locking people up, I suppose. I just did not consider the environment and, in retrospect, that was wrong. Over the years I have witnessed South Australia's very poor record with respect to the environment. While I was in England I spent a day with Thames Water and I saw the work it has been doing on the environment: for the first time in 20 years salmon inhabit the Thames River. I spent time with North West Water and saw the amount of work it does with respect to the East Pennines. North West Water builds stone walls to ensure that the Pennines are not over-farmed with sheep and that the environment is maintained.

Recently I flew over Eyre Peninsula to spend some time with the Speaker and, as I flew over the area, I noticed that, in many areas, lines of trees have been planted recently, or have been left when the area was cleared, to prevent the erosion of soil during bad climates when the wind blows the earth away and, very often, that earth ends up in Adelaide. I have family who live in the South-East and, when one visits that area, one sees areas that are now absolutely crippled with salt damp. The salt has come to the top of the earth and nothing grows but saltbush. It is good pastoral land but the environment has been neglected.

I grew up near the Murray River and, I admit, I never saw a European carp when I fished there as a boy. I returned four months ago and I did catch some eating fish but I caught a lot of European carp. We have neglected our environment. As the member for Norwood said in moving the motion, we are now addressing and doing something about these problems after many years so that we do not lose what we have in South Australia. For the first time in 1995 we saw a reverse in the decline of natural vegetation. For the year 1994-95, following the release of A Greener South Australia, we passed a major milestone in that 10.6 million trees were planted, approximately four million more trees than were lost in the State. We are now reversing the trend of neglecting our environment.

This Government has gone out of its way to address areas such as the Murray-Darling which, of course, affect the Murray River and the 2001 Project. We are addressing the problems with the Patawalonga and the Torrens River. It is a long time ago, but I can remember that in the summer when I first arrived from England we would swim in the Torrens River near Channel 7. Although the banks of the river and so on have been much improved, you would still think twice about swimming in there. The Torrens River is being addressed as is the Patawalonga and other areas.

We must not forget that we are here for only a short time. South Australia must be left in a condition that our children and grandchildren can enjoy. This Government has woken up to the fact that if we do not do something we will not have a place that our children and grandchildren can enjoy as we did. Unfortunately, while we were enjoying, it we neglected it. I support the motion. It is most appropriate that this issue be debated and voted on today, World Environment Today.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I support the motion, as my colleague the

member for Florey just indicated, on this very important day, World Environment Day. Every day I am in this Chamber I look at the green colour of the House of Assembly, and it reminds me strongly of the Liberal Government's commitment to the environment. Without being at all melodramatic, it is fair to say that this Liberal Government would be the greenest South Australian Liberal Government for a very long time. I commend a colleague whom I have had the pleasure to spend a lot of time with over the last 3½ years, the member for Norwood, the Hon. John Cummins. I do so because he is very committed to environmental matters. Recently, I travelled through his electorate, and I can now understand why he is so committed to enhancement of the environment. In the District of Norwood, much is being done to improve the amenity of the locality.

Someone who often gets brickbats rather than accolades is the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, the Hon. David Wotton. Again, I know Minister Wotton well, having been his parliamentary secretary, chair of his litter strategy committee and chair of a notional values working party and because my electorate of Mawson abuts his electorate. We have a lot of common interests, because a number of heavy metals—phosphorous, nitrogen and potash in particular—are the major elements which filter down from the Minister's electorate of Heysen into the electorate of Mawson, cause damage to the wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas and ultimately end up in Gulf St Vincent.

Certainly, the Minister was not backwards in coming forward when he realised that these issues needed to be addressed. Irrespective of the colour of the Government of the day, I do not know why it was not done 40 or 50 years ago, because it is primarily about commonsense. Minister Wotton realised that we need a holistic approach to catchment management in South Australia. Upon gaining office, the Minister and his parliamentary colleagues—and I am proud to say that I was one of those—got on with the job of achieving for South Australia holistic water resources legislation. The great news for all citizens of South Australia today is that this revolutionary legislation is being gazetted.

It is important on World Environment Day that we acknowledge this, because as the member for Hartley—who is another committed member of the Minister's portfolio committee on environment—says, we have to sustain South Australia for future generations. Surely one of the most important tasks of having the privilege to be a steward, representing constituents in the Parliament of South Australia, is to ensure a sustainable future for our young people.

If we look at the 200 years or thereabouts that white settlers have been in Australia, we see that we have not had a good track record when it comes to protecting and enhancing our environment. As a farmer until I came into this place, I have been outdoors for 70 or 80 per cent of my life and have never had any problem with sunburn until recent years. When I go home and spend a few hours on the farm, which is rare, I end up with cracked lips, I burn quickly and so on. There is no doubt that the sun has a more powerful impact today. Scientific and anecdotal evidence exists on the ozone layer. We have to address those issues.

As someone who has used a lot of gases in refrigeration, I realise the importance of making sure that we do not damage the ozone layer and, if we have a leak in our refrigeration units today, we call the technician and have it fixed properly. We use user-friendly gases. That is another initiative brought forward lately. There is still a lot further to go.

Salt degradation is harming our countryside, simply because we have cleared too many trees. Initiatives such as Greening Australia and Trees for Life, along with such committed groups as Friends of the Onkaparinga in my electorate and, in the Willunga Basin, the Noarlunga Hills Landcare Management Group, mean that we now see direct drilling programs. I see schools in my electorate propagating trees so that we can develop our green corridors. We see 80 000 trees being planted along the Southern Expressway—a first.

I am appalled when I drive down the existing Main South Road and note the measly amount of money spent and the puny trees planted along that road, parts of which have been there all my life and some of which has been there for the past 20 years. Nobody thought about green corridors, enhancing the environment and realising that you can develop an expressway as well as looking after the environment and creating a green corridor not only to address carbon-monoxide exhaust emissions but also to allow our native animals to be able to travel.

I could say a lot more and I am disappointed that I am out of time, but I am rapt in and committed to the environment. I stand high on the fact that the Olsen Liberal Government is absolutely committed to addressing the degradation and problems of the past. I look forward with my colleagues and citizens of South Australia to further enhancing the improvement in our environment.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I thank the members for Florey and Mawson for their contributions to this debate. It is World Environment Day, so it is important that this matter be voted on today. There is no doubt that this Government, in terms of the environment, has made major headway. I pointed out previously, as did the member for Florey, that we are now planting more trees than we are taking out. Since 1995 we have reversed the decline in native vegetation—the first time that that has occurred in the history of this State. This Government is environmentally conscious and will continue in that regard.

Mr Brokenshire: Hear, hear!

Mr CUMMINS: The member for Mawson says, 'Hear, hear!' He is a member of the environmental backbench committee, as am I. It is appropriate today that this matter be voted on and I ask that members support it.

Motion carried.

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

LICENSED CLUBS

Petitions signed by 216 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow licensed clubs to sell liquor to a club member for consumption off the premises were presented by Messrs Blevins and Meier, Mrs Rosenberg and Mr Scalzi.

Petitions received.

NORTH-EAST ROAD PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

A petition signed by 427 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install a pedestrian crossing on North-East Road at Hillcrest was presented by Mrs Geraghty.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—
SA Water Corporation, Water and Sewerage Pricing—
Report—April 1997

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Workers Compensation Tribunal Practice Directions

By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—
Public and Environmental Health Council—Report,
1995-96

South Australian Council of Reproductive Technology—
Report, 31 March 1997

Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee—
Report, 1995-96

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. E.S. Ashenden)—

Local Government Act—Controlling Authority—
Notice of Approval—

Livestock Saleyards Association of South Australia
Murray Mallee Community Transport Scheme
Rules—Centennial Park Cemetery Authority

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further
Education (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Vocational Education, Employment and Training Board—
Report, 1996.

WATER PRICES

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair points out to all members on both sides of the House that it does not want a repetition of the behaviour that occurred yesterday. I suggest to all members that they comply with the Standing Orders. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: On 14 April 1997 the State Government received the final report from the Commissioner in relation to the prices oversight of SA Water. The Government sought this report in line with the Council of Australian Governments' Competition Principles Agreement and pursuant to the States GBE Competition Act 1996. The Commissioner can only make pricing recommendations. These are to be considered by the Government and pricing decisions remain with the Government. The Commissioner considers the report 'a framework that could guide future price reviews rather than identification of a price path that would meet...COAG and national competition policy requirements by a certain date' (page 8).

This report should be viewed as one of the many factors this Government will take into account as part of its normal annual review process of water and sewerage service pricing. It provides an independent process to allow issues to be canvassed to assist the development in the wider community of a better understanding of the options for pricing change and the associated benefits and cost of that change. This aspect of the Commissioner's work would be strengthened in any future review. A central theme of the report is the development of pricing systems that reflect the true cost of services, taking account of the external costs of water and sewerage provision. It is the Government's responsibility to

take these economic comments into consideration when considering the broader social and equity outcomes.

There are five areas of the report that require comment: first, water prices. The Commissioner recommended a single volumetric or kilolitre price for all water use, reflecting the additional cost of delivering a kilolitre of water with a supply availability or access charge. This unit cost is calculated having regard to the rate of return on capital invested. The report refers to the potential for the unit or volumetric charge for water to be as low as 40¢ per kilolitre but suggests that it may be significantly higher. The Government understands that some may question why volumetric water charges are above the estimated additional unit cost of service delivery as outlined by the Commissioner's report. To move to a uniform water charge based on this cost would simply mean that access charges would need to rise sharply, and this would have a negative effect on the community, particularly on pensioners. The Government rejects this position.

The Government would implement further change to the structure of water prices only if it were satisfied that both the economic and social impacts of change are reasonable. It has no plan to change the existing price setting process. In relation to common statewide pricing for water and sewerage the Commissioner's view was that, in principle, all sections of the community should be charged efficient commercial prices, which translates to customers paying the full cost of service delivery.

If deemed appropriate to charge certain sections of the community non-commercial prices, explicit subsidies should be paid as community service obligation payments. The Government policy is to have statewide uniform pricing. Let me assure all country people that, after significant input from their local members, Government will not remove the common statewide pricing approach. A community service obligation payment has already been agreed by Government as outlined by the Commissioner and will continue. Government believes the social impacts of abolishing the common statewide approach to pricing would be too damaging to country customers. It rejects this recommendation but supports the community service obligation approach.

In relation to sewerage pricing, the Commissioner recommended consideration of charging based on sewerage catchments (assuming costs would actually vary materially by catchment). The Commissioner's position is based on the imminent capital expenditures required to comply with environmental objectives for sewerage plant discharges, particularly for metropolitan plants. Government does not support this recommendation as it believes property based charges for sewerage should remain.

In relation to property based value charging, the Commissioner recommended removal of property based charges for both water and sewerage. Government will continue to reduce commercial property based charges for water. Property based charges for commercial water customers would need to be replaced in the longer term with an appropriate access charge. There is no proposal to amend the basis of residential sewerage charging as Government believes that the impact on low valued residential property owners would be too severe.

Trade waste charges were also recommended by the Commissioner or, as an alternative, a transparent community service obligation should be identified. Government will review the case for introduction of a trade waste charging system. South Australian Water Corporation was originally declared for prices oversight as it is a GBE having monopoly

or near monopoly market power. As this situation has not changed, it is anticipated that there will be some ongoing process of prices oversight.

It must be stressed that this document is only a guideline from the Commissioner—it represents a rational economic framework to which the Government will add its judgments on social or equity concerns. It is the job of Government to set these purely economic findings having regard to households and businesses in our State.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE ACT

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In 1988 the South Australian Parliament enacted the Aboriginal Heritage Act to protect and preserve the Aboriginal culture and heritage of this State. In significant respects, the Act has failed to meet the needs of the Aboriginal community, Government, enterprises and the wider community. Since its election in 1993, the Government has sponsored a series of consultations to gather views on how the Aboriginal Heritage Act and its relationship with the Federal Act could be improved, including the Premier's Aboriginal Heritage Consultation in both 1994 and 1995. This consultation involved Aboriginal leaders, including representatives of the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. The person who drove that whole process of consultation was the then Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, and I acknowledge the very significant role he played.

The Government had also set up a working party involving a wide range of relevant State Government agencies and a national working party of Federal, State and Territory Aboriginal Affairs administrators. The results of those consultations are reflected in the draft Aboriginal Heritage Bill 1997 and, as this is one of the most significant Bills this Parliament will consider, the Government is committed to the widest possible consultation process.

In view of the diversity of Aboriginal community organisations, Aboriginal people and others with a vested interest in, or a commercial or legislative need to comply with, the provisions of the Aboriginal heritage legislation, a consultation process has already been commenced and is planned to provide pro-active, structured briefings to as wide a cross-section of interests as possible. To achieve this aim, the Chairman of the Aboriginal Heritage Committee, assisted by the Chief Executive of the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs, will undertake a series of regional community briefings in Adelaide, the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands, Andamooka, Berri, Bordertown, Broken Hill, Ceduna, Coober Pedy, Davenport, Finke, Hawker, Kingston in the South-East, Maitland, Marree, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Oodnadatta, Point Pearce, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Whyalla.

Consultations will provide the opportunity for all Aboriginal heritage organisations, the South Australian Farmers Federation, the Chamber of Mines, the Local Government Association and environmental groups to comment on all aspects as proposed in the draft Bill. It is important to stress that the draft Bill does not represent the State Government's concluded position. It is a further stage in the development of this legislation. Consultation will continue until 30 September, and submissions should be addressed to the

Chief Executive of the Department of State Aboriginal affairs.

The draft Bill aims to provide more effective protection for Aboriginal heritage, provide Aboriginal communities with administrative processes which will help in the clarification of their territory and membership, develop reliable processes for dealing with Aboriginal heritage issues in relation to property, provide some compatibility between Federal and State processes, and strengthen South Australia's adherence to the national principles for heritage protection endorsed by the Ministerial Council on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs. Significantly, I believe that this legislation has the potential to maintain South Australia's leadership position in relation to Aboriginal heritage legislation and commend the consultation process to this House and to the broader South Australian community.

QUESTION TIME

AUTOMOTIVE TARIFFS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Deputy Premier and the Premier join me in publicly calling upon South Australian Federal Liberal MPs to oppose further car tariff cuts and, in particular, will Senators Grant Chapman, Robert Hill, Alan Ferguson, Jeannie Ferris, Nick Minchin and Amanda Vanstone be publicly urged by the State Government to join Labor in voting to block further tariff cuts in the Senate, putting the State before Party?

Today's national media carries reports that the impending decision on car tariffs by the Howard Government will result in further cuts to perhaps 10 per cent by 2005 following a reported win by Federal Treasurer Costello over Industry Minister Moore—again, according to the national press. This morning I spoke with Kim Beazley and Simon Crean and gained their commitment that the Federal Labor Opposition would move to block cuts to car tariffs below 15 per cent when the legislation enters the Senate. All Labor Senators from all States will vote against the cuts in defence of jobs here in South Australia.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Premier has decided to go to Canberra today on behalf of all South Australians to make sure that, before the decision is finally made in Canberra, a position will finally be put to all representatives, whether they be representatives of South Australia or senior members of Liberal Governments from other States. Clearly, in this State the Government, with the help of lobbying from Victoria, has been able to shift the Federal Government so that we no longer have this discussion on the 2.5 per cent. That has been put out, and that has been virtually changed to a position such that we can now look forward to some change in this tariff debate.

It was decided last night that it was important in the last few hours that the message be continually put before our Federal colleagues to make sure that the message got through. Consequently, we have the visit of the Premier today. Clearly he is in Canberra, representing the best interests of all South Australians. We will make sure that, if there is any further advice from manufacturers or anyone else from this State, it is fed into him so that he can negotiate and get the message clearly across on behalf of us all today.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House of progress being made to overcome the current odour problems at the Bolivar sewage treatment plant? I understand this morning the Minister met with Mr Ken Hartley, the person commissioned by the Government to perform the audit of the Bolivar water treatment operation. Given the allegations made by the Leader on radio this morning, I seek an upgrade on the current situation.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—for Coles for her question. This morning when I was driving from one appointment to another I was fascinated to hear the Leader of the Opposition on the radio blaming the contract and the management of United Water for the current pong we have in this city.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson for the first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I find it amazing that politics are continually being played on an issue on which the Government has come forward and said it was due to a mechanical problem at Bolivar. The Government has come forward and said that the problem is the infection of the lagoons. When the Leader of the Opposition goes there in the next few days and has a look for himself, he will find that the lagoons are the major problem. As I said, it is unfortunate that it has been politicised to this point, because it has nothing to do with the management of United Water.

The same number of employees are involved in the operational work at Bolivar as there were under SA Water. Larger quantities of chemicals are being used than were used under the Labor Government when it changed the whole process. That is the base level in terms of the management of the scheme. I went there this morning and had a discussion with United Water to see what the problems were, and what it was doing about them.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: United Water has never denied that it was its problem—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition now joins the member for Mawson.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: From the start United Water has accepted that there was a mechanical breakdown, and it had a problem with the lagoons. The problem with the Leader of the Opposition is that he has a lot of difficulty in managing the truth in some of these issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. I have a list detailing the names of a number of members who want to ask questions. However, two of them are close to having their name struck off and not getting the call for the rest of the day.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There is some 300 hectares of lagoon out there, and probably two-thirds is infected and gone off. That is the fundamental problem. I notice that the member for Taylor nods her head. She ought to drive across the road, look and get some explanations instead of complaining and stirring up the whole process all the time. She lives a lot closer to it than I do and a lot of other South Australians. If she looked at it and asked what was being done to try to

sort out the problem, she would find out some of the answers. Massive dosing of the lagoons will be carried out with hydrogen peroxide, which is the quickest and simplest oxygenator available. Some specific micro-organisms will be introduced into the lagoons to try to get rid of the anaerobic smells. Massive work is being done out there to try—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No; if you understood the chemistry of the pool, you would know that it is the anaerobic area that is causing the problem. If you had any knowledge at all of chemistry, you would know that it is not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is now the first person to be taken off the list. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: He would know full well that it is the hydrogen sulphide and nitrogen oxide that are causing the problem and that it is created in the anaerobic area, not in the aerobic area. A major program is under way to make sure that we sort out the lagoon problem. Everybody laughs, and I know the member for Taylor laughs about this. The problem out there happens to have been created 30 years ago. It is a problem, because the systems that are being used are biological. We are not opposing the systems, but they are biological and take time to turn around. In my discussions with Professor Hartley this morning I asked how quickly we will know that this whole system will change, and we expect to know that within the next two or three weeks. In the meantime, massive dosing of the lagoons is taking place and we hope that the whole system will be mended sooner rather than later.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question again to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister for Infrastructure on this World Environment Day. Given the Minister's statement last night that the smell from Bolivar is no worse than that from Bombay or Jakarta, will he support my request to the French—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has the call.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir; I am just looking for protection. Given the Minister's statement last night that the smell from Bolivar is no worse than that from Bombay or Jakarta, will he support my request to the French water company, Compagnie Generale des Eaux, to investigate the performance of its subsidiary, United Water, to ensure the delivery of world's best practice in Adelaide? A fact sheet issued by the Government states that United Water is the vehicle through which the parent company, Thames Water, and CGE would direct the delivery of world class expertise to become 'the first Australian based global water industry market leader'. I have today written to CGE expressing my concern that the company's goal may be compromised by United Water's management at Bolivar.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is definitely commenting; leave is withdrawn.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the Treasurer is out of order.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I hope that, at his programmed visit to Bolivar tomorrow, the Leader of the Opposition will take up with United Water all these questions in relation to which he is play acting in the public arena. He will find—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I was actually responding to you, if you go back to look at the transcript.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One question at the time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I hope that on his stunt visit out there tomorrow he will sit down with the United Water people and get the truth of the whole matter, ask them about the contract—of which they have a copy—and have it checked out to see that, in all the areas of waste water management, they have met the maintenance and control levels that they were asked to meet. In every level of water management, they have surpassed all the quality standards set by the contract.

We all know that this is a political stunt run particularly by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We know that every day the Leader of the Opposition sits down and dreams up the day's political stunt.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The contract is not in any way connected to this smell. The Leader knows that but he is not prepared to stand up and go with the Government and admit that this problem is due to a mechanical breakdown and an error in the general bypassing system.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will cease to chatter.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Everyone has accepted that explanation and the problem is in the process of being rectified. I have accepted that explanation and United Water has accepted that it is a major problem that needs to be sorted out. This is a political stunt run by the Leader of the Opposition, and he knows it is no more than that. It is about time the Leader grew up and faced the facts of the contract.

STAMP DUTIES

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Why is the State Taxation Office conducting a stamp duty amnesty, and what types of dutiable documents are affected by it? I am anxious to understand what the benefits and effects of this policy will be in the community with respect to reducing cost burdens on the one hand and forgoing debt retirement or provision of higher levels of essential Government services in the community on the other hand?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The matter of taxation compliance has been discussed in this Chamber on a number of occasions, and I have previously congratulated the Commissioner of Taxation and his staff for their efforts to ensure that proper and due taxes are paid. Between 2 June and 1 August, penalties, not duty, will be waived on certain stamp dutiable documents. An amnesty has been declared for this period because we are well aware that a number of people who do not have regular contact with the State Taxation Office quite often forget their obligations. Whilst there are those people who do have regular contact and who do pay their taxes according to the rules laid down by the State, a number of people are not meeting their obligations. One problem is that, when these transactions come to light, a heavy penalty is imposed on the—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am sure that the *Border Watch* will give me a message. But in terms of tax compliance—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:—the issue is about getting the best results and ensuring that people pay what they should be paying. Numerous advice has been sent to brokers, accountants, lawyers and anyone who might have some conveyancing responsibility. The particular areas affected will include transfers of businesses, changes in partnership, transfers of private shares and units in a trust, mortgages, deeds and leases, and changes to beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries of a trust.

Those are areas in which, as I said, a large number of participants do not operate within the mainstream taxation collection system. Quite often those people forget that, if they transfer between themselves and do not notify the tax office and do not pay the appropriate duty, they will be subject to penalty. For those people who bring forward their documents, we will waive not the original duty but the penalty on those documents. I believe that this will, first, operate as an educational exercise to ensure that every person is aware of their obligations. And, secondly, we believe that the revenue results will be beneficial to the State rather than waiting until a document comes to light in one or two years, or whatever, and then applying penalties. I again congratulate the Commissioner of Taxation for this amnesty.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Has United Water breached the requirements of the Government's \$1.5 billion water contract that requires United Water to avoid disruption to the public, including odour control, and, if so, what penalties will be applied to United Water or what payments withheld? The leaked water contract in the Opposition's possession says—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. He will explain his question and not comment.

Mr FOLEY: The leaked water contract states:

United Water shall operate treatment processes and odour control facilities at the plants in an efficient manner so that odour complaints from neighbours and the general community will be minimised.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There has been no breach of the contract.

Mr Clarke: Where have you had your nose?

The SPEAKER: Order!

KOALAS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, on the celebration of World Environment Day, provide more details of the public appeal to support its koala rescue campaign on Kangaroo Island and explain how these public donations will be used?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I acknowledge the assistance and support that has been provided by the member for Flinders in this program and, through the honourable member, I also acknowledge the patience that has been shown by landowners on Kangaroo Island during a very difficult period. I welcome the opportunity to bring the House briefly up to date with the success of this program. I have been concerned with the misinformation that has circulated over the last few days regarding the cost of this program to South Australian taxpayers. It would appear that there are people

who still believe that it was inappropriate for the Government to have introduced a sterilisation program and who would rather have seen the Government responsible for the shooting of koalas on Kangaroo Island. The community in this State and, indeed, throughout the world has made it very clear that the shooting of koalas is not an option that could be considered by the Government.

I am very pleased that the current program has been supported by both sides of the House and, of course, by all State Environment Ministers and the Federal Minister. Members would be aware that the Government allocated \$635 000 over two years for a very comprehensive plan to address the koala population problem on Kangaroo Island. This plan, which has many parts, includes sterilisation of male and female adult koalas. Only yesterday we reached the point, after a few months of activity in this area, where 700 koalas have so far been sterilised, at a cost of \$200 000. That indicates that the program is working well. The plan also includes planting thousands of new trees on the island and in the South-East of the State and a comprehensive community education campaign.

I referred to the interest that this program is generating around the world. I was fascinated to see in a recent edition of the *New York Times* a large article picked up from the *Parndana Guardian* which referred in some detail to this program. Today, I had the privilege of officially launching the Public Appeal for Koala Rescue, and I was delighted to announce the corporate sponsorship which has been very significant in this program. I recognise those sponsors: the Adelaide Bank, Shell service stations, Pizza Hut, the *Advertiser*, Channel 9, Kodak and the Metropolitan Fire Service, which hosted today's official launch. Donations for the appeal can be left at any Adelaide Bank or by credit card through the mail or through the koala rescue web site.

It costs \$136 to catch, sterilise and release each koala. So, we hope that there will be strong support in the community. I believe that there will be because, as I said earlier, the community made very clear that it did not support the shooting of koalas on Kangaroo Island but very much supported the program that is now working so successfully, introduced by this Government after years and years of inaction by previous Governments. I am sure that this program will be totally effective.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Given the breakdown of the biological process at the Bolivar sewage treatment works, what action has the Minister taken to ensure that effluent discharge to Gulf St Vincent has not breached the discharge licence issued by the Environment Protection Authority? The leaked water contract states that United Water must:

... dispose of all residuals. . . in a manner which is approved by SA Water and the Environmental Protection Authority.

The Opposition has been contacted today by a well placed source that has claimed that untreated sewage is now being discharged into Gulf St Vincent via the sludge lagoons at the Bolivar treatment works.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have been keeping a very close watch on this situation, as has the EPA, and the EPA has been keeping me informed about the issue. I have not been made aware, from any of the monitoring that has been carried out, that untreated sewage is entering the gulf, and I

would be very surprised if that were the case. If it were, the EPA would have informed me well before this. The member for Hart would be aware that, as a result of the EPA's involvement and its responsibility in this matter, it was determined that an independent audit should be carried out. We have already had a question that has referred to the responsibilities of that person. He has now started that audit, and I am satisfied that we have been able to deal with the issue as quickly as we have as far as the Environment Protection Authority is concerned.

I do not believe for a moment that untreated sewage is entering the gulf, but I will ask the EPA this afternoon for an update on the situation, and I will be pleased to make the honourable member aware of the response.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide an update to the House on the outcomes of the State Government's key employment programs?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I am extremely pleased to be able to provide an update on the situation involving a great number of South Australians, young and old, who have been given valuable employment and training opportunities through the direct actions of this State Government. Since January 1994 more than 20 000 South Australians have taken part in specific employment programs funded by the Liberal Government. In addition, more than 10 000 young people have benefited from Government-funded career promotional activities, and over 3 000 have taken part in seminar and business development activities through the Kickstart program. A total of 4 486 people have been involved in Kickstart employment projects, with more than half of those gaining long-term jobs as a result.

The community organisation Don't Overlook Mature Expertise (DOME) has also been funded to provide training to over 1 000 people and has placed more than 500 in jobs. The State Government has provided traineeships for more than 3 500 young people since January 1994 and has also assisted in the training of almost 4 000 apprentices in the past 3½ years. From January 1994 to the present, the three initiatives of Greening Urban SA, the Group Training Employers Rebate and the Employment Broker Scheme, funded under the Jobs Package, provided jobs and training opportunities for some 1 419 people, with 80 per cent of those participants gaining employment as a direct result of their involvement.

The State Government's \$30 million Youth Employment Statement and the New Employment Partnership will ensure that the job opportunities continue. Job Shop has commenced with 295 participants; 24 projects are being developed for Community at Work funding; and Group Training contracts have increased by 134 in the past year, bringing the number up until May to an impressive 1 784. Almost 400 young people have been employed under the WorkCover exemption initiative. Five Regional Job Exchanges have been approved for a total of 150 participants in their first year. Some 500 young people will gain employment in the public sector under the \$3 million Youth Recruitment Program, and 200 will be given valuable work experience and training under the Local Government Employment Program.

In total, more than 35 000 South Australians have been assisted by the employment initiatives provided by the Liberal Government. As we can see, this Government has

been extremely busy and highly effective in providing employment opportunities for South Australians, and will continue vigorously to support programs that have jobs as the ultimate result. I would like to refer to another initiative of the Liberal Government, as this was raised in another place yesterday.

The Hon. Terry Cameron called upon the Government to immediately set up a hotline that will enable small business to access all the information necessary to help them employ young South Australians. The Hon. Terry Cameron claimed that no hotline number currently exists that serves this purpose. This claim was made after a considerable amount of inanity and misinterpretation of the Liberal Government's recent budget. It serves no purpose for the Hon. Terry Cameron to insist that something that was an initiative of this Government has not taken place. I would like to inform the House of the details of that initiative.

On 21 December 1996 the State Government established the Youth Employer Information Line—and for anyone interested in the telephone number it is 1800 350 00. This line continues to be available to the business community, its purpose being to inform employers of State Government initiatives available if they choose to employ young people. These incentives are outlined in the Youth Employment Statement, which was released by the Premier on 16 December. To date, the Youth Employment Information Line has received 1 736 calls. The line also operates as a referral service for business—

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir, under Standing Order 98 the Minister should answer the substantive portion of the question. There is nothing in the question about hotline, employer hotlines, and the like, and she has now been going for five minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has been making particularly good progress during this Question Time with the number of questions that have been asked. I hope that we are not going to drift into bad habits. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I also note that the line also operates a referral service for business. In particular, referrals are made to Commonwealth Government agencies in relation to the wage subsidies available through that area when employing young people. Additionally, the Commonwealth Government also operates a hotline, which specialises in handling employer inquiries in relation to employment matters, including incentives available to businesses when employing young people. This is another matter of the Labor Party Opposition talking about it and this Government actually doing it.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Given that United Water has managed the breakdown of the process at the Bolivar sewerage works, will United Water pay for Professor Hartley's consultancy, or will the taxpayer meet the cost? Yesterday the Minister told the House that the Government had brought in Professor Hartley and then said:

So that no questions can be asked involving United Water, SA Water or me as Minister as to how this problem will be fixed in the short term.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Government members really have to have a bit of a giggle at the sort of nonsense coming from the other side. I will obtain a list of the breakdowns that occurred under the previous Labor Government

and send them to the honourable member so that she can see that it is a serious problem that can occur under any Government. A mechanical breakdown is not something that can be helped. If the member for Taylor took the time and effort to walk across the road from her office, get in her car and go out and see how the system works she might understand. I find it amazing that a person who has a Ph.D cannot understand the simple biological functions that occur. The honourable member, who has done so much work, ought to understand—and I think she does understand—that the biological process takes some time.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will get to that, if you give me time. I need a bit of practice, such as the Hon. Mr Blevins used to get. One of the things that the member for Taylor ought to do—as I did this morning and a fortnight ago—is to sit down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should answer the question and ignore the chitter chatter.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the member for Taylor sat down with them—and they have offered to do this for any member of Parliament—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The member for Hart does not even bother to take the time. All the member for Hart ever does is criticise the contract. The honourable member has never bothered to find out whether or not United Water is moving forward. Members opposite need to visit Bolivar and find out how the biological process and the mechanical system works to obtain some understanding of how the whole plant works. So it is seen to be independent, we are not asking United Water or SA Water to undertake this investigation. It will be paid for by SA Water. The contract is through the EPA. We will be paying the EPA directly the cost of subcontracting Professor Hartley. Whatever it costs, the EPA will manage it independently of SA Water and SA Water will pay.

DISABILITY SERVICES

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of those initiatives in the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell has the call, and I ask that she be shown the courtesy of being able to ask her question without continued interruption.

Ms GREIG: —1997-98 budget which will benefit people with a psychiatric disability and their carers? A number of my constituents have asked me about the Liberal Government's commitment to the provision of appropriate community mental health supports.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I acknowledge the member for Reynell's fierce support for people with mental illness in her electorate, which was obvious when the honourable member and I attended a community meeting with a number of her constituents recently. Everyone is aware of the great demand within the community to deliver services to people with a mental illness. That is because one in five South Australians are affected by a mental illness. Obviously that means that it indirectly touches the lives of many more than that. We set about a process of reforming how mental health services were to be provided in this State, having been let down by the previous Administration. There was a recognised need to break away from the old institutionalised

care model and to deliver more services and supports within the community.

People may ask why this is so. Frankly, it is because people with mental illnesses deserve exactly the same opportunities as those without mental illnesses. They deserve the same opportunities to live within the community with appropriate supports. Earlier this week I had the pleasure of opening the new Schizophrenia Fellowship Southern Activity Centre with the member for Kaurna, who again is another great advocate for the people in the south. That was a terrific exercise. It is called Pannanga, and it builds on other community services such as Clubhouse, which we opened in May 1996 in Adelaide's west.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I detail yet another development in this type of policy with the establishment of three unique support services for people with mental illness. These services will operate in the following areas: one in Adelaide's southern area, one in Adelaide's northern areas and one in the Murray Mallee region within the electorate of the member for Ridley, Mr Peter Lewis. The amount of \$100 000 has been committed for each one of those neighbourhood network services; in other words, a total of \$300 000. They will provide community supports and advice for people with mental illness. The services will provide people with greater community support and certainly important access to mainstream services such as health, education and transport.

The service to be established in the member for Reynell's electorate at Hackham West will be run by Centacare Catholic Family Services. It will cover the local government areas of Willunga, Happy Valley and Noarlunga. The northern service will be operated by the excellent Port Adelaide Central Mission, delivering services to areas such as Tea Tree Gully, Salisbury, Gawler, Munno Para and Elizabeth. As I said, the third service, which will be in the Murray-Mallee region, will be run by the Edwards Crossing Community House. People around Australia acknowledge that our efforts to put care into the community have led the nation, thanks to the realignment process. Again, I reiterate that the realignment process is based on providing appropriate opportunities for people with a mental illness to live in the community and to give them every opportunity to do so.

It is very pleasing to attend a number of functions such as the one to which I have alluded in the member for Reynell's electorate and the one in the member for Kaurna's electorate recently at the opening of Pannanga and to hear the consumers of mental health services indicating that at last—and I emphasise 'at last'—things are being done by a Government; in other words, the Liberal Government's recognising the vacuum created by the previous Labor Government and now providing appropriate community services so that people with a mental illness can live an unstigmatised and dignified life as they deserve.

NATIONAL PARKS

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Given that today is World Environment Day, will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources explain the claim in the Premier's budget pamphlet that an extra \$2.5 million has been allocated to conserve parks and wildlife when the budget's allocation for conservation has been cut by \$2.1 million? The 1997-98 recurrent budget for resource conservation, which includes the management of national parks and reserves, has been cut by \$2.1 million compared with expenditure this year, and the

parks' agenda capital program of \$4.5 million is less than the \$5.1 million under-spent on environmental infrastructure in this year's budget.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am very pleased to be able to inform the House about the extra \$2.5 million. It is part of an initiative that I will be announcing next Monday as part of the parks' agenda. It is part of a funding program that will bring \$30 million into parks over a six year period—a damn site more than was ever put into parks by previous Labor Governments! The opportunity will be provided for the Opposition to question in detail—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Opposition will have the opportunity to ask questions during the Estimates Committees, because that is the appropriate time for that to happen. The details of the \$2.5 million initiative will be announced next Monday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the second time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I hope that the honourable member who asked the question will take some interest in that initiative because, as I said earlier, it is a lot more than was provided by the previous Labor Government. There will be an opportunity for questions to be asked at the appropriate time—

Mr Clarke: Two minutes to say, 'I don't know.'

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already spoken to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I suggest that he go out and have a cup of tea or coffee, or a cold drink, otherwise he may not survive the next 18 minutes.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that he is not assisted to transgress by the Treasurer.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have nothing more to say. I totally reject the allegation that has been made by the honourable member who asked the question that there is a reduction in funding. As I said, during Estimates the honourable member will have the appropriate opportunity to learn more about it. When the details are provided next Monday, I hope that she and other Opposition members will take note of what is one of the most important initiatives that has ever been introduced in national parks in this State.

BREAKOUT CREEK

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): What assurances will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources give in relation to increasing the flood risks and health problems faced by the constituents of Colton as a result of concept plans to build a wetlands at Breakout Creek? I have received a copy of a leaflet that has been sent to constituents in my area claiming that the Torrens Catchment Water Management Board's proposed Breakout Creek wetlands development would increase pest numbers such as mosquitoes and snakes and that the planting of reeds and the placement of rocks in the wetlands would amount to building a brick wall across the river and cause flooding.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to be able to respond to the question asked by the member for Colton. At the outset, let me say that I am delighted with the work that is being carried out by the catchment boards, particularly the Torrens Catchment Board, and the work that is being carried out upstream. I am aware of the leaflet referred to by my

colleague, and I have to say that it is composed almost entirely of scaremongering and misinformation. This question provides me with an opportunity to correct some of that misinformation.

I emphasise the fact that it is a draft concept plan that is being considered at present. It is an opportunity for the Torrens Catchment Water Management Board to consult on that draft plan, focusing particular attention on special interest groups. The board will then have the opportunity to spend time consulting further with the wider community to ensure that all aspects of the proposal are properly considered and all options investigated. That consultation will take many months, and I have received a lot of representations, from both those in support of removing the horses and those who are violently opposed to removing the horses. It is obviously a sensitive issue in the honourable member's electorate, and it is appropriate that there be consultation to work through this issue.

I know that the member for Colton has received a lot of representation and has spent a considerable amount of time bringing to my attention some of the concerns that have been expressed by constituents in his electorate. As the honourable member indicated, the leaflet refers to the proposal to establish a wetlands and likens it to building a brick wall across the river. That is patently untrue. The planting proposed would involve low level reeds and native grasses with scattered shrubs and clean stemmed trees. Two low level footbridges are proposed, which will be staggered and located to ensure that flooding is not exacerbated. This model has already been used successfully in other parts of the Torrens. I know that there has been some recent flooding in the area as a result of pump malfunctions in the local drainage system, which was installed and maintained by the local authority.

It can be concluded that the Breakout Creek wetlands proposal would not have an adverse impact on flooding and would be substantiated by engineering calculations. The leaflet also claims that the proposed wetlands could cause health risks. The South Australian Health Commission, the South Australian Committee on Health Aspects of Water Quality and the Salisbury council all advise that well designed and constructed wetlands such as those proposed in the Breakout Creek concept plan are not breeding sites for mosquitoes and nor are they a health hazard.

Naturally, the board would not proceed with the proposal if it thought that it would pose a significant public health risk, and I would not allow it to proceed under those conditions. I emphasise that the proposal needs to be a partnership project with councils and the local community but, as I have already mentioned, the draft concept plan has to undergo many months of consultation and negotiation and a range of issues are still to be worked through before there is any decision on the future of the Breakout Creek portion of the Torrens Linear Park. I hope that the member for Colton will make his constituents aware of that situation and the amount of consultation that is yet to take place before any decisions are made regarding this proposal.

REIDS ROAD-SILKES ROAD FORD

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Has the Minister for Local Government examined the Local Government Act to ensure that his statement is correct with regard to the dispute over the Reids Road-Silk Road ford closure, namely:

All the Act requires me to do is provide a conciliator. That does not mean for one moment the situation will change.

Under section 271 of the Local Government Act, the Minister for Local Government has the power to settle disputes between councils. In 1980, an amendment gave the Minister authority to delegate the exercise of this power to a person appointed by the Minister. Section 271(3) provides:

The decision of the Minister or person appointed by the Minister with regard to any such difference will be final and may be made a rule of the Supreme Court and enforced accordingly.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Of course I am well aware of the Local Government Act and this section of the legislation, but I really do not know what the nub of the question is. If the honourable member is asking why I appointed former judge Mrs Ira Stevens to handle the petition, the answer is very simple. As the honourable member would well know, I was previously a councillor in the city of Tea Tree Gully and, when this matter came forward on a number of occasions, I was a councillor and was involved in the debate. Because I was councillor for the ward in which Reids Road is located, I indicated what my preferred position was. It could well have been argued that, because of statements I made some years ago and because of a position I took some years ago, there was a conflict of interest if I were the one who handled the petition and made the decision.

As the honourable member rightly pointed out, when the decision is made, it is a solid decision and can be challenged only in the Supreme Court. Therefore, had I handled the petition and come back with a decision, I would have been making a decision on a matter in which, it could well have been argued, I had a conflict of interest. Therefore, I appointed a person who, first, was completely neutral and who can be seen to have no interest whatsoever in this area and, secondly, who was eminently trained in all the legal areas and is, therefore, in a position to be able to handle what is an emotional issue and one which that requires careful legal consideration.

In relation to my comment to which the honourable member referred about that being the end of the issue—and I cannot remember the exact words—I do not resile from the fact that I used those words. However, they did not come out in the article in the way that I intended. I said that the advice I have been given is that the City of Tea Tree Gully has acted completely legally, that it closed the road in property which is within its council boundaries. I made the point that it would appear that any decision in relation to the petition that the Campbelltown council had put to me was one that would probably not be altered. Having made that comment, as surely the honourable member would agree, I am not in a position to be able to make a ruling on such an important issue as this which requires the type of answer I have given. That is why I have appointed Mrs Stevens to handle that matter.

WINE OF AUSTRALIA WEB SITE

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Information and Contract Services advise the House of the potential benefits to the South Australian wine industry which will result from the Wine of Australia web site, which the Minister opened this morning? Today I was privileged to attend the launch of this initiative for the South Australian wine industry in which the electorate of Mawson through the McLaren Vale wine industry had a prominent featuring role.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We had the launch of the Wine of Australia web site this morning and it was a unique occasion. Here is the opportunity for us to bring together the great expertise we have both in wine making, being a world

leader in wine production, and also in the growing skills we have in information technology and multimedia. One of the plans put down as part of our IT2 000 vision was to always bring together the skills we developed in information technology to enhance other industry sectors in this State. Here is a classic example of how effectively it could be done today. On the Wine of Australia web site, there is information on 770 wineries in Australia—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—I'll come to that in a moment—and 44 different wine regions in Australia. Here it is, and it is based in Adelaide. We have used Adelaide multimedia skills for the entire work that has gone into it. The web site itself gives information on the following. I will provide the address, because I know members in this House would like to be able to taste some of the virtual wine they can now get on the wine web site.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Don't worry; we toasted it with a real wine product this morning—from McLaren Vale; I cannot think of a more appropriate region in which to be tasting wine.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We had some key wine figures such as Darry Osborn and others there this morning to talk about their product. There is information about the wineries themselves. As I indicated, 770 wineries are on the web site. There is information about the wine regions—and 44 wine regions are listed—about producers and growers, and about retailers and suppliers. There is specific provision on the web site for selecting, ordering and paying for wine. The member for Elizabeth will be able to select her wine, order it and pay for it on the web site. There is also information about wine varieties, grape growing, export regulations, wine tourism, industry bodies and wine appreciation.

The key feature is the region which is most prominently covered at this stage due to the efforts put in by the wine growers themselves, that is, the McLaren Vale region. Of course, this week McLaren Vale has its sea and wine weekend on Sunday and Monday: people can sample some of the wines at McLaren Vale as well as taste of the superb seafood that this State produces. The first batch of oysters coming out of Kangaroo Island from Raptis and Sons will be specially available, as well as a collection of other seafood particularly from the Fleurieu region of South Australia.

The web site is www.wineaustralia.com.au. Having seen at least part of the site this morning, I can say it will probably become the world's premium wine site. Nowhere else at present on the Internet can you get the sort of depth of information, the variety and the spread that you can get on this site for wine of Australia. We are already exporting \$600 million worth of wine out of Australia. South Australia is once again reinforced as the wine State of Australia. We stamped that position yet again today. It is part of our vision for IT2 000 in this State, and it shows that we are getting on and implementing our ESB.

HOUSING, PRIVATE RENTAL

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Will the Minister for Housing and Urban Development comment on the status of vacancies in the private rental market and in particular on that of the lower rental end of the market? I have had complaints that waiting lists for public housing are long. Also, it is difficult

to get into private rental at all, much less at an affordable price.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will answer the question briefly, because no specifics were given. I will provide one or two facts. We still have the cheapest rental market in Australia. I cannot understand why the honourable member should be concerned about the cost of rental, because we are the cheapest of the mainland States. So, in comparison to what the rest of Australia is bearing, obviously we are competitive.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In terms of the private sector, my last briefing indicated that about 2 to 3 per cent was the vacancy rate. I have explained to this House previously that, when we have people in extreme need, those people, on occasions, have rejected housing which we would have normally felt was suitable. So there are some mixes and matches in the marketplace. In terms of capacity to provide the houses, my understanding from all other States is that South Australia is the best provider of any State by a long margin; for example, if you look at waiting lists and who is on those waiting lists—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes, but the long waiters are those who want a turn at public housing. In other States, nobody gets a turn at public housing unless they are a priority case. That is the point I am making. There have been people who would normally get Housing Trust accommodation but who would never be classed as eligible in any other State. If the honourable member has specific concerns and would like to give me details that I can check out to the best of my ability, I am certainly happy to respond in detail. However, given the generality of the question, I have covered the important points. South Australia has the cheapest rental of anywhere in Australia, and our population is far better catered for than that of any other State in Australia.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Today I raise an issue which relates to my electorate and which affects many members of this House. I am talking about those of us who have a substantial train service within our electorate. In the electorate of Hart, which takes in the better part of Port Adelaide and, indeed, the Lefevre Peninsula, we have an excellent train service running through to Outer Harbor. However, we have an increasing problem with the number of people using this service and, indeed, the number of people being able to avail themselves of this service after hours.

The local *Portside Messenger* and the *Weekly Times Messenger* newspapers within my area and neighbouring areas have been running a campaign over the past three or four weeks highlighting this trend away from the use of the train service in our area and mounting a campaign to improve it. I am happy to identify with and fully endorse and encourage this campaign. I applaud the Messenger Press for

undertaking it, because only through sustained campaigns such as this can we possibly effect any change to public policy as far as the Liberal Government is concerned, particularly given that many of these train lines run through Labor electorates.

The really critical issues are the safety of the service, particularly after dark, the very poor condition of most of our platforms and train stations, and inadequate lighting and security. There is no presence of any TransAdelaide officers at any of our platforms, and particularly after dark these are very uninviting and indeed at times quite dangerous places for general members of the public accessing public transport. That is particularly so for the young and elderly who, as we know, can be very vulnerable to those of our community who wish to prey on the vulnerable in dark, dingy places, as from time to time train stations can tend to be.

The level of security on our trains is not sufficient. Although my colleague the member for Spence would no doubt be the highest user of public transport in this place, I make good use of the train service in my electorate. When as shadow Minister I come into the city to attend many functions, quite often I catch the train. I certainly do not catch the train home. I pay for a taxi out of my own pocket because, whilst I will catch the Outer Harbor train at 6.30 or 7 p.m. and at times feel uneasy on that train without any security, I certainly would not run the risk of catching that train home at midnight. Unfortunately, in the late hours of the evening or the wee hours of the morning that service can at times be a concern to those who are travelling on it.

I want to see the Government—indeed, Parties from both sides of the House—address the issue of safety and the condition and quality of the train service that we provide in this city, particularly the corridor down to Outer Harbor. It is an excellent corridor, an excellent service and an excellent piece of public infrastructure, but it is not being maintained sufficiently or being used nearly as much as it should be. We are all aware of the quite significant environmental and social benefits of getting as many people off the roads and onto public transport as we can.

I can only urge and implore the Government to treat this campaign by the *Portside Messenger* with the respect it deserves, to join with me to make some real attempts to improve the security, lighting and level of comfort—a whole range of measures to improve the quality of this service. Only then will we get the numbers back onto the train service, make it an inviting means of public transport and get the full usage and utilisation of this important piece of public infrastructure. So, on behalf of my electorate of Hart I urge—indeed, demand—that the Government take immediate action to address the poor quality of our train stations, the lack of security and the overall poor state of the Outer Harbor train service.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I rise on World Environment Day, which seems to me a most important day for us and future generations. I congratulate Planet Ark: the proceeds from the sale of the green ribbons that some of us are wearing will go to the development of Planet Ark's environmental education computer disk, which will go to schools. I also congratulate the sponsors of the green ribbon campaign, the National Carton Recycling Campaign. I acknowledge the contribution of Coles and Video Easy stores. In the past three years I am pleased to note that the world as a whole is embracing renewable and sustainable resources, rather than being obsessed with production and

consumption at any cost. The West and industrialised countries are guilty of being obsessed by the dollar to the cost of the environment, and Third World countries with problems of hunger and poverty are involved in environmental degradation. Both must work together to see that action on the issue of the world environment ensures sustainable development worldwide.

In 1989 the General Assembly called for global meetings to devise integrated strategies to halt the impact of human behaviour on the physical environment and to promote environmentally sustainable economic development. I am glad to say that as a result of that call the Earth Summit was held in Rio de Janeiro from 3 to 14 June 1992. I do not know whether members have read the agenda, but Earth Summit Agenda 21 promises exciting things for the environment provided that the world community takes the step to adopt them—which, unfortunately, it has not done. If that agenda is adopted, it will ensure that the deterioration of the ecosystem on which earth life depends is stopped.

The agenda also affirmed the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, adopted at Stockholm on 16 June 1972, which involved 27 principles. The implementation of these principles, together with the implementation of other strategies such as the greenhouse reduction strategy, will ensure that in the future we have an environment with which the world can live.

I am sorry to say that the former Federal Labor Government did not implement, and now the Federal Liberal Government is not implementing, objectives essential for the environment. In particular, I am talking about the national greenhouse reduction strategy. Australia has the highest level of emissions per head of any country in the world. It has still not implemented the strategy. One must ask why. According to the national greenhouse gas inventory, these figures are increasing; in other words, we are getting worse, not getting better. Fuel use must decrease. Binding targets must be set by Governments, and these targets should be set for the short and long term. It is past the time when Australia does nothing about this. In the past, the Federal Labor Government would put the argument that China was a major polluter and until China did something the Federal Labor Government would do nothing. That was its approach. Unfortunately, the Federal Liberal Government has not done much about it, either.

One must also look at what we can do in terms of energy efficiency. The Factor 4 report of the Club of Rome clearly indicates that efficiency in the use of energy can dramatically reduce emissions. It is fairly simple to do that. For example, by the time the energy gets to the light in your house, you have basically lost 97 per cent of the energy. With efficient energy use you can turn that around. We need energy efficient conservation policies, a fuel switching and cleaner energy policy and promotion of renewable energy. In relation to renewable energy, I am happy to say that this Government is looking at a solar unit at Wilpena Pound which, if it succeeds, will be the largest solar unit in the southern hemisphere. We are also spending \$500 000 now on feasibility studies in relation to wind energy. So, I am glad to say, this State Government is doing something about renewable energy sources. I recently saw delegations from Japan and Italy in relation to wind energy, and they are interested in investing in this State if we go down that track. I hope that the Government will see fit to install a solar unit at Wilpena Pound.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): The alienation of youth from societal structures is a worrying development, and I know that members in this House will agree with me when I say that this is one of the most crucial issues world wide which is in need of a solution. As I have said previously in this House, Adelaide has the highest youth unemployment rate in the country, running at 42.1 per cent. According to ABS figures, that percentage represents a total of 10 600 people in the 15 to 19 years age group in Adelaide. Of course, intensive capital investment programs by the private sector and Government, as well as prevocational and vocational training and education programs, need to be considered.

However, much more needs to be done, and the crisis of homelessness, alcohol and drug addiction, sexual abuse, discrimination, violence and increasing youth crime rates must be looked at from a wider socioeconomic perspective if successful support structures are to be developed. Originally, the Hindley Street Youth Service was supported by volunteers. When funding for this program was made available it was a very positive step in the right direction. We need more funding for programs such as the Hindley Street Youth Service. The service has applied for a continuation of funding with a request for \$170 000 for this financial year; \$242 000 is the overall budget required if the Hindley Street Youth Service is to sustain its current level of youth programs. The Adelaide City Council has been approached to fund the remainder of the Hindley Street Youth Service's budget. Until yesterday the centre had—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, I know, but if members visited the Hindley Street Youth Service they would see that it is a very worthwhile project. I understand that the centre had approached the Minister for Youth Affairs regarding this funding and, as of yesterday, had not heard whether it would receive funding for the next financial year. Naturally this is causing some distress to the staff and volunteers, not to mention the youth who rely on this centre for support. I give my support for the funding application of this service. The organisation has provided an essential and valuable service, which I think deserves recognition and encouragement from parliamentary members.

Dedicated Hindley Street Youth Service workers have provided back-up services at all hours of the day and night, sometimes experiencing and exposing themselves and their families to great hardships and inconvenience. Some workers sleep on doorsteps to give support to homeless youth who are in crisis or experiencing possibly life-threatening situations. Visiting the drop-in centre, I saw where some young people were sleeping and they were in a life-threatening situation. Workers provide counselling to youth affected by depression and related physical and mental problems; operate the drop-in centre; take young people on camping trips; find employment for them and provide computer, dance and other program lessons too numerous to mention.

We should not turn our back upon resources such as this but support their continuation and strengthen them where we can. The current budget for the Hindley Street Youth Service does not allow for the leasing of a 12-seater outreach van, which would be a major improvement in their street program. The advantages of working from a mobile service are numerous: it enables youth workers to attend to any crisis in a very short time, and they can reach young people in their social environment and provide on-the-spot support and counselling. A mobile outreach service provides a safe space

for a young person in crisis, and more people will be able to receive support.

Services provided from the van can be expanded, providing for an additional health service backup resource, which is very essential for these young people. I am sure that the Hindley Street Youth Service workers would be greatly encouraged if the Government could find a van, perhaps from within its own fleet of vehicles. This is a great opportunity for the Government to show that it does care about the welfare of our youth and that it is prepared to strengthen current youth initiative support programs.

I urge the Minister to grant funding to this service. I have spent time at the drop-in centre, wandered around the squats and assisted quite a few homeless youth. If we give them a chance and spend a little time and money on them, they will be fine and responsible adults. As members of Parliament we need to give them that support, because without it they have no hope of a future. I urge the Minister: please, grant the funding.

Mr BASS (Florey): Yesterday, in answer to a question from the member for Gordon, the Treasurer referred to an incident that occurred at Mount Gambier when he was Police Minister. The Treasurer named a police officer, Detective Sergeant Modra, and mentioned Alan Scott and the *Border Watch*. Alan Scott and the *Border Watch* can defend themselves but, unfortunately, Detective Sergeant Modra cannot defend himself due to his position. I intend to put on the record a few comments relevant to the Treasurer's answer yesterday. In Question Time yesterday the Treasurer stated:

Group 4 was under severe harassment, and I can only assume that it was from Sergeant Modra.

If the Treasurer could only assume that the harassment came from Sergeant Modra, then I believe he was wrong in naming him: either it was or was not Sergeant Modra. If the Treasurer does not have evidence then he should not name names. Let us look at what happened at Mount Gambier. From my information, Detective Sergeant Modra was told that drugs in the Mount Gambier Prison was a matter for Group 4 and the Department of Correctional Services. It is my view that, as the Detective Sergeant in charge of the Mount Gambier CIB, an area covering the majority of the South-East, whether or not drugs are in the local prison would be a matter of great importance to the local police.

It is the police who, at any time in the future, may be confronting these criminals in dangerous situations and they must know whether people in prisons are using drugs. If prisoners are using drugs then it is appropriate for the police to know about it. A comment was made yesterday about evidence given at the coronial inquiry over the death of a prisoner in the Mount Gambier gaol. Detective Sergeant Modra was under oath to give truthful evidence and was asked questions by Miss Rosie Atkins, counsel assisting the Coroner. Irrespective of why the questions were asked, counsel assisting must have believed that it was appropriate to ask Detective Sergeant Modra those questions, and as a police officer he had an obligation to answer those questions.

The comments made by Detective Sergeant Modra were, as he believed, the truth. We would expect nothing less of our police officers. He never raised the matter as the Treasurer alleged: he was replying to questions under oath. The member for Gordon, who asked the question of the Treasurer, did so without knowing the forthcoming reply and has spent this

morning supporting the Mount Gambier police to the media, as he always has and as they deserve.

Detective Sergeant Modra is a career police officer. He served in the CIB for nearly 20 years, including the Whyalla and Elizabeth CIBs; he served with the National Crime Authority, and he is now Officer-in-Charge of the Mount Gambier CIB. He has an impeccable record in the Police Force. He has gained promotion to the rank of Detective Sergeant in charge of his own CIB region, and he is a fine example of a South Australian police officer. He deserves the support of all South Australians as do all South Australian police officers.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Thank you for the call, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is a pleasure to see someone with your procedural fairness in the Chair. Yesterday, before I was rudely interrupted, I was talking about free-range eggs, and the refusal of the Attorney-General to formulate a legal definition of 'free-range eggs' so that consumers are not defrauded when buying battery hen produced eggs under the name 'free-range eggs'.

I was also talking about the Attorney-General's statement to another place that there were no cases in which self-induced intoxication with drink or drugs had been pleaded in courts as an excuse for crime, or very few, when, in fact, in answer to a parliamentary question in this House, the same Attorney-General said that such cases come up often and, indeed, in response to a subsequent question, 'Are there any records of self-induced intoxication with drink or drugs as a plea?', said there were none.

So, if there were no records, how could the Attorney say there were few or no cases? Before I was rudely interrupted I was moving to a third point, which was the Attorney-General's claim that under the Director of Public Prosecutions Act he was unable to direct the DPP on the conduct of any particular case. In fact, I established quite conclusively that under the Director of Public Prosecutions Act the DPP was subject to the Attorney-General's direction, both on matters of policy generally and on individual cases. The Hon. Chris Sumner, when he was Attorney-General, was quite careful in his handling of that Bill to ensure that he retained discretion as Attorney-General to instruct the DPP on individual matters.

Although the then shadow Attorney-General, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, opposed that particular clause in the Bill, he was unsuccessful, and the Bill in the form in which the then Attorney-General, the Hon. Chris Sumner, wanted it became law. The Attorney-General has a faulty recollection, and we have established that by our dialogue. I asked the Attorney-General, given that he was unhappy with the DPP Act in that it allowed him as Attorney-General to direct the DPP on individual cases when he did not want in any way to compromise the independence of the DPP and to give the DPP any instruction on individual cases, whether he will move to amend the DPP Act to take that authority away from himself as Attorney-General. The answer came back that he had no intentions to change the Act. What a very odd Attorney-General we have—certainly, native in his portfolio, an utter captive of his department.

Mr Clarke: Unlike his representative in this House.

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, unlike the courageous Attorney-General's spokesman in this House who speaks his mind and who calls it as he sees it. Because the Government has been padding up in Question Time and allowing the Opposition to ask very few questions, unlike the situation when the

Treasurer was Deputy Premier and there was a guarantee of 10 parliamentary questions per Question Time, I have been unable to ask a few questions this week. One question I would have liked to ask today of the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is whether the Government has changed its policy of retaining heritage listed Tram Barn A at Hackney, because on 20 April 1994, in answer to a parliamentary question, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources told the House:

It has reached a stage where a decision needs to be made, and I have made that decision. I have determined that Tram Barn A will remain. Tram Barn A, as all members should know, is on the State, national and local heritage registers.

On 6 February 1995 the then Premier wrote to a West Croydon man:

I have yet to be presented with any evidence which would make me believe that my Government's decision to protect the Tram Barn was incorrect. Consequently, I can assure you that there is no plan to reverse this decision. Indeed, as you note, I am presently exploring possible uses for what I regard as a valuable asset.

Mr Deputy Speaker, we shall see the veracity of those two individuals.

Mr WADE (Elder): In the closing years of the Labor Government, disability services actually lost money in real terms. In 1988 the IDSC had 10 to 15 clients on its urgent list. Five years later, when the Liberal Party gained office, we were faced with an urgent client list of 141 people. This reflects the extent of the Labor Government's commitment to the welfare of IDSC clientele and its total disregard for the urgent needs of South Australians who suffer from intellectual disability and those who care for them. In the majority of situations it is the parents and families of the intellectually disabled who choose to care for their child rather than place them in an institution. By doing so they place love, devotion and dedication before personal comforts. In many ways, these loving parents and family members no longer possess the freedoms of choice and movement that the rest of us take for granted.

Many of these parents are able to rest from their caring duties only when their child sleeps. I know of IDSC clients who sleep a maximum of only two or three hours a night. It is these people, the carers, who were ignored by the Labor Government. I find it incomprehensible that some people still say to me that Labor is for the ordinary person, when those most abused by Labor were in fact ordinary people who have spent 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year, year after year caring for their disabled children. Those people were ignored by the one Party which purported to support them. These caring parents know that their situation will deteriorate as their children grow older—and they will grow older. They know that their situation will deteriorate as they themselves grow older. It will not get better for them, except in the amount and type of assistance that can be offered to them by the Government and by welfare agencies.

The Liberal Government came to power faced with a huge debt and no money in the account. Regardless of these dire circumstances, we recognised the dire circumstances facing 141 people on the IDSC urgent list. Although most areas of Government expenditure faced cutbacks, the Liberal Government quarantined disability services from any budget cuts. This quarantine is still in effect. Improved efficiencies in operating disability services have freed up \$6.4 million, all of which was reinvested back into desperately needed new services. Last financial year the Government provided an

additional \$5.4 million for disability services. In December 1996 the Liberal Government appointed South Australia's first Minister for Disability Services, which reflected the high priority this Government has given to people with a disability and to their carers.

The 1997-98 budget continues our commitment to disability services. The number of people on the IDSC urgent list will fall as the \$5.4 million in the 1996-97 budget flows through to services on the ground and as a greater proportion of the 1997-98 budget allocation is allocated to accommodation and in-home support. In this budget we have provided a \$1 million additional allocation of equipment for people with a disability and for the frail aged. We have provided an additional \$2 million for extra teachers and school support staff to support disabled students who have integrated into mainstream classes. We have provided an additional \$5 million for disability support services; in fact, we have injected \$16.8 million into the disability sector. We are doing what Labor would not do. We are giving opportunities for carers and people with disabilities to manage their own futures. These opportunities were denied to them under Labor. We know it is not enough: it will not satisfy all their outstanding needs, but it is a significant contribution towards easing many years of neglect by consecutive Labor administrations.

RACING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Racing) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill proposes amendments to the *Racing Act 1976* relating to a number of disparate matters.

The Bill proposes:

- to permit a non-registered racing club, with the approval of RIDA, to have totalizator and bookmaker betting at their meetings;
- to permit TAB to accept bets in the form of a cash voucher that has been issued by the TAB;
- to permit TAB to accept bets in the form of a smart card that has been issued by the TAB;
- to permit TAB to remit one payment to RIDA, who in turn will deposit that money into the SATRA, SAHRA, and SAGRA Funds established under Section 23 of the Racing Act;
- to permit TAB to make profit distributions on a quarterly basis, based on 12 accounting periods per financial year;
- to permit both the TAB and bookmakers to bet on events, as approved by the Minister, without the necessity to prescribe those events by regulation;
- the profit from fixed odds betting with the TAB and an amount of 1.75 per cent from bets with licensed bookmakers, on events other than racing be paid to the Recreation and Sport Fund;
- to permit TAB to enter into an agreement, with an interstate or international authority, to provide a fixed odds or pari-mutual betting system on sporting events including football matches but not including racing events;
- to permit RIDA to authorise a licensed bookmaker to field at any place without the necessity to prescribe that place by regulation;
- to permit a licensed bookmaker to field at any place without the requirement that an event must be in progress.

The amendments are now discussed in more detail.

The Racing Act permits only registered racing clubs to conduct on-course totalizator betting which in turn allows the Racing Industry Development Authority to grant a permit to a bookmaker to accept bets at the approved meeting. It is a function of the three controlling authorities to register racing clubs.

The South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority, prior to 1996, pursuant to the local rules of racing exempted a number of racing clubs from compliance with the Australian Rules of racing. These clubs, commonly known as picnic clubs, are all in the far north of the State and conduct no more than 10 meetings per year at which betting was permitted to be conducted. The local rule allowed SATRA to register these clubs and thus comply with the requirements of the Racing Act for the purpose of betting at these meetings.

In 1996 SATRA rescinded the local rule of racing, which enabled the Authority to exempt clubs from compliance with the Australian Rules of Racing. This meant that SATRA would only register those clubs that complied with the Australian Rules of Racing. The major difficulty with registration is the expense of providing reasonable and acceptable facilities, such as veterinary stalls, photo finish equipment, proper running rails, etc. The picnic clubs are not able to afford these costs.

The Government has had numerous complaints from persons associated with picnic clubs at Oodnadatta, Marree, Coober Pedy and Innamincka. Those complaints revolve around the fact that they are no longer permitted to provide betting facilities at their meetings because they are unregistered.

The Government strongly supports the provision of betting facilities at these meetings in remote areas of the State as they are essentially for community fund raising. Being able to bet at these meetings is an attraction for people in remote areas of the State who attend these events. In such circumstances, the Racing Industry Development Authority would permit betting on horses, other than registered horses, as well as betting on corresponding metropolitan and interstate race meetings.

At present the TAB must not accept totalizator bets unless those bets are paid for by cash or against an established account that is sufficiently in credit to meet the amount of the bet.

This restriction does not allow TAB to take advantage of promotional activities such as accepting cash vouchers, issued by the TAB, for bets placed with them.

Cash betting vouchers have been an acceptable form of betting with licensed bookmakers in this State over an extended period and have enhanced the use of services for customers.

The Government is of the view this facility should be extended to the TAB.

It is proposed that the TAB will be able to accept bets by deducting money from a smart card which has been previously acquired by the customer.

Smart cards can be produced in a number of forms however the type of card facility that would be utilised by TAB customers would be either a stored value card or a reloadable card.

In relation to the stored value card, this particular card would have been acquired by the customer for a pre-determined dollar amount. Once the card reaches a zero balance, the customer would be required to purchase a new card.

In relation to the reloadable card, the customer will have the option of adding additional funds onto the card. These additional funds would only be added from the customer's existing debit type accounts or cash. The customer would not have the ability to add funds to the card through any form of credit facility.

The current legislation requires the TAB to remit three separate payments each quarter to RIDA to be deposited in the SATRA, SAHRA, and SAGRA Funds established under the Racing Act. It is proposed that by allowing TAB to remit a single payment to RIDA it would increase efficiency and reinforce the pivotal function of RIDA in administering the funds of the industry.

TAB profit distribution, to the Government and the racing industry, is made as soon as possible after the end of the relevant quarter. The Act defines 'quarter' and 'quarterly accounting day'. The definitions refer to the four weekly accounting periods last expiring in the months of March, June, September and December in any year. This equates to 13 accounting periods.

It is proposed to bring TAB's accounting practices in line with commercial practice, and to facilitate more accurate yearly comparisons. The new practice will provide for 12 accounting periods per financial year.

The proposed change to the accounting periods will not have a significant effect on the dates on which TAB makes its quarterly distributions to Government and RIDA.

Current legislation allows TAB to conduct betting on football, Australian Formula One Grand Prix and any America's Cup yachting race held in Australia, any international cricket match held in Australia and on any other sporting event prescribed by regulation.

Bookmakers are permitted to provide a betting service on any approved event that is prescribed by regulation.

It is proposed to amend the Racing Act to remove the stipulation that events, including sporting events, on which betting by the TAB and bookmakers is proposed, be prescribed by regulation. It is both restrictive and time consuming prescribing events by regulation. It does not allow either the TAB or bookmakers to effectively respond to market demands. It is considered the legislation be amended to provide that betting on events by the TAB and bookmakers be approved by the Minister provided that the controlling authority of the event does not object.

Sports betting is considered to be a growth area and one which can be well promoted because of the high level of interest generated by particular events within the general community. Sports betting is also seen as a strong platform to introduce new and light users to TAB and its other products.

It is proposed that any profit from fixed odds bets with the TAB in relation to events other than racing be paid to the Recreation and Sport Fund. This will also be the case with unclaimed dividends. It is also proposed that 1.75 per cent of bets made with bookmakers on events other than racing be paid to the Recreation and Sport Fund.

The Bill also provides for the TAB to enter into agreements with relevant interstate or overseas authorities, whereby the TAB would act as the agent of that authority for the purpose of accepting bets on sporting events. This would involve both fixed odds and pari-mutual betting.

By providing the opportunity for fixed odds betting on sporting or other events (but not racing) the Government considers that the TAB will benefit from the initiative in the following areas:

- TAB customers will be provided a choice between pari-mutual or fixed odds betting.
- TAB will be in a position to directly compete in the market place with other organisations that already provide these services.
- Betting on sporting and other events lend themselves to fixed odds.

At present, similar services are provided interstate and overseas, and the Government is aware that South Australians are utilising these services. The consequence of this is that the Government and the community are missing out on the financial benefits that would arise through the profit distribution mechanisms, if the bets were placed with the TAB.

In the case of fixed odds betting, this will allow TAB to offer a service through an already established operation which has commercial benefits in the sense that the TAB will not have to develop its own fixed odds system. In the case of pari-mutual betting, such an agreement provides marketing opportunities to the TAB as betting pools are combined and therefore the size of the pool is increased.

In addition, it is proposed to delete the definition of approved sporting venue and the requirement that an approved sporting venue be prescribed by regulation. As is the situation with prescribing events by regulation, it is both restrictive and time consuming prescribing approved sporting venues by regulation.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 14—Functions and powers of RIDA
Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 14 of the principal Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 51—Functions and powers of TAB
Clause 4 expands the functions of TAB to include totalizator betting on all sporting events and other events instead of only on major sporting events as provided for at the moment in section 51(1)(d) of the principal Act.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 62—Acceptance and payment of bets
Clause 5 amends section 62 of the principal Act. The amendment will allow TAB to issue cash vouchers for the purposes of betting with TAB and to accept bets electronically.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 63—Conduct of on course totalizator betting by racing clubs
Clause 6 amends section 63 of the principal Act to allow RIDA to authorise an unregistered racing club to conduct on course totalizator betting.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 69—Application of amount deducted under s. 68

Clause 7 inserts a new subsection (4) into section 69 of the principal Act which will enable TAB to pay tax money for the three racing funds to RIDA which will then distribute the money to the funds in accordance with section 69. New subsection (5) changes the accounting periods under this section to periods that are more consistent with general commercial practice.

Clause 8: Repeal of s. 80

Clause 8 repeals section 80 of the principal Act. The substance of section 80 is included in new section 148A inserted by clause 22 of the Bill.

Clause 9: Substitution of heading

Clause 9 makes a consequential change to the heading to Division 4 of Part 3 of the principal Act.

Clause 10: Substitution of s. 84I

Clause 10 replaces section 84I of the principal Act with a provision that allows TAB to conduct totalizator betting on sporting events generally (except races and football matches) and on other events.

Clause 11: Insertion of s. 84IA

Clause 11 inserts new section 84IA into the principal Act. This section is a rule making provision similar to section 84A of the principal Act.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 84J—Application of amount bet

Clause 12 removes the requirement in section 84J(1)(a)(iii) that part of the totalizator pool set aside may be paid to the body conducting the event on which betting was conducted.

Clause 13: Insertion of s. 84K

Clause 13 inserts new section 84K into the principal Act. This section will enable the combining of totalizator pools on sporting events other than races (see the definition of 'sporting totalizator pool' in subsection (8)). It is similar to section 82A of the principal Act which provides for the combining of racing totalizator pools.

Clause 14: Repeal of Division 5 of Part 3

Clause 14 repeals Division 5 of Part 3 of the principal Act which consists of section 84L. The substance of this section is included in new section 148A.

Clause 15: Insertion of Part 3A

Clause 15 inserts a new Part 3A dealing with fixed odds betting with interstate or overseas authorities. Section 84L is similar to section 82A and 84K. It provides for an agreement between TAB and an interstate or overseas authority under which TAB accepts fixed odds bets on behalf of the other authority. Section 84M provides for the distribution of the profits of this kind of betting and section 84N provides for unclaimed dividends.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 85—Interpretation

Clause 16 changes the definition of 'approved event' so that an event will in the future be approved by the Minister instead of by regulation.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 112—Permit authorising bookmaker to accept bets

This clause amends section 112 of the principal Act. The amendment to subsection (1) gives RIDA the general power to grant a permit to a bookmaker to accept bets on races or approved events specified in the permit at a place specified in the permit. This replaces the system of permits being limited to approved events and approved sporting venues declared by regulation. New subsection (2a) provides that RIDA must consult the person who occupies or has control of the place at which it proposes to allow a bookmaker to accept bets. Whether it consults or not, the person who occupies or controls the place is entitled to refuse permission to a bookmaker to accept bets.

Clause 18: Amendment of s. 114—Payment to RIDA of percentage of money bet with bookmakers

Clause 18 makes consequential amendments to section 114 of the principal Act. The opportunity has been taken to remove provisions from subsections (1) and (3) of this section that have expired.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 118—Effect of licence

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 119—Prohibition of certain information as to racing or betting

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 120—RIDA may give or authorise information as to betting

These clauses make consequential changes.

Clause 22: Insertion of s. 148A

This clause inserts new section 148A which is in substitution for existing sections 80 and 84L.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Earlier today the member for Hart asked me a question about the quality of the water leaving the Bolivar sewerage works and entering the gulf. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that the normal primary and secondary treatment processes at the Bolivar sewage treatment works prior to entry into the final stabilisation lagoons are fully operational and, in fact, I am told that the quality of treated waste water leaving the plant has not changed. So, the allegations that were made by the member for Hart are not accurate, and I repeat: the quality of treated waste water leaving the plant at Bolivar has not changed.

CASINO BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

- No. 1. Page 1, lines 19 and 20 (clause 3)—Leave out definition of "authorised game" and insert the following—"authorised game" means a game of chance authorised by or in accordance with the conditions of the casino licence;".
- No. 2. Page 8 (clause 20)—After line 21 insert the following:
 "(4) An applicant may withdraw an application at any time.
 (5) In the case of the application for the licence that is to be the first licence granted after the commencement of this Act, the application lapses if Aser Nominees Pty Ltd notifies the Authority that it is no longer prepared to treat with the applicant for the transfer of a lease of the casino to the applicant."
- No. 3. Page 8 (clause 21)—After line 25 insert the following:
 "(1a) If the Authority is satisfied that two or more applicants would be suitable persons to operate the casino, the Authority may recommend to the Governor that a choice be made between those applicants (but a recommendation need not be delayed until the Authority has assessed all applications)."
- No. 4. Page 10—After line 6 insert new clause as follows:
 "Applicants to be notified of result of investigation
 23A. The Authority must notify the Governor and the applicant of the results of its investigation."
- No. 5. Page 11 (clause 28)—After line 34 insert the following:
 "(2a) If a person ceases to occupy a sensitive position or a position of responsibility, the licensee must within 14 days give the Authority written notice
 (a) identifying the person and the position; and
 (b) stating the date when the person ceased to occupy the position; and
 (c) stating why the person ceased to occupy the position. Maximum penalty: \$5 000."
- No. 6. Page 12 (clause 29)—After line 18 insert the following:
 "(5) The Commissioner of Police must make available to the Commissioner information about criminal convictions and other information to which the Commissioner of Police has access relevant to whether the application should be granted."
- No. 7. Page 12, lines 19 to 26 (clause 30)—Leave out the clause and insert new clauses as follow:
 "Decision on application
 30. (1) The Commissioner may grant or refuse an application for approval under this Division.
 (2) The Commissioner must give written notice to the licensee and the person for whom approval was sought of the Commissioner's decision on the application.
 Suspension of approval
 30A. (1) If the person to whom an approval relates is charged with an offence involving dishonesty or punishable by imprisonment, the Commissioner may, by written notice to the licensee and the approved person, suspend the approval.
 (2) While the approval is under suspension the person is not to be regarded as a person approved under this Division to work in a position of responsibility or a sensitive position (as the case requires).
 (3) The Commissioner may revoke a suspension at any time.
 Revocation of approval
 30B. (1) The Commissioner may, by written notice to the licensee and the approved person, revoke the approval.
 (2) Before the Commissioner revokes an approval, the Commissioner must, by written notices, invite the licensee and the approved person to make representations to the Commissioner within a specified time and must consider any representations made in response to the invitations."
- No. 8. Page 12, line 27 (Heading)—Leave out "Obligations of staff" and insert "Provisions of general application to staff".
- No. 9. Page 12 (clause 31)—After line 34 insert the following:
 "(3) The Commissioner may, by instrument in writing, exempt a person or class of persons from compliance with this section."
- No. 10. Page 13, line 2 (clause 32)—After "any game" insert "in the casino".
- No. 11. Page 13, lines 9 and 10 (clause 33)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause as follows:
 "(2) However, a staff member does not commit an offence by accepting a gift or gratuity if
 (a) it is a staff gratuity paid by the licensee or another employer on a basis approved by the Commissioner; or
 (b) it is of a kind, or given in circumstances, approved by the Commissioner."
- No. 12. Page 13—After line 10 insert new clause as follows:
 "Staff to be exempt from Security and Investigation Agents Act 1995
 33A. A person is, in relation to the performance of functions and duties as a staff member, exempt from the Security and Investigation Agents Act 1995."
- No. 13. Page 13, lines 12 to 29 (clauses 34 and 35)—Leave out these clauses and Division 5 heading and insert new clauses as follow:
 "Approval of management systems etc.
 34. (1) It is a condition of the casino licence that—
 (a) systems and procedures for conducting approved games; and
 (b) systems and procedures of surveillance and security; and
 (c) systems and procedures for internal management and control; and
 (d) systems and procedures for handling, dealing with and accounting for money and gambling chips; and
 (e) other systems and procedures that the Commissioner determines to be subject to this section, must be approved by the Commissioner.
 (2) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must ensure that the licensee's operations under the casino licence conform with the approved systems and procedures.
 Operations involving movement of money etc.
 34A. (1) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must comply with directions given by the Commissioner or an authorised officer about the movement or counting of money or gambling chips in the casino.
 (2) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must comply with instructions given by the Commissioner to facilitate the scrutiny by authorised officers of operations involving the movement or counting of money or gambling chips in the casino.
 Approval of installation etc. of equipment
 34B. (1) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must not permit the installation or use of—
 (a) equipment for gambling; or
 (b) equipment for surveillance or security; or

- (c) equipment of any other kind or for any other purpose notified by the Authority to the licensee, unless it has been approved by the Commissioner.
- (2) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must comply with any instructions of the Commissioner about the use of any such equipment.
- (3) It is a condition of the casino licence that the Commissioner may, personally or through the agency of an authorised officer, assume control of any such equipment at any time.
- (4) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must not permit the removal of any such equipment except with the approval of the Commissioner.
- Interference with approved system or equipment
35. (1) A person must not interfere with an approved system or equipment with the intention of gaining a benefit for himself, herself or another.
Maximum penalty: \$10 000.
- (2) A person who, in the casino, has possession of a device designed, adapted or intended to be used for the purpose of interfering with the proper operation of an approved system or equipment is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$10 000.
- (3) A person who, in the casino, uses a computer, calculator or other device that assists in projecting the outcome of an authorised game is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$10 000.
- (4) A person other than a staff member authorised by the licensee to do so must not remove cash or gambling chips from gaming equipment.
Maximum penalty: \$10 000."
- No. 14. Page 14, line 14 (clause 37)—Leave out the penalty provision and insert the following:
"Maximum penalty:
In the case of the licensee—\$10 000.
In the case of a staff member—\$2 000."
- No. 15. Page 14 (clause 37)—After line 17 insert new subclauses as follow:
"(5) An authorised person who suspects on reasonable grounds that a person who is in the casino or about to enter the casino may be a child may require the person to produce evidence of age to the authorised person's satisfaction.
(6) A person who—
(a) fails without reasonable excuse to comply with a requirement under subsection (5); or
(b) makes a false statement, or produces false evidence, in response to such a requirement, is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$2 000.
(7) An authorised person who suspects on reasonable grounds that a person who is in the casino is a child—
(a) may require the person to leave the casino; and
(b) if the person fails to comply with that requirement— exercise reasonable force to remove the person from the casino.
(8) In this section, an authorised person is—
(a) an agent or employee of the licensee; or
(b) a police officer."
- No. 16. Page 14, lines 28 to 30 (clause 38)—Leave out subclause (3) and insert new subclause as follows:
"(3) An order may be made under this section on any reasonable ground.
Examples—
An order might be made on any one or more of the following grounds—
· The excluded person is placing his or her own welfare, or the welfare of dependents, at risk through gambling.
· The excluded person has damaged or misused equipment in the casino used for gambling.
· The excluded person has committed, is committing or is about to commit an offence."
- No. 17. Page 16—After line 11 insert new clause as follows:
"Summary exclusion in case of intoxication etc.
39A. An agent or employee of the licensee or a police officer may exercise reasonable force to prevent a person entering the casino, or to remove a person from the casino, if the person—

- (a) is behaving in an abusive, offensive or disorderly manner; or
(b) appears to be intoxicated."
- No. 18. Page 19, line 9 (clause 47)—Leave out "The licensee must" and insert "I is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must".
- No. 19. Page 19, lines 19 to 22 (clause 48)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause as follows:
"(2) A staff member must, at the request of an authorised officer, facilitate an examination by the officer of—
(a) systems, procedures or equipment used for gambling, surveillance or security; or
(b) accounts or records relating to the operation of the casino.
Maximum penalty: \$25 000."

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

A number of amendments have been made to the Bill. When the Bill was debated in the lower House we had received advice from a number of agencies. We deliberately left this matter over the intervening period for further work to be done on it. We had based our Bill on the existing Act and, indeed, New South Wales' changes to its legislation. As a result of further correspondence and further briefs we believed that further improvements could be made. The amendments that have been moved, mainly by the Government, tidy up the Bill and make it a very strong and forceful Bill with which to control the operations of the Casino. The amendments are straightforward; they have been thoroughly debated in another place and they add to the quality of the Bill. I thank the Opposition for its assistance in moving this Bill forward.

As we are all aware, the Government intends to sell the ASER complex, and this is a very important component thereof. However, we must ensure, whatever happens with the sale of the Casino, that it is in appropriate hands and that there are appropriate controls. I believe that this Bill now gives us that level of comfort that everyone would be looking for.

Mr FOLEY: The Government approached the Opposition in recent weeks to indicate that officers of the Gaming Supervisory Authority and other officers from within Government had felt that a number of further amendments needed to be made to the Bill we had debated in the House, which was lying on the table in another place. There are quite a number of diverse amendments. Primarily, the first lot focus on the need to improve the process for assessing the parties bidding for the licence, in terms of ensuring that probity issues are addressed at the same time as advancing the need for proper consideration and, where possible, a quicker consideration to go hand in hand.

The Opposition believes that that is not an unreasonable request, to ensure that more than one potential purchaser can be evaluated without necessarily completing the full probity. Obviously, that will be done before any final recommendation is put to Cabinet. That seems quite a sensible adjustment to the process.

The Government also requested the consideration of a number of other issues relating to employment, to which we have agreed. One in particular, which I understand has been well covered in another place, relates to clause 30, under which provision an employee of the Casino who may be charged under an offence normally punishable by imprisonment will effectively be stood aside until a resolution of the charge by the commissioner and any other authority.

The Opposition, as it indicated to the Government, was concerned that, given the higher degree of probity expected

of employees of the Casino and the lack of other opportunities for placement of employment within the Casino, there may be isolated incidents whereby someone charged could be stood down without wages and then subsequently found not guilty of the charge. We had lengthy discussions with the Government, and I understand that in another place the Leader of the Upper House (Hon. Rob Lucas) has read a statement to the Parliament clarifying that issue and making the very pertinent point that only on rare occasions would this provision be used. The Opposition has accepted that, albeit reluctantly, as being the best that we could achieve in this instance. In a constructive move with the Government we have agreed not to move any further amendment, and we will watch that issue with interest.

A number of other adjustments have been made in the other place, including issues to do with the removal from the Casino of people believed to be under 18 and a number of other fine-tuning mechanisms, some of which were quite technical in nature and on all of which the Opposition has been appropriately briefed. We have discussed it in our Caucus and shadow Cabinet and we are in agreement with the Government. I hope that the Gaming Supervisory Authority and other Government officers have sufficiently scrutinised the Bill and that this will be the last set of adjustments for some time. I am not saying that by way of wanting to rebuke anyone at all: these things are never simple, but it is always easier to deal with them in one go than to have two or three cracks at them.

In this instance, we seem to have covered all bases for the foreseeable future. Again, the Opposition has demonstrated its willingness and ability to work constructively with the Government on matters of importance, matters where politics is not the main issue and where the interests of the State are best served. Points are continually made by the Government as to where we may be in disagreement, and we are accused of playing politics. It is fair to say that, when it comes to the finances of this State and to the proper good management of this State's assets, and the asset sales program, the track record of this Opposition has been excellent over the past 3½ years.

That is not to say that we give the Government *carte blanche* but, where possible, we constructively work with members of the Government. I hope that that constructive approach by the Opposition is appreciated by the Government. When we choose to have disagreements, they are on matters that require disagreement, from our pint of view, at least, so that disagreement should be treated in the proper context. In this instance we have been constructive, and we are happy to see the passage of this Bill today.

Motion carried.

**GAMING SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY
(ADMINISTRATIVE RESTRUCTURING)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**LIQUOR LICENSING (ADMINISTRATIVE
RESTRUCTURING) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (PAY-ROLL TAX AND
TAXATION ADMINISTRATION) BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) and the Minister for Transport (Hon. D.V. Laidlaw) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

ASER (RESTRUCTURE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 28 May. Page 1447.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): This is yet again another Bill in a series of Bills with which we have been dealing. Indeed, the previous Bill, the Casino Bill, was a principal piece of legislation to sort out the sale process of the ASER development. This Bill was forecast when we originally discussed the original Casino legislation. As members would be aware, it has been reported by the Government—and I must say by the Treasurer in a somewhat more heightened state of politicking in his criticisms of the whole ASER development—that when the ASER project was put in place, namely, the ASER Property Trust, the ASER Investment Unit Trust and whatever other structures were put in place, it was a dog's breakfast. It was a very complex and detailed structure in terms of the lease arrangements in which the Casino, the Hyatt, the Riverside Centre, the Convention Centre, common ground and car parks were all part of the lease that had been obtained from TransAdelaide by the ASER Property Trust.

The current lease structure is inappropriate and incompatible with a sale process, given the Government's intention to sell the Casino licence with or without the Hyatt Hotel—and separate from Riverside and the Convention Centre. Therefore, it is necessary for the existing head lease to be surrendered and replaced immediately with new leases specifically for the Hyatt, the Convention Centre, the car parks, the Casino and so on. In that sense, the Casino, the hotel, Riverside and the Government's assets would be on separate title. It may well be that the purchaser of the Casino will also purchase the Hyatt complex, but it is also possible that that will not occur. Clearly, separate leases are needed.

The Opposition accepts that and, in the main, this Bill facilitates that process. It also creates its own unique problems concerning the common shared facilities, which, I understand, involve various pieces of infrastructure relating to water, cooling, fire services, electrical and other common facilities, which, whilst on the one title, were shared amongst the various lessees. The separate leases create a problem for the Government. This Bill establishes a structure to deal with that problem in the form of a corporation to manage the common area. It will be called the ASER Services Corporation. The corporation will consist of members of the various parties that take over the various leases. Sufficient structures have been incorporated in that to ensure that the common area is managed as best as possible for the good of the various holders of the leases.

Clearly, other issues arise from that, but after briefings and discussing the matter I am satisfied that everything is okay. For example, it is important to ensure that the tenants of the Riverside building, both the office and shop tenants, are secure. They will simply transfer from the present ownership structure to the new owner, and therefore those tenancies will remain in place. I refer to clause 30 of the Bill dealing with the Development Act 1993 and the Development Act 1994. The clause deals with waiving the normal public consultation process in relation to this project, given that it was originally subject to exemption from certain parts of development law in respect of its location. The Opposition agrees that need not occur in this case, either. We are happy to agree to that clause.

I say that because, as constructive as the Treasurer tends to be from time to time, he will not miss the opportunity to make a statement about what he considers to be the down side of the ASER development. I know the Treasurer well, and he will not resist that temptation—I will be very surprised if he does. Let me put that into context. Without question what was done in 1983 and 1985, at the end of the day, has not been of financial benefit to the shareholders, though it has been of significant benefit in terms of offering facilities to the community. On a cost benefit analysis, people can make up their own mind whether that was a good or bad investment. No doubt, the Treasurer will have his views.

There is no doubt that in hindsight things could have and should have been done differently—no question about that. The Opposition has repeatedly said in this place that mistakes were made by the former Labor Government, and I for one as the shadow Treasurer of the present Labor Opposition indicate that those mistakes should be acknowledged, and I simply say that all Governments make mistakes. Clearly mistakes were made with this project—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I point out to the member for Bright that I am addressing that issue now. We are acknowledging that error, and it is a pity that money was lost. With the benefit of hindsight, all Governments could be better. I have copped some criticism from within the Labor Party for being prepared to say that we made these sorts of mistakes. We made decisions we should not have made. We paid a terrible price in electoral terms at the last election for many of those mistakes. I do not walk away from that. I will cop fair and square on the chin that the Labor Party made these financial errors but, as any Party should, we have learnt from those errors.

We are now a much wiser political Party, and we are now a much more cautious political Party. We are a Party that will offer very cautious financial management in the future. I will say this, and particularly for the education of the former Minister and present member for Bright, who is destined to remain on the back bench for the remainder of his political career: at least we have learnt from our mistakes. We have learnt from terrible mistakes, realising that there are some things Government should do, some things Government is good at, some things Government should not do, some things Government is not good at.

This Government has hindsight, whereas Governments in 1983 and 1985 did not have that benefit. As I have said before, the very day some weeks ago when the Treasurer rose in this place to berate the Opposition about the ASER complex issue, the Premier made a statement admitting that the Hansen Yuncken deal for the EDS building development on North Terrace will cost the taxpayer, on his admission,

somewhere between \$4 million and \$14 million. Privately, many members of the Government have admitted to me that the figure in terms of the cost to the taxpayer is closer to \$40 million.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Rubbish!

Mr FOLEY: The member for Bright can say that is rubbish but, when a Government signs a head lease on an 11 storey building for 15 years with a no abatement clause allowing for the top rental in town, that is a very foolish deal. Less than 50 per cent of the building will be sublet to EDS for only half the period of the head lease and the balance of the space will have to be taken by other private sector companies. For the life of me, I do not know why they would want to move in there when deals are being offered in town for similar quality accommodation at a price 50 per cent lower. The Government will have to move its own departments into that building. When that opportunity cost is factored in, the numbers rapidly increase. We know that the AMP will offer two or three years rent free accommodation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I advise the honourable member to relate his remarks to the Bill before the Chair.

Mr FOLEY: Yes, Sir. The AMP building is offering rent-free accommodation and, linking my comments to the ASER development, we know the real problems the Government had filling the Riverside Tower. I find it amazing that the Government has the hypocrisy, the foolishness and the financial recklessness to enter into such a deal on the very day that the ASER restructuring Bill is before Parliament.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: As the member for Bright knows, because he was probably at the Cabinet table, and he was a supporter of the Premier of the day who was pushing this project, proper due diligence and proper assessment was not undertaken by this Government. I know that Treasury was horrified. It is an horrific liability to the State. It may well be that, in a decade's time, as I have said before, we may call back in the very people to unwind that mess as we have had to unwind the ASER development.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I live in very real hope. I have seen the submissions that went before Cabinet for that project. I have them in my possession. I have released segments of them in Parliament. In linking my comments back to ASER, as the Labor shadow Treasurer, I am prepared to acknowledge error. I only wish that this Treasurer is prepared to admit to the errors of this Government, although the Premier neared that point last Friday when he suggested that the former Premier was wrong to pledge no tax increases and to go ahead with the 'Going all the way' campaign. We all knew that.

Mr Brokenshire: He didn't know how big the debt was, either.

Mr FOLEY: He was in Cabinet. I really enjoy it when Ministers and Premiers such as the present Premier dump on the former Premier—but he was sitting around the Cabinet table, too. John Olsen was sitting around the Cabinet table, putting his hand up for 'Going all the way', putting his hand up for no tax increases, but then, when he wants to make life difficult for his former Premier and the Minister for Information and Contract Services—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: How do you know he put his hand up?

Mr FOLEY: He had to put his hand up—Cabinet solidarity.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The interjections are completely defeating the relevance of the Bill.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mawson.

Mr FOLEY: I know that many members present in the Chamber do not understand the principles of Cabinet solidarity because none of them will be in it and those who were will not go back. All Ministers agree to decisions: Cabinet sticks to the decisions of Cabinet. It is inappropriate for a sitting Minister to dump on a Cabinet in the way that the Premier did last Friday. That is slightly off the track.

The Opposition wanted to make the point strongly in anticipation of the Treasurer's comments. We will expedite this Bill. We do not see a need for it to go to Committee. Yet again, it demonstrates the constructive working approach of the Labor Party to ensure that this important piece of reform and restructuring goes ahead to enable the swift sale of the various component parts of this development so that the development proceeds and prices for the Government are maximised.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I intended to thank the member for Hart for his cooperation until he decided to drift off into history, and I must say that he did it very badly. I remind him that our experience with ASER was to be \$70 million originally, then it became \$140 million, then it became \$185 million, and there was some value adding in that process. We will use the \$185 million as the benchmark—an inflated benchmark at that stage—and it became \$345 million. I would have thought that the Labor Government of the day would learn from that experience. Not content with that, it moved on to the Myer-Remm centre. After being destroyed on the building site, after having the most outrageous demands made by the building unions—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I was not going to open up this can, but the member for Hart said to me that members opposite would never do that again. Now that they have hindsight, now that they have learnt their lesson, they will never do it again. In terms of where we went from the experience of ASER, into the experience of Myer-Remm—

Mr Foley: Into the experience of the EDS building.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: A number of assumptions have been made by the honourable member about the EDS building, namely, that it will not have the occupancy that has been stated by the former Premier. When that building is built and when that occupancy is satisfied, will the honourable member say, 'Hang on, I am sorry,' or will he say—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am simply saying to the honourable member that there are certain guarantees in this world and other things are not guaranteed. The honourable member can reflect from the Opposition benches whether the Government has enhanced the North Terrace precinct. That is a little bit different, and he will have the opportunity from the Opposition benches to reflect upon that in three years' time or whenever the building is complete and the occupancy rate slowly moves up. He will be able to reflect on whether the Government has done a fair thing by the taxpayers at that time. At this stage, to suggest that any site would be fully occupied at the beginning is an extremely naive call.

I was not going to reflect on the Casino debacle, on top of the Remm debacle, the State Bank debacle and SGIC, except to say that they were all a learning experience. Not only do I try to learn from experiences from within the State but also I try to take a line from what has happened in other jurisdictions—for example, with Rothschilds, Tricontinental and a

few of the other terrible things that have happened around Australia—all as a result of Labor Governments. Labor Governments invariably get themselves into this sort of mess. They say, 'I'm going to play friends; I'm going to try to play with the big boys,' and they cost the taxpayers a fortune.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Hart will be able to reflect upon that in three or four years and say whether I was right or wrong. When we get to that point he can reflect, and he may or may not be surprised. The Government believes that what it is doing is for the betterment of the IT industry in this State and, indeed, for the North Terrace precinct.

The issue of ASER and unwinding the corporate arrangement that prevailed is one of the most complex that anyone could have come across and, indeed, the leasing arrangements which prevail and which give title to various parts of the complex are matters that were and still remain complex. We have a facilitating Bill to allow the corporate structure and, indeed, the leasing arrangements to be unwound. This legislation deals with the site arrangements and the capacity to handle various parts of the ASER site. It is important to understand that, when the site was put together, it was not put together very accurately, and there have been some difficulties in site determination. Those matters are handled within the Bill. There is a capacity to handle the common areas which will service all but the Casino, hence the corporation, as the member for Hart has quite rightly pointed out.

This is a facilitating Bill; it is an important Bill to allow the sale to proceed. We have done the best job possible under the complex arrangements that prevailed at the time. Once this Bill has been passed in both Houses, we will have the capacity to get on with the job of selling ASER, and I thank the Opposition for its cooperation.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, the bells in Old Parliament House simply cannot be heard. Some of us are here through goodwill rather than anything else. It might be worthwhile looking at that from a perspective of calling us to the Chamber in future.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We are aware of that problem and we are attempting to fix it. The immediate problem has been resolved.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Adjourned debate on the second reading.
(Continued from 3 June. Page 1520.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): The Opposition will support this Bill.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Opposition has studied the Bill most carefully. It is part of national model legislation and makes the Friendly Societies (Victoria) Act the law of South Australia. The Bill provides for nationally uniform prudential supervision, the cost of which will be met by the friendly societies themselves. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): This matter was dispensed in due fashion, and I thank the Opposition for its support. There was an agreed determination by all States, Territories and the Commonwealth that we would have common legislation governing our financial institutions. That was accomplished in relation to the building societies and the credit unions through the auspices of the Queensland legislation. For the friendly societies, this is being achieved through the auspices of the Victorian legislation. It is template legislation. It is being adopted by this Parliament and is a means by which the States can retain their integrity without the Commonwealth dictating what the States should do.

As a result of the working parties, we now have legislation governing friendly societies which will provide standard requirements and prudential requirements for all friendly societies across Australia. These were the last of the financial institutions that needed to become subject to uniformity across Australia. As I said, the banks were already covered by the Reserve Bank. The credit unions and building societies were of more recent vintage and the friendly societies are now being covered by common legislation. It will take away the angst and some of the problems that could be created if the State retained the regulatory regimes, which would also have reduced their capacity to compete in an open marketplace. I thank the Opposition for its support, and I understand there is one amendment to the Bill on a clause involving money.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11.

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

Page 6, after line 6—Insert new clause as follows:

Levies

11. (1) This section imposes

(a) the levy payable under sections 119 and 120 of the AFIC (South Australia) Code by a society; and

(b) the supervision levy payable under section 51 of the Friendly Societies (South Australia) Code by a society.

(2) An expression has in subsection (1) the meaning it would have if this section were in the AFIC (South Australia) Code or the Friendly Societies (South Australia) Code, as the case requires.

This clause deals with levies. These clauses are normally the province of the House of Assembly.

Mr ATKINSON: Will the Treasurer explain to the Committee the effect of the amendment and say what the levies will be?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The levies are determined as a standard set of levies in consultation with the industry, taking into account the costs of the supervision required. The levies are related to the cost of the supervision. In the case of building societies and credit unions it is supposed to be the cost of running the supervisory scheme, and has proved to be so. It is then paid by the members relative to their share of the scheme, I believe in relation to the assets of their scheme.

Mr ATKINSON: So, the levy is on the assets of the friendly society?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No.

Mr ATKINSON: On what is this a levy?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The levy pays for the supervision. A number of friendly societies are not involved in finance, as the honourable member would understand. All those members who participate in financial markets, take loans or involve themselves in transactions in the financial sector are covered by this legislation. That does not include

the pharmaceutical operations and other ancillary areas in which friendly societies would be involved. My understanding, which has been agreed to by all the friendly societies in determining the levies which will pay for the full—

Mr Atkinson: Your understanding has been agreed to.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: From my briefing on this matter last year, I understand that the levy is generated on a cost recovery basis relative to the financial assets of the various friendly societies. That is my understanding. It is basically cost recovery, related to the financial strength of the various participants.

Mr ATKINSON: I am not sure that that answer is clear. I asked the Minister whether this was a levy on assets—a kind of wealth tax on friendly societies—and the Treasurer says it is not. Then he says it is a levy related to the financial strength of a friendly society. How is that financial strength measured? To what is this levy applied?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thought I had made it quite clear. It is my understanding that all the friendly societies have agreed on contributing to the supervisory scheme. With respect to how the moneys are determined, I understand that it is not a tax, as the honourable member would suggest: it is a user pays system for ensuring that the supervision of the industry is complete. My understanding is that it is based upon the financial strength or asset base of those institutions. So, friendly societies with small asset bases of \$10 million are not paying the same as a friendly society with an asset base of \$100 million. That is my understanding, from the discussions that were held last year when we considered whether we would adopt single legislation for each State or template legislation. That is the best answer I can give, but I will give the honourable member a detailed answer about how it actually translates. The industry itself will be involved in determining how it is actually applied, as was the case with building societies. I will provide the honourable member with an answer on how all the participants understand it will apply.

Clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (12 to 16), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (U-TURNS AT TRAFFIC LIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to make changes to the Road Traffic Act to allow vehicles within classes prescribed by the regulations to make U-turns at prescribed signalised intersections and junctions.

In relation to this legislation, it is intended initially to limit this initiative to buses making U-turns at the junction of King William Road and Victoria Drive, Adelaide. However, the wording is designed so that the same facility can be extended to other intersections and junctions, and other classes of vehicles, prescribed by the Regulations, should the need arise.

While buses have used Pennington Terrace, North Adelaide, since the 1950s, the numbers have increased in recent years from approximately 104 in 1991 to 400 per weekday currently. Much of the earlier increase was due to more buses from the southern suburbs being extended through the Central Business District from their old terminal points around Victoria Square, with about 60 per cent of the buses using Pennington Terrace doing so prior to the commencement of competitive tendering. It is important to note that there will always

be a need for buses to turn around on the edges of the City no matter how our public transport system is organised.

The increase in bus traffic has generated concern from local residents, prompting an investigation of various alternatives to the turning loop.

In recent months, a number of alternative turning loops have been investigated by the City Council and the Passenger Transport Board, including the use of the southern car park at Adelaide Oval. The various alternatives examined have been rejected as either too costly or as unacceptable to adjacent landowners or users.

The City of Adelaide, the Passenger Transport Board and TransAdelaide now agree that the optimum solution is to allow buses to make a U-turn, using special signals, at the King William Road/Victoria Drive junction.

The proposed U-turn arrangement at the King William Road/Victoria Drive junction is currently illegal under the Road Traffic Act, section 71A. However, such an arrangement would be similar to the 'hook' right turns now made by buses from the left side of the road at a number of intersections, including King William Street/North Terrace and Rundle Road/Dequetteville Terrace.

Considering the 'Hook Turn' provisions in the Road Traffic Act and the cost of all other infrastructure options, it is considered appropriate by all parties that the Road Traffic Act be amended to provide for U-turning buses at signalised intersections and junctions.

Under the arrangements, northbound terminating buses would pull into a separate bus lane adjacent to the western kerb of King William Road. They would wait for a 'B' Light, which would be activated only when all other conflicting vehicular and pedestrian traffic was stopped by a red light, then would execute a U-turn to the eastern southbound carriageway.

The bus U-turn will not only benefit the residents of Pennington Terrace, but the public transport system in general. The buses that now turn around at Pennington Terrace all enter the City from the southern suburbs, and carry very few passengers north of the Festival Theatre. The U-turn will, therefore, reduce the amount of empty running that the buses must undertake.

Given the characteristics of buses, and their high passenger carrying capabilities, special arrangements for buses to have various forms of priority over traffic are becoming more prevalent all over the world. These proposed arrangements should be considered simply as another step in making public transport more efficient and effective.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 71—Right turns not at intersections or junctions and U-turns

Section 71 of the Act provides that a U-turn may be made from any convenient place on the road. However, it should be made clear that this is not the case if the U-turn is being made at an intersection or junction at which there are traffic lights.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 71A—U-turns at traffic lights

It is proposed that it will be possible for the driver of a vehicle of a prescribed class to execute a U-turn at an intersection or junction at which there are traffic lights if authorised to do so under the regulations. The U-turn will be required to be executed in the manner prescribed by the regulations, and to be executed in accordance with any specific requirement prescribed by the regulations.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL WINE CENTRE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 May, Page 1444.)

Ms WHITE (Taylor): On behalf of the Opposition I support this Bill, which will enable a National Wine Centre to be established in South Australia. Although supporting this legislation the Opposition will move one amendment to the Bill and in Committee will ask a series of questions which may or may not lead to further but minor amendments in another place when the Bill progresses to that place. This is a Bill for a National Wine Centre, so it is a project of national

significance. It is a bid to attract the status of a national centre for the wine tourism industry in South Australia.

The Government's proposal for the National Wine Centre was introduced over seven months ago, and too much time has been spent to-ing and fro-ing about this matter. Adelaide's standing in attracting the centre had reached a stage where the Labor Opposition felt it was time to show some leadership and stop the speculation about the site, as there was a real threat that South Australia was about to lose the national bid to either the ACT or New South Wales. This project was announced by the former Premier and Tourism Minister over seven months ago. At that time the proposal was for a wine centre along the lines of the Taj Mahal.

Parts of a report conducted by Ernst and Young have been circulating, although the report has not been made public. The Opposition has been trying to obtain a copy of that report but it has still not been made available, despite letters to the Government. I sent a letter to the Tourism Minister dated 23 April following an article in the *City Messenger* in which he said that the report would be available, but I have still not been able to see that report. At the time that report was finalised there was much community concern about what was being proposed. We still do not know the extent of that proposal, but portions of the report that had become public talked about a project that would result in a \$1 million a year loss.

Clearly what had been proposed, even though we had not seen the details, did not appear to be appropriate. Certainly many people were concerned that the Goodman building would not be appropriate for what was being proposed at that time. It is now seven months later and no designs or plans are in existence. However, given the importance of attracting the National Wine Centre to Adelaide, the Labor Opposition is willing to support enabling legislation to ensure that the centre goes ahead in Adelaide, but we still want to see the plans. The National Wine Centre was announced over seven months ago, and since that time the site has been an issue of great speculation, so much so that on 2 January this year the present Tourism Minister felt it necessary to issue a press release, which stated:

The announcement puts an end to speculation that Mr Ashenden, as the new Minister for Tourism, was going to change the proposed location of the National Wine Centre. This project is a high priority for the State Government and we will be moving quickly to finalise all the details so we can start building the National Wine Centre to become a major tourist attraction for Australia's wine capital.

The Hackney Road site identified in that press release was the same site mentioned when the project was announced last year, which seemingly put an end to speculation about the site. However, the Opposition obtained a subsequent letter from the Premier (no less) to the Defence Minister asking that the Torrens Parade Ground be released for the National Wine Centre. For the benefit of all members, the letter, dated 17 March 1997, states:

Dear Ian,

The South Australian Government is committed to the establishment of a National Wine Centre in Adelaide, to showcase the achievements of all of Australia's wine-producing regions. This will be an important project for Adelaide and for South Australia as 'the Wine State', and has support from the wine industry around Australia. The project will be a key contributor to tourism development and the national wine industry development. For the project's commercial success, and to consolidate industry's support for it, a location in central Adelaide that maximises tourism opportunities and visitation levels is sought. The Torrens Parade Ground and associated buildings, owned by your department, presents itself as a particularly advantageous location. It is centrally located among

the major cultural tourism institutions in the North Terrace precinct. If it were to be available for development as a home for the National Wine Centre, the unique social history of the site could be preserved and presented to the public, alongside complementary attractions. I would be grateful for your urgent consideration of whether the Torrens Parade Ground could be made available.

This letter is dated 17 March this year, only two months after the present Tourism Minister said that the location of the centre would be the Hackney Road site. This caused much confusion. Indeed, the to-ing and fro-ing since the time the centre project was announced last year has put at risk our bid to establish the National Wine Centre in Adelaide. In light of that, last week, when the Government brought legislation to the Opposition, the Labor Party took the Caucus decision that the importance of attracting the wine centre to Adelaide was pre-eminent and is now supporting the establishment of the wine centre at the Hackney road site.

Our reservations about the appropriateness of the Goodman building for the wine centre project touted last year have been overridden by the Government's assurances that that is not what is planned and, as we are yet to see what is planned because plans and designs do not exist at this point, we will be moving an amendment to ensure that, once plans and designs are ready, the public and the relevant council have input into the Hackney site. One idea for the centre is to consolidate the wine industry by showcasing products in the centre of Adelaide.

I am told that the Winemakers' Federation, the Australian Wine and Brandy Corporation and perhaps other groups will be locating to the Hackney site, and perhaps the Minister will elaborate on that. Obviously South Australia is an important wine State and, we would argue, the pre-eminent wine State. It is certainly the nation's largest wine producer. In fact, South Australia's rapidly expanding wine industry currently contributes about \$900 million a year to our economy, which indicates that South Australia, and indeed Adelaide, is the perfect place to establish such a centre. Establishing that centre in Adelaide will assist in putting a focus on Adelaide as the wine tourism centre of Australia.

It is important that the centre be located in the city. The centre must be located centrally. It is important, when considering where to put this centre, that no one region of South Australia is advantaged. For that reason, Adelaide is the best location. The Opposition's amendment, as I stated publicly on Tuesday after our Caucus decision, will ensure that the Government does go to the public and prepares a PER once those plans are established.

An honourable member: What does that include?

Ms WHITE: It must include a statement of the expected environmental, social and economic effects of the development. It must include a statement of the extent to which these effects are consistent with any relevant development plans or planning strategies. When the report is ready it must be referred to the relevant city council, that is, the Adelaide City Council. It must be available for public inspection for at least 30 days, and a public meeting must be conducted within that 30 day period. The Minister must then prepare an assessment report that comments on the submissions which are received during that time. The aim of this is to ensure that the Government does not go ahead and do something which is unacceptable at the Hackney site. Currently, there are no plans on the table; no-one has seen any plans; they do not exist. As an Opposition we would not be fulfilling our responsibility if we did not ensure that the Government conducted a proper but short process of submitting a PER.

For the past seven months the Government has to-and-froed, and still no plans are on the table. It is time to get on with this, but it is also time to ensure that what does eventuate at the Hackney site is an environmentally and culturally appropriate development. We believe that by moving this amendment we will ensure that that happens at the Hackney site. In summary, the Opposition recognises the importance of establishing a national wine centre in Adelaide, and we therefore support this enabling legislation provided our amendment in respect of public consultation is passed.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to support the Bill. I look forward with great anticipation, as I am sure do all South Australians, wine producers and all those involved in the wine industry, to the establishment of the national wine centre in South Australia. There is no doubt in my mind that it will make a significant contribution to this State and to the wine industry overall. I know the Government is determined that this wine centre will be a world-class facility. It will promote the international status of the Australian wine industry because it will become the national headquarters of that industry. It will be an interpretative, educational and entertaining centre and, of course, it will promote the Australian wine industry and its culture to all visitors. It will provide a dynamic showcase of excellence and diversity of all Australian wines, wine makers and wine regions from the whole nation.

I understand that it also plans to reinforce Australia's growing international reputation as a world-class wine producer, and in doing so emphasise and support the delivery of Australia's wine industry's vision 2025 strategy which the wine industry has put before the nation. In addition, the National Wine Centre will cater for wine tastings for the promotion of wine sales, wine appreciation classes, professional development and vocational and educational training opportunities as part of the joint industry and Government approach. It is no accident that the wine industry is committed to the National Wine Centre at Hackney. I understand that the Wine Makers Federation of Australia has signed a memorandum of understanding with the Government which, in the process, will bring about broad representation from both the industry and other wine growing States in this nation.

I shall place on the record some background in regard to the wine industry's approach to this project, because through its support for this Bill the wine industry has reaffirmed its approach by joining with the South Australian Government in support of the establishment of the National Wine Centre in Adelaide. This support for the development is representative of the national wine industry and will help it gain international recognition. The National Wine Centre will be established without bias towards any wine region or company and, because of its location, will provide easy access for the industry and the general public, including interstate and national visitors. The plan is that the centre will be surrounded by a small vineyard, and in doing so it will create an environment and atmosphere in keeping with the ambience and viticultural feel that the Australian wine industry so eminently presents already to the international scene.

As the first truly international wine centre in the world, this national wine centre will have a major impact on the Australian tourism industry by playing an important role in reinforcing Australia's standard as a world-class wine producer. It will also create an impetus for new travel throughout this nation. At the same time I am sure the centre

will assist the Australian wine industry to increase both domestic and international wine consumption, and in doing so promote the growth of this State's and Australia's most pre-eminent industry. Many members are aware that the background of the site option is now past history. The fact is that a site has been agreed to and the process is under way.

I reinforce the fact that the Hackney site is an appropriate location. It is central in this State and will not be biased towards any one region of South Australia. It is central to visitors and will hopefully encourage them to visit all wine regions in this State. I also note that the Bill provides a clear statement of the functions of the centre, including: public enjoyment and education regarding wine production and wine appreciation; the promotion of the qualities of the industry and the regions of excellence of the product itself; and the associated tourism promotion associated with the industry. Importantly, the centre will become the headquarters of the Australian wine industry. I know that my colleagues parochially promote their own regions, but it would be remiss of me in representing the largest wine producing region in the nation not to take this opportunity to briefly get on the record—

Mrs Rosenberg: It has more sun than Queensland.

Mr ANDREW: Exactly. That provides the opportunity for the Riverland to be, as it is at the moment, the leader in terms of growth in production and hectareage area and in expansion to meet the current international demands of the wine export market.

Members interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: Despite the interjections from my colleagues—whether it be the member for Custance, the member for Light (who is being very patient and who I am sure will contribute appropriately) or the member for Mawson (who is giving me great respect as distinct from what he has done to Opposition members this week)—I place on record that the Riverland produces about 30 per cent of Australia's wine grape production and at the moment is accounting for more than 60 per cent of Australia's export wine.

Members interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: If my colleagues continue to interject I will reinforce the fact that the Riverland no longer has the public perception of being a bulk wine producer. Members are enticing me to defend the improved, quality wine production of the Riverland. It is happening for a number of reasons, which I will place on record. The first is that no longer does the Riverland vineyard management process involve supplying irrigation water that puts under threat quality versus production. What we do now, as Riverland irrigated vines, is supply a very precise amount of irrigation water so that we optimise the compromise between quality and production.

Furthermore, it was often presumed historically that the fact that those wines were produced in a warmer climate detracted from the quality of the wine. This has now been overcome as a result of, first, the move to mechanisation and, secondly, technology, because no longer are grapes left out in plastic buckets to stand in the sun all day so that the fermentation process starts and the wine making cannot be controlled. In the Riverland at the moment more than 80 per cent of wine grapes are mechanically harvested in the cool of the night, so the fermentation and wine making process is controlled very accurately and, combined with the technology of the wine making process, Riverland wine grape production is now being appreciated for its quality. It is often recognised internationally more than it is locally.

All the major companies are represented in my region, but it is appropriate to quote Bill Moularadellis of Kingston Estates, who has been well publicised in recent years. When Bill Moularadellis started wine making after graduating in oenology from Roseworthy more than 10 years ago, he found that the domestic market was biased against irrigated wine grapes. He looked at the export markets and now, as I indicated earlier, 80 per cent of his volume is being acclaimed as an export product. I have gone longer than I intended, but I have been enticed into it by my colleagues. I reinforce the fact that the Riverland is also enjoying a significant growth in tourism, partly attributable to the growth in the wine industry.

During 1996 the Big River country recorded the highest growth in visitor numbers of any country region in South Australia. For the first time in 10 years the Riverland has started to see a strong growth in tourism, and the wineries in the area are improving their services to tourists as part of this process. To give my colleagues from other wine producing areas a fair go before time expires this evening, I reiterate the big picture: the wine industry is now worth an estimated \$900 million this year to the State's economy. The value of grape production alone has increased from something like \$63 million in 1992-93 to \$130-odd million in the next two years and is now turning into hundreds of millions of dollars of production.

All of us would have noted the *Advertiser* report of yesterday on the flourishing export sector in South Australia, and one of the major industries leading the economic revival is, of course, the wine industry, with current indications being that the export value of the South Australian wine industry will be \$400 million during 1996-97 and that the Australian wine industry, particularly because of the strength of the South Australian industry and the Riverland production, is on target to achieve sales of a billion dollars by 2002.

In conclusion, I summarise by saying that this national wine centre will no doubt become a national icon. It reflects and exhibits the leadership that South Australia has taken as Australia's leading wine State. I commend the Government and the industry at large for its cooperation to see that this Bill is now before the House so that we can get this very significant project built. I am pleased to support the Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I support this Bill, but the only reason I support it is that our Leader has advised us that if we do not support the wine centre on this site there is a very real danger that it will go elsewhere. For that reason and that reason alone, I support the wine centre on this site.

I support the concept totally. I have some severe reservations about \$20 million worth of taxpayers' money being spent on this concept. A number of my constituents have telephoned and told me that they are outraged by the amount of money that has suddenly been found when the hospitals and schools, etc. need significant upgrading. My response to them has been, 'If you want this \$20 million spent, again, it is here or nothing. If this does not go ahead, it is not going to be transferred to schools or hospitals: it has been appropriated for this particular purpose, and that is the end of it.' But it takes a little bit of explaining to people who have done without in relation to their schools and hospitals, etc., why all of a sudden \$20 million of taxpayers' money is available. I have explained to them the way it works.

In South Australia, the fact is—and we all have to get used to it—that little or nothing will occur unless it is Government subsidised. Almost everyone in this State—employers, so-

called entrepreneurs—expects a hand-out from the State. It is becoming a true socialist State—and that does not make me uncomfortable.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I agree about the Entertainment Centre: no argument from me. My priorities were always different. However, it is this or nothing. Everyone both in this Parliament and outside this Parliament knows that this site is wrong. This is not the right site for this very useful and desirable Wine Centre. But it is the wrong site. Everyone knows that: I do not have to make a case for that. That site should revert to parklands. If it were up to me, I would knock over not just the Tram Barn but also the Goodman building and give it back to the Botanic Gardens, or whoever. I believe one of the silliest decisions we made in Government was to keep those two Tram Barns. I would not have thought that that could have been topped by an even sillier decision by this Government to knock down just one of them. How ridiculous can you get? However, that is something that the Government will have to deal with. I will be interested to see how it does: I will be happy to see its discomfort.

I hope that, before anything irrevocable is done on this site, commonsense prevails. Given that there is not one person who genuinely believes this to be the right site, I am not sure why people are saying to us—and they are, and we have accepted being stood over in this way—‘You accept this site or it is going to New South Wales or the ACT.’ I have no idea why people are doing that. There are plenty of other places in South Australia—even within Adelaide, if it has to be in Adelaide—where this could be located. I hope that before anything irrevocable is done commonsense prevails and that the Wine Centre is built at a more appropriate South Australian location.

Debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER RESOURCES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

- No. 1. Page 10, lines 12 to 19 (clause 30)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 2. Page 10, lines 20 to 27 (clause 31)—Leave out the clause.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Government supports the amendments that have come down from another place. There has been consultation with the Conservation Council, the Local Government Association and the South Australian Farmers Federation. The Farmers Federation expressed concern about this clause and the Government, as a result of that consultation, is prepared to support the amendments from another place.

Ms HURLEY: I want to speak on this amendment, because I raised a query about clause 30 the first time this Bill was before the House and the Minister said at that time that it would not be a problem. He said that there was no difficulty and no problem with anyone and that, as a result of his extensive consultation, he had satisfied everyone and everything. Once it got to the other place that did not seem to be the case at all, and the Minister was successfully lobbied to leave out the clause. It seems that we now have a Bill allowing for a water catchment board and a drainage board to operate in the South-East with no resolution mechanism available between the two. The Minister has said repeatedly that that would not happen because he had

consulted with everyone, but I have very little faith in the Minister's consultative abilities because it does not work out at any turn.

I will support these amendments because I did raise queries and concerns about them previously and deleting the clause seems to be one way of dealing with it. I reiterate, not only has the Minister not handled this Bill very well but he did not handle the original Water Resources Bill very well either. It was extensively amended after he had told all and sundry that there had been proper consultation and that he had got it right. He has got it wrong again and again.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As I said in my second reading contribution, there was more consultation in regard to the introduction of the water resources legislation than probably many other pieces of legislation. Certainly much more consultation than was provided to the Opposition and interest groups by the previous Government. It is important legislation. It is as a result of amendments moved in the Upper House moving towards integrated resource management (which is something that this Government supports) that we are now debating this legislation. There was consultation. The Opposition and the Democrats in another place introduced the amendments and, if anyone is to be blamed, it is them. I would have thought that they would have gone out and said, ‘It is important that these amendments be passed in this form.’ They failed to do that.

The Government supports the amendments. I am delighted that this legislation will now be passed and the Water Resources Act can be proclaimed.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL WINE CENTRE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr VENNING (Custance): I support this Bill even though I believe—without being too parochial—that the wine centre should have been in the Barossa Valley not only because the Barossa is the most recognisable and historic wine region in South Australia without any doubt but also because we have the most magnificent building, the Chateau Tanunda building, which would have fitted it to a tee.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Exactly, and most people who know thought this is where it should have gone. I fought for this issue for as long as I could without bringing it to surface and I spoke to everyone concerned, but I realise that we could not afford to procrastinate any longer on the issue or we could have lost it to the ACT, Victoria or New South Wales. We needed to have a bipartisan approach on this issue and I thank the Opposition for it. We now need to move swiftly and secure this centre, which is to be an internationally recognised venue.

I join the Premier and the Winemakers Federation of Australia in applauding the announcement last Wednesday of bipartisan support for the establishment of the National Wine Centre at the former Hackney bus depot in Adelaide. I must confess I always thought it would have been appropriate to have this centre in the Barossa Valley, but the peak national wine industry body, the Winemakers Federation of Australia, gave support for the wine centre conditional on the following: the centre would be representative of the whole Australian wine industry; the centre was capable of generating international recognition; and an appropriate site must be found. The criteria for an appropriate site were: that it would

accommodate all the components of the industry believed to be essential, including a vineyard (and I remind the House that Chateau Tanunda already has a magnificent vineyard, historic to boot); and that it did not show bias towards any wine region or regions—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr VENNING:—wine company or companies, but had good exposure on the general public and was easily accessible. Yes, I do agree that, by having it in the Barossa, it would not have met that criteria. I had to bow down on that point, even though I did fight a tough battle with the former Premier, the current Premier and the current Minister. As much as I would have liked to have the centre in the Barossa, having made representations for more than two years, particularly as I thought the Chateau Tanunda site was the ideal spot for it, I am afraid it did not fit in with the criteria, and I have had to settle for keeping it in South Australia and in Adelaide. If we had procrastinated any longer, we might not have had it at all.

Incidentally, I am still very confident that a very suitable use will be found for the Chateau Tanunda site in the not too distant future. As to the proposed Hackney site for the National Wine Centre, it has a great deal going for it. It is centrally located, and its being so close to the Botanical Gardens and the wonderful tropical conservatory is a bonus. For those who have wanted to see the Botanic Gardens expanded into the Hackney bus depot site, the wine centre should blend in very well with the gardens.

However, there is one problem, to which the member for Giles alluded. Even though I am a heritage-minded person, and have been all my life, being involved with the National Trust since I was young, I hope that Tram Barn A disappears from the site. I have had a look at it with the officer in charge of the wine museum at the moment, and she was graceful in showing me the building. I could not find one single factor that would excite my innermost self to say the thing should be preserved. I hope it will go, and go very quickly. As the Premier said in his second reading explanation, the wine industry is keen to ensure that this is so, and sample vineyards will be planted around this centre. I hope that the area currently occupied by the Tram Barn will be pristine vineyard. This will enable tourists to get a real feel for the industry. It will look a lot better than the site looks currently.

The National Wine Centre steering committee announced last week that a consortium of two leading architectural firms has been chosen to design the multimillion dollar centre: Cox-Grieve, a joint venture design team comprised of a Sydney based firm, Cox Richardson; and an architect based locally in Adelaide, Steve Grieve. They were chosen following an exhaustive tender process in which 25 submissions from leading Australian architects were received by the National Wine Centre steering committee. According to the steering committee Chairman, John Lamb, the Cox-Grieve consortium presents the perfect blend of national expertise and local knowledge needed for the development of the National Wine Centre here in Adelaide.

The centre will also give the industry's 30 year plan Vision 2025 a significant boost, particularly with regard to the development of a national wine tourism strategy, according to the Chief Executive of the Winemakers' Federation of Australia, Ian Sutton. The objectives of Australia's National Wine Centre are stated as being:

1. To thrill, excite, educate and arouse the interest of visitors about wine;
2. To be dramatic, theatrical and provide a sensory experience;

3. To have a major impact on the Australian tourism industry;
4. To stand as an attraction for international status and renown;
5. To educate visitors to a better understanding of wine, wine making and the wine industry in Australia.

Its functions are to act as a catalyst to encourage people to visit the wine regions of Australia—no doubt the Barossa; to gain first-hand experience of the winery, the vineyard, the winemakers and their vines; to create a dynamic showcase of the excellence and diversity of Australian wines and wine regions; to consolidate the headquarters of the Australian national wine industry, and we produce 60 per cent of the product here; to create a link between food, wine, the Australian lifestyle and particularly the Australian characters of the industry—and I have plenty in my electorate, such as Peter Lehmann and his ilk—

Mr Buckby interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Correction, Sir. He does live over the creek in the District of Light. It will also showcase the Australian wine industry as a world leader in innovation, technology and best practice in both grape and wine production.

The idea to establish a National Wine Centre is not new. In fact, during the 1980s the idea of a wine museum was first floated in South Australia. However, it was not until 1994, following the death of Max Schubert, the maker of Penfold Grange Hermitage, after whom the electorate that I hope to represent will be named, that some action was taken to turn the idea into reality.

I first raised this issue in this House in 1991, as did the then member for Gilles, Colin McKee. I welcome the fact that the industry has joined with the South Australian Government in giving its support for the National Wine Centre to be established here in Adelaide. Construction work on the site is scheduled to begin in late 1997, with completion due in 1998.

As the member representing two great wine areas, that is, the Barossa Valley and the Clare Valley, I am very keen to see this centre established in South Australia, and I support this Bill wholeheartedly because it sets the wheels in motion for the construction of the centre to commence. After some prevarication we have got to this stage, and I hope that there are no delays. I will watch with interest the progress of the building. I look forward to opening day. The wine industry is Australia's premier industry, and this centre will be suitable recognition of that fact. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Today is an historic one for South Australia and it is certainly an historic day—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: It may not be an historic day for some members opposite who do not understand the importance and significance of the wine industry, but for those of us who believe in economic development and opportunities for future generations, it is a very historic day. Just over 100 years ago some magnificent vines were planted in my electorate. As a result of the initiatives of the Reynell family and many other families in the region of McLaren Vale and Reynella, today we have a vibrant agricultural industry that is generating hundreds of millions of dollars for South Australia and creating lots of jobs.

For me, as a member of the South Australian Parliament who very proudly represents the premium shiraz growing region in Australia and possibly the world, it is a proud day because this Bill puts the stamp once and for all on the fact

that Adelaide, South Australia, is the wine capital of Australia. I have been arguing for that both before I came into Parliament and since I became a member. Industry representatives have said to me day in and day out that we must get the wine centre set up. The Government, in partnership with the industry, has delivered on another promise.

I understand what the member for Giles said, because some people in this State ask why we should spend \$20 million on a wine centre rather than put it into health. I remind the member for Giles and the people who say this that the Olsen Liberal Government is spending more money on health and education than the Labor Government did. The fact is that, if we have vibrant economic opportunities, we will have a bigger tax base on which to work and we will continue to have a sustainable increase in those other important areas.

The \$20 million is a one-off investment by the South Australian Government and taxpayers to ensure that we keep the stamp of wine capital for generations to come. In 100 years from now, when future generations and members of Parliament in this House celebrate the centenary of the National Wine Centre, they will look back and say that we have had about 250 years of success with our wine industry, and they will be seeing billions of dollars worth of exports from South Australia.

As well as the obvious benefits associated with this new centre, which will create jobs and increase economic activity, it puts the wine capital stamp on South Australia. It also ties in with the tourism opportunities on which the Government has been working so diligently since it came into office. Every region will benefit from this. I would have liked to see the wine centre as an expansion of the McLaren Vale-Fleurieu Visitor Centre. I saw that as the logical place to build it because it is close to Adelaide, we had 30 acres of land and most people throughout the world know about McLaren Vale. However, because of parochial interests, it had to go on neutral territory.

I also understand that, whilst we are very successful in the areas of conventions and the like, some people only have a few hours to taste our wines and experience the South Australian wine industry. We need to be able to capitalise on that so that when they go back interstate and overseas they would have sampled the product, got some of our books and wine brochures and been able to purchase those wines.

Tourism and the wine industry go hand in hand. We need to understand that, and that is why this Government has set up the Wine Tourism Council, which will be a major player with industry to ensure that this wine centre becomes another icon for South Australia. We have seen today the Wine Australia web site release, which the McLaren Vale district is leading. It will be in that centre. There will be significant information on the latest wine industry, as well as the historic interpretive sites. Also, people will have opportunities to purchase and taste the product.

I will not speak for much longer because it is late in the afternoon, but I want to say a couple of things. A few games have been played regarding the wine centre. It is too significant a development for games to continue to be played. I personally do not support the amendment of the member for Taylor. On the one hand, the member for Taylor is saying that on a bipartisan basis she supports the site—and I commend her for that—but she then has a bob each way and wants to delay the project by at least six months by creating further implications and complications for the development.

Not everybody will be happy with the site, but the industry wants it. It is clearly the best location for people to access. A wine centre with a vineyard around it goes hand in hand with a botanic garden and a rose garden. It is about open space and about people getting out there, moving around and experiencing something that is real and natural. Some people say—and I support them—that South Australia should be promoting the fact that we are a wine and roses State. We have a magnificent rose spectacle in the Botanic Gardens, and the Wine Centre will further add to that.

I strongly congratulate all those who have been involved. I congratulate the Premier and the Minister, both of whom have worked hard on this, and industry leaders. As a member with a premium wine region in my electorate, I will continue to give my support to this, as it is all about jobs, jobs and more jobs and a future for all South Australians.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Actually, I have a vineyard close to me and a lot of land in the district of Napier that would have made a wonderful wine centre. However, I am not here to debate the merits of respective wine centres. I really want to talk about the application of the Development Act to the final approval of this centre. The Opposition supported amendments to the environmental impact statement section of the Development Act which allowed fewer environmental impact statements (fewer in some senses), namely, the PER and DR, to be made. The PER and DR have lesser periods of public consultation and restricted terms of reference, so that these impact assessments are able to be carried out more quickly and at a lower cost than a full EIS. This was done to enable many developments to be fast tracked and to be assessed more quickly and cleanly.

The proposed wine centre is an excellent example of where the PER and/or DR might be used. I would be disappointed if the Government does not take the opportunity to use that section of the Development Act in this case. It is important that the public have their say when the plans are revealed. After all, governments are really not well known for their fine judgment in matters of building and planning. A number of errors have been made in the past, some major and some minor. It is important that the final plans for the centre be open for public examination so that we can have experts, people living in the area and people concerned with heritage matters comment on those plans and indicate whether they see any errors in them. We will probably end up with a better site and planning because of it. It is important that we have the matter open to public scrutiny, because we have heard conceptual plans for it such that we will have vineyards, reception areas, restaurants, and so on, but we have not yet seen how these plans will translate onto this site, how the development will look and how it will affect the amenity of what is an important area of the city.

Admittedly, it does not look good, but we do not want to build anything that does not greatly improve the area. It is important that we get this right for all the reasons that Government members have talked about. This is an important international centre that should see us through for many decades hence. It must be a showcase for South Australia. It must be something we can point to with great pride. I suggest that, if we have proper public consultation and debate about the actual plans, the chances of our getting it right are far better. I know the Government does not always have this view about public consultation: it prefers to fast track things and rely on its own judgment. However, not all of us have as

much faith as the Government has in its own judgment. I certainly commend the shadow Minister for Tourism for foreshadowing an amendment that uses the PER provisions of the Development Act to ensure that we get proper consultation on this important new centre.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I rise in support of this Bill, and I recognise the Opposition's support for the measure, as well. South Australia controls some 55 per cent of Australian wine exports, and it is right that this centre should be placed in South Australia. Given the time constraints, I will not reiterate what other members have already said. However, I would like to place on record that I agree with the member for Custance—the Chateau Tanunda would be an excellent site for this centre, although I recognise the fact that it would place the Southern Vales at somewhat of a disadvantage. Siting the centre in Adelaide means that it is central to all vine growing areas—the Southern Vales, the Riverland, the Clare Valley, the Coonawarra and the Barossa—

An honourable member: And the Adelaide Hills.

Mr BUCKBY: Yes. Just one bell of concern rings in my head, and it concerns the Barossa Valley. In all international tourist studies it is the second-most recognised region for international tourists when they come to Australia. My only concern with this is that, in coming to Adelaide and being able to visit the wine centre here, they may well then get the taste of the wine here, see what they want to see and then go elsewhere. They may do that rather than spending a full day, or maybe one or two days, in the Barossa, with such facilities as convention centres, the Kinsman development proposed for the Tanunda Golf Club and the Barossa Valley tourist rail service which will hopefully commence within the next 12 months. Visitors may be interested in seeing only the wine centre and not going into the region. I hope that concern will not cause us any pain but, nevertheless, it is a matter that should be borne in mind.

It is important also that this be a world-class facility. I believe that the ideas generated about the proposed centre will provide that, but we must ensure that the facility is not second-rate and gives good standing to the wine industry here, because South Australia is the premium wine State in Australia. We produce some of the best wines in the world and we must have a wine centre that matches that quality of wine.

Finally, I fully support this project and I am looking forward to its getting under way. It will be a great tourist attraction in South Australia and will blend in well on its proposed site.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.
Motion carried.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank all members who have contributed to the debate and expressed their views on what is an important project for the State. First, I should like to refer to comments made by the lead speaker opposite. The first comment was that there were no plans. The reason there were no plans was that a decision was taken to sit down with the Opposition and get a bipartisan view. That was done about a month ago. As members opposite know, I was asked to sit down with the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Taylor about a month ago, but no plans were available at that time and there has been no continuation of that situation. But what is the point in having a bipartisan

view and offering the Opposition a place on the steering committee if you already have the plans? It is a pointless exercise. In our generosity and with our understanding of the situation, we decided to involve the Opposition.

This site is important, and in this respect the Government has the support of all the wine associations in Australia: the Wine Makers Federation, the Australian Wine and Brandy Corporation, the Australian Wine Export Council, the Grape and Wine Research Development Corporation, Wine Australia Pty Ltd, the Australian Wine Makers Forum, the Australian Wine Foundation, the Wine Information Bureau and the Wine Grape Growers Council. The reason for this support is that all these bodies will be located on the site, and it is important that we have their support. Many issues will be raised in Committee and I will not comment further now. However, the member for Taylor raised one issue in particular, and I have been advised that the report she requested is in the mail. The letter was signed by the Premier yesterday and she should get it reasonably soon.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1.

Ms WHITE: The title relates to the National Wine Centre but what is the status of Adelaide's bid to be granted national status for the wine centre?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: All of the wine federations and groups that I mentioned have supported the National Wine Centre. There is some argument whether it should be called the Australian National Wine Centre and that will be discussed further, but the matter of locating the centre here is supported by all members of the industry.

Ms WHITE: Has the Government approached the Federal Government about funding for the centre? There was some indication that it would do so from the Federation fund. What indications of financial support has the Government received?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is possible that a centre of this type would be recognised for a grant from the Federation \$1 billion. It is my understanding that at the meeting with the Prime Minister tomorrow both the Adelaide to Darwin rail link and the wine centre will be put forward as opportunities to use that fund.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Ms WHITE: Will the Minister outline the main implications of setting up the centre as an instrumentality of the Crown? Did the Government consider any other arrangement for the centre? If so, what was that arrangement and why was it rejected?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government considered that it was best to set it up as a statutory authority and that, because it will be at the eastern end of the Botanic Gardens, it was believed that it ought to be a more formal body than simply being part of the department.

Ms WHITE: As the centre is to be an instrumentality of the Crown, what happens to profits or losses incurred by the centre and who benefits or is responsible for them?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Profits will remain with the corporation and be used to continue to develop and expand the National Wine Centre. An arrangement between the Government and the wine industry for picking up losses is to be discussed further.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Ms WHITE: This clause deals with the land at the centre. An informal suggestion has been made that a portion of land abutting the Conservatory might be retained by the Botanic Gardens rather than becoming part of the centre's land. Is this to occur, and has the board of the Botanic Gardens been consulted on this? If it has been consulted, what is its view on this portion of land?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am advised that the Botanic Gardens and the wine centre will be an integrated development and that negotiations are currently taking place with the Botanic Gardens board on how to square up the land. Once that is agreed to, it will be automatically transferred and sorted out by regulation. In essence, it is straightening up that line.

Ms WHITE: What formal discussions has the Government had with the board of the Botanic Gardens regarding the centre's plans for the development on the Hackney precinct, and what is its position on the Government's proposal?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Botanic Gardens board has requested to be involved in the planning of the development, and I understand that a formal discussion with the Botanic Gardens board will be held this evening.

Ms WHITE: What discussions has the Government had with the Adelaide City Council—the Lord Mayor or any of her council—about the wine centre's being located at Hackney, and what views do those people have about the Government's proposal? When the Minister answers this question about the Adelaide City Council, will he also indicate any discussions the Government has had with the Partnership 21 people?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: On behalf of the Government I had discussions with the new Lord Mayor. She has advised the Government that her personal opinion is that, pragmatically, she would accept the development of the site. She, herself, would prefer to have other views and I think it is better that she put those on the record because they are her own personal views. However, she has advised that from her point of view the council will support the project. She wishes to be represented on any steering committee. I understand that the council has nominated Graham Inns to be on any future steering committee that works through the design and planning of this centre. In relation to Partnership 21, discussions were held prior to Ilan Hershman leaving but there have not been any discussions since then.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 4—Leave out this clause and insert:

6. The Development Act 1993 will apply to a proposal by the Centre to undertake development of the Centre as follows:

(a) section 49 of that Act will apply initially—

(i) whether or not the development is to be undertaken in partnership or joint venture with a person who is not a State agency; and

(ii) as if an application for approval of the development under that section were only required to be lodged with the Minister within the meaning of the Act;

on the lodging of such an application, that the Act will then apply as if a direction had been given by that Minister and a determination made by the Major Developments Panel under section 49(16a) of that Act that a PER be prepared with respect to the development.

The purpose of this amendment is to open up this process to the public of South Australia. As the Minister has pointed out, there are no plans or designs in existence. It is the Opposition's concern that the people of South Australia ensure that what is built or developed at the Hackney site is

appropriate for that site and appropriate for a National Wine Centre.

The amendment is to introduce a PER process under the Development Act into the processes that the Government must undertake in this development as defined in the Bill. The PER relates to the preparation of a PER and involves looking at a statement of the expected environmental, social and economic effects of the development. It must also consider the extent to which those effects are consistent with planning strategies and development plans for that precinct. The PER must be referred to the Adelaide City Council and it must be open for at least 30 business days to the public. In that time a public meeting must be held to discuss the proposal and the Government must respond to submissions.

By introducing this process, which, as the member for Napier pointed out, still allows a fast tracking of this proposal but injects appropriate consultation and consideration of community attitudes and viewpoints on the development, we believe that the most appropriate development will eventuate at the site. I ask the Government to accept this amendment, which the Opposition believes will add to the development, not, as the Government might be about to argue, detract from it. The project has taken seven months to come to this point and only last week we established where it will be located. There are still no plans or designs so we need to focus attention on getting the job done. The PER process will enhance that in a minimum of time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government rejects the amendment for several reasons. First, as the Opposition is aware, there is currently a National Wine Steering Committee set up. The Opposition were advised that it would be asked to have a member on the steering committee. If they want to be in it they can be; if they do not want to be in it that suits us. The Adelaide City Council has already accepted and nominated Graham Inns, and I understand that the Botanic Gardens Board is meeting tonight and will also nominate someone. In terms of the Opposition's involvement, because we agreed that there would be bipartisan support for the project we agreed to a bipartisan committee, and that is what will be set up. Secondly, advice given to me today is that the PER requires the following: applications and lodgement of plans prior to consultation; an issues paper must be released, which will take at least four weeks; guidelines need to be issued by the major developments panel, which is listed here; public exhibition of the plan for 30 days and a public meeting during that period; and an assessment of the report by the Minister, followed by the Government's decision. I understand that the whole process will take six months.

If it is deemed to be a major project, with representatives from the Government, the Opposition, the Adelaide City Council and the Botanic Gardens Board on the steering committee, it will take three months. The Government sees this as a stalling process. It is a major project. It has been deemed exactly the same as the Capital City project. There will be adequate involvement for the Adelaide City Council, the Botanic Gardens Board and the Opposition. We want exactly the same procedure to apply. The honourable member made the point earlier that we want to get on with the job. We do not want to muck around any longer, and this will just hold up the project.

Ms HURLEY: This rather confirms my suspicion about the Government's attitude to consultation. I understood from the Minister that consultation would include representatives from the Government, the Opposition, the Botanic Gardens

and the Adelaide City Council. We are talking about consultation with the wider community and people who have interests in heritage matters, the city and the wine industry—people who know what they are talking about. That is all the more reason why it is very important to have this public consultation period. We do not want a closed consultation process by a Government with a very blinkered view, which rushes in in three months, produces and approves quick plans and then goes ahead with the building. That will create a problem.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you members. The member for Napier has the floor.

Ms HURLEY: The Minister has advised that it will take six months for the PER, but I am not sure that that is so. We have never had a PER.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: That is what I said: we have never had a PER and, I suppose, this is one time when we will be able to test it out. I can only say that if the Government had been a bit further advanced with the plans it might have taken a lesser period. It is all very well for the Government to drag its heels, not produce plans and then blame the Opposition because the project is not up and running in time. That is no reason to exclude the public from having their due and proper say in what is a very important project for South Australia and one in which the public are investing \$20 million. The public has a right to see these plans since they are funding the project. The Minister's objection simply does not hold water. There is no use establishing a wine centre if we do not do it properly, and if it takes another three months then I say so be it.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am always surprised when I hear pleas of, 'We have to put it out to public consultation', when I understand that the conservatory was established under section 49. It is always different when it is not the same. I will check on that, but that is the advice I have been given. It can be done for one project when Labor is in Government, but when it is in Opposition it is a different story. The project needs to proceed. Section 49 of the Development Act was passed by this Parliament, so it ought to be able to be used. We have stated in the Bill that we intend to do that, so it is clear that all issues that relate to section 49 ought to and will apply.

Mr EVANS: I oppose the amendment. I accept the Minister's comment that it is easy to be in Opposition when you are not in Government. For instance, I refer to the Craighburn development in my electorate. Over a period of 20 years, former Labor Governments consulted the community about that project. A petition was signed by 10 000 people to say that they did not want the development, and on seven separate occasions four Labor Ministers said that it would not proceed. However, lo and behold, before Labor went out of office it allowed the contract to be signed so that the development would proceed.

The Opposition is standing there with tears in its eyes and hand on its heart saying, 'We must consult.' My answer to that is: what is the point of consulting when, ultimately, it did not listen when it was in government? I suggest that the Minister is absolutely right to say that this is nothing but a political stunt given that there might be an election in the wind in the next four, five or six months. I have no doubt that there has been an agreement with the Democrats in the other place. We all know that the second person on the ticket, Ian Gilfillan, happens to be the spokesperson for the society to

save the parklands. I have no doubt that this is nothing more than a delaying tactic so that the wine centre happens to be on the agenda during the election process and so that the Democrats and the Labor Party can once again come to a deal on preferences and run around the State saying, 'Aren't we great because we have consulted and tried to save the parklands?'

The Parliament has already heard the argument about whether there are major projects important enough to be put through for the development of the State. There is no doubt that, after much consultation and public debate on this issue, this is exactly the sort of project that should be fast-tracked. If you go to Asia, you will see the growth of the wine industry and the interest that is shown in the South Australian wine industry. This project should be rushed through so that we can say that we have a wine industry and a national wine centre that we are proud of. I think the Minister is absolutely right to reject the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (8)

Atkinson, M. J.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D.	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hurley, A. K.	White, P. L. (teller)

NOES (27)

Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, D. S.	Baker, S. J.
Bass, R. P.	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Condous, S. G.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A. (teller)
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Such, R. B.	Wade, D. E.
Wotton, D. C.	

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A.	Andrew, K. A.
Rann, M. D.	Olsen, J. W.
Stevens, L.	Venning, I. H.

Majority of 19 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 7.

Ms WHITE: Clause 7(1)(a) provides that one of the functions of the centre will be to provide for activities relating to wine production. Will the Minister guarantee that this will not include a working winery?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes.

Ms WHITE: Paragraph (b) talks about the promotion of the Australian wine industry and regions and the excellence of Australian wines. What checks will there be against certain regions having what could be regarded by parts of the industry as an unfair advantage, given the recent controversy about the designation of individual wines as belonging to a specific geographical region? I am thinking of the recent Coonawarra boundaries argument. What appeal mechanism would there be for an individual winery owner who believed that the classification or positioning of his product within the wine centre was unfair?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The board, when eventually set up, will have representation from every State. That is basically being done to protect the State's interest, consequently the reason for a national wine centre. Any grievances about the structure of the operation would be taken up with the management of the organisation and, consequently, with the board. That sort of process normally enables fairness to prevail.

Ms WHITE: When I asked that question I was thinking along the lines that the tourism industry—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: This is very distracting for the Chair and for members of the Committee.

Ms WHITE: I was thinking that the South Australian Tourism Commission does not deal directly with individual tourist operators; it has a regional tourist body to act on its behalf.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Members of the Committee, members were expelled yesterday for better behaviour than this.

Ms WHITE: Will the centre favour South Australia in directing tourists to wine regions of Australia and, if not, what will be the mechanism for dealing with interstate complaints along these lines?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: South Australia represents about 60 per cent of exports, as the honourable member would be aware. Because the industry is so good at self determination and has been so for some time, I expect that the board would be able to sort out those issues and make sure that we have a national wine museum. I understand that the general idea is that we would have products from regions all around Australia continually being displayed and moving to different areas, selling different areas and different types of production as it goes on. I understand that that general policy will be set up and run by the board.

Ms WHITE: Paragraph (d) talks about making this centre the headquarters for the Australian wine industry. Under what conditions will the wine industry bodies be housed at the centre? For example, will they pay market rents and, if so, by what method would such rents be determined?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Just as an aside, I think it is important to note that there has been a pretty fantastic decision made in Canberra. The tariff is to remain at 15 per cent until 2005 and then 10 per cent thereafter. So, it has been a magnificent success story for our Premier and for South Australia. In terms of the question, market rates will prevail and the market will determine that sort of proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN: The member has already asked three questions on this, which is the maximum allowed.

Ms WHITE: There are at least seven subclauses to this, and I have asked only one on—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has other colleagues.

Ms WHITE: I have only two more.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, if the Minister is happy for that to occur.

Ms WHITE: Paragraph (e) refers to dining and refreshment facilities. Will there be a restaurant? If so, has the Government had discussions with any individual restaurant operator and will a contract for such a restaurant go to public tender?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: A reference group will be set up to discuss the issues of dining and refreshments because, clearly, the centre will need one, and it will be part

of the whole planning of the centre. There has been no discussion at all with any individual person.

Ms WHITE: Paragraph (f) states 'to carry out other works'. Does that include demolition of existing buildings?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No, that provision does not mean that. That is in relation to any building, landscaping or exterior facilities, or whatever. If there is to be any demolition, that is to take place under section 49.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 12 passed.

Clause 13.

Ms WHITE: How much will board members be paid?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That has not been determined.

Clause passed.

Clause 14 passed.

Clause 15.

Ms WHITE: Do the penalties under clauses 15 and 16 differ from the usual level of penalty?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Apparently, these correspond with those under the Public Corporations Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

Ms WHITE: Subclause (3) provides that a delegation may be made to a particular person or a particular person occupying a particular office or position. Is there anything to stop an interstate person from operating as the principal for the centre?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government appoints the board and, as a consequence, the board would make any delegation. However, at the end of the day, it is responsible to the Minister. So, if there was any delegation that was outside the general view of the Government, the Minister could step in.

Clause passed.

Clause 22.

Ms WHITE: Does the Minister have anyone in mind for the Chief Executive position and what would he anticipate that such a person, once appointed, would be paid?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I have not had any discussions with anyone. My understanding is that no discussions have taken place with anyone about this position. This is the board's decision, not the Minister's.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (23 to 30) passed.

Schedule.

Mr ATKINSON: I would have liked to ask a question in Question Time today but, as a result of the Government's padding up, we cannot ask many questions.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Good, as the member for Peake says. It is a happenstance that the question I wanted to ask is raised by the schedule, which I note makes the boundaries of the wine centre Plane Avenue, Hackney Road and First Creek. Within those boundaries is Tram Barn A. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources told the House on 20 April 1994:

It has reached a stage where a decision needs to be made, and I have made that decision. . . I have therefore determined that Tram Barn A will remain. . . Tram Barn A, as all members should know, is on the State, national and local heritage registers.

That is the Minister talking to Parliament. Sometime later the then Premier wrote to a West Croydon constituent of mine and in that letter he said:

I have not yet been presented with any evidence which would make me believe that my Government's decision to protect the Tram Barn was incorrect. Consequently, I can assure you that there is no plan to reverse this decision. Indeed, as you note, I am presently exploring possible uses for what I regard as a valuable asset.

Naturally, those assurances from the Premier and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources were welcomed by electric traction enthusiasts and by people who are fond of South Australia's engineering history. What is the status of Tram Barn A now under Government policy in light of the Bill?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No decision has been made on the future of Tram Barn A but, if there is a decision once the planning and design is completed, to remove it, it can be removed, according to section 49.

Mr ATKINSON: There is a clear policy laid down by the Government in a statement to Parliament and in a letter on the Premier's letterhead. Is the Minister saying that the Government has changed its policy and now there is a possibility that Tram Barn A can be demolished and, if so, what procedure will the Government be following and what opportunity will there be for public input in that regard?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Section 49 of the Development Act.

Mr ATKINSON: That is not a satisfactory answer to the question. Will the Government inform the Committee of the terms of section 49 of the Development Act so that readers of *Hansard* will have some idea what is in that section?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Section 49, Crown developments, would apply if the Government chooses to knock over Tram Barn A.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 1 July at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Tuesday 3 June 1997****QUESTIONS ON NOTICE****PASSENGER TRANSPORT BOARD CONTRACTS****9. Mr ATKINSON:**

1. How much will the Government's subsidy to Serco, Hills Transit and TransAdelaide cost, respectively, for the first 12 months of the contract system?

2. Will the Minister release a summary of the tender documents certified by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information.

1. Under the terms of the existing contracts between the Passenger Transport Board (PTB) and metropolitan bus service

contractors, payments are made by the PTB for services provided and for patronage outcomes achieved. Contract payments are not a 'subsidy', as the Government is neither subsidising nor guaranteeing the financial position of contractors as part of the contracts. In comparison, prior to January 1997, funding for TransAdelaide's non-contracted metropolitan services was provided by way of a subsidy, reflecting the gap between the cost of the services provided and any off-setting external income derived by TransAdelaide.

Following the awarding of negotiated bus, train and tram contracts to TransAdelaide in January 1997, all funding for metropolitan public transport is now provided by way of service contracts. The total cost for contracted services in 1995-96 was \$15.415 million. The total cost of contracted services for 1996-97 will be available at the end of this financial year, following certification of the PTB's financial statements by the Auditor-General.

2. The Auditor-General, as part of the annual audit process within the PTB, has free and complete access to all tender documentation submitted to the PTB and to all evaluation reports prepared by the PTB. The report of the Auditor-General for the 1995-96 financial year has already been laid before this House. No summary of tender documents has been prepared as part of the audit process.

In regard to the Hills Transit bus service contract, no 'tender' was submitted by the company. The PTB awarded a contract to Hills Transit, following negotiation of a proposal submitted by Hills Transit.