

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 March 1992

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Motor Vehicles (Historic Vehicles and Disabled Person's Parking) Amendment,
Parliament (Joint Parliamentary Service Committee) Amendment,
Urban Land Trust (Urban Consolidation) Amendment.

STATE LOTTERIES (SOCCER POOLS AND OTHER) AMENDMENT BILL

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

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I notice in this place he whom I have always regarded as the member for Kavel. In light of a Liberal Party advertisement of 17 March which canvasses candidates for the electorate of Kavel for a by-election, which as the advertisement states 'will be on 9 May 1992', can you, Sir, give the House an assurance that Mr Goldsworthy is indeed the member for Kavel and technically is not a stranger?

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Kavel at this stage is a member of the House and has not resigned.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 259, 279, 284, 297, 305, 313, 316, 317, 319 to 323, 326 to 329, 332, 333, 336 to 338, 340, 341, 343 to 345, 347, 355, 357 to 359, 361 to 372, 374, 376, 379, 384 to 386, 389, 390, 392 to 402 and 408 to 413; and I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RIVER RED GUMS VANDALISM

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 20 February.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: The vandalism of four river red gums near Chowilla was first reported to the National Parks and Wildlife Service on 24 October 1991. The site was inspected by the District Ranger and Mr Schmidt on 5 November 1991 when it was determined that one of the trees had been ringbarked and three had been engraved with initials and other identifying marks. Officers of the Resource Protection Branch of the National Parks and Wildlife Service believe they know who the offender/s are. It appears that holidaymakers from Victoria, travelling on a houseboat, may have caused the damage.

While the trees are not sited in a national park, officers have made inquiries with the Victorian Department of Conservation

and Environment with a view to interviewing the alleged offenders for possible offences under the Native Vegetation Act 1991. Further action will be considered when a report has been received from the Victorian authorities.

OPERATION HYGIENE

In reply to **Mrs KOTZ (Newland)** 12 February.

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER**: In reply to Mrs Kotz's question asked of the Premier, Hon. J.C. Bannon, MP, on 12 February 1992, concerning Operation Hygiene, I offer the following information.

As indicated in the report on Operation Hygiene tabled in the Parliament, inquiries are still continuing into a number of 'suspect officers' still employed in the South Australia Police Department. The details on the exact number will not be released as it impacts on operational police matters. It must be stressed that as investigations continue into the suspect officers it may be revealed that the suspicions were unfounded. However, if sufficient evidence is obtained to warrant the charging of these persons, then that will occur.

The question of 'Executive Power' for the Commissioner of Police to enforce absolute standards of integrity and fidelity is still under consideration by the Government. The Commissioner of Police extends an invitation for the honourable member to participate in a confidential briefing on these matters if she so desires.

WHEAT MARKETING TRUST FUND

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 30 October.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: Only the wheat and barley industries contribute to the South Australian Grain Industry Trust Fund. I believe it appropriate to add that on the recommendation of United Farmers and Stockowners, no levy has been struck for wheat since the 1988-89 season. It is my understanding the UF&S believes the level of contributions to the fund by South Australian wheat growers is adequate for the time being.

STAR FORCE

In reply to **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** 18 February.

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER**: The Police STAR Force has been used for prisoner escort only on rare occasions. It has not been a normal role. The member for Bright will be aware of new arrangements recently announced by the Minister of Correctional Services in relation to escorts for high risk prisoners.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSIONER

In reply to **Mr ATKINSON (Spence)** 26 November.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: In the complaint referred to by Mr Atkinson, which was made to the Equal Opportunity Commission, the complainant identified the respondent as BTR Engineering. The Commissioner is obliged by law, under section 93 (3) of the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 (SA), upon a complaint being lodged, to cause a written summary of particulars of the complaint to be served, personally or by post, upon the respondent named in the complaint. So, in accordance with the Equal Opportunity Commission's usual administrative practice, a company search at the Australian Securities Commission was undertaken to determine the correct name of the company, the names of the directors of that company and the company's registered office.

After these details were ascertained, a letter giving notice of the complaint was sent to the directors of BTR Engineering (Australia) Limited at the company's registered office in Melbourne. Contrary to the suggestion in Mr Atkinson's question, the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity did not write to directors of the company individually. It is the usual procedure of the Equal Opportunity Commission, where a company's registered office is interstate, to give notice of a complaint to the appropriate South Australian manager of the company named in the complaint. I consider this to be good administrative practice.

As the registered office of BTR Engineering (Australia) Limited was in Victoria, a telephone call by an officer at the Equal Opportunity Commission was made to the appropriate South Australian Office of BTR Engineering (Australia) Limited. The officer was informed that correspondence should be addressed to

the Foundry Manager. Subsequently, a letter giving notice of the complaint was sent to the Foundry Manager of BTR Engineering (Australia) Limited at Bowden, South Australia. In total two letters advising of the complaint against BTR Engineering (Australia) Limited were sent.

WHEAT AND BARLEY INDUSTRIES

In reply to Mr **BLACKER (Flinders)** 30 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: During the Committee stage of the Wheat Marketing (Trust Fund) Amendment Bill, I indicated that the deed defines a wide range of grains or seeds as eligible items under the trust fund and the deed is similarly wide when defining research. While the trustees therefore have a flexible charter, clause 5 of the deed stipulates that they shall not make payment for research purposes without prior, written authorisation by the United Farmers and Stockowners. Accordingly, it is the UF&S as the governing body which ultimately determines the nature of the research to be funded.

I believe it is important to set this background and, having done so, it seems realistic to predict that wheat and barley will remain the principal beneficiaries under the trust arrangement. That is not to say other industries will be denied but as the only contributors to the fund up to this time, wheat and barley have staked a very large claim. Over the years the actual amounts contributed by wheat and barley producers has varied depending on the levy rate and annual production. It is not for me to predict how the trust funds will be apportioned between industries. However, there no doubt will equitable distribution by the trustees acting in concern with UF&S and with trends in the wheat, barley and other markets firmly in sight.

TREES FOR LIFE

In reply to Dr **ARMITAGE (Adelaide)** 7 March.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As advised in my media release of 22 October 1990, I did support Trees for Life by growing seedlings at my ministerial office. Arrangements have been made with Trees for Life for boxes of seeds to be planted by my office next season.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—65th General Report.
Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to the Judiciary.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Justices Act 1921—Rules—Court Fees.
Education Act 1972—Regulations—Director-General.
Fair Trading Act 1987—Regulations—Health and Fitness Businesses.
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Corporation Licences.
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Regulations—Court Fees.
Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Regulations—Court Fees.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Regulations—Court Fees.
Probate Fees.
Trustee Act 1936—Regulation—Commonwealth Bank.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Vehicle Inspection Fees.
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease, 26 February 1992.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Refuse Burning—Marion and Mitcham.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Regulations—Gas Fitting.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Women and TAFE—A National Plan of Action.
The Flinders University of South Australia Act—By-laws—South Australian College of Advanced Education Revocation.

Corporation By-laws—

- Glenelg—No. 3—Vehicle Movement.
- Noarlunga—No. 1—Penalties and Permits.
- No. 2—Flammable Undergrowth.
- No. 3—Bees.
- No. 4—Petrol Pumps.
- No. 5—Dogs.
- No. 6—Animals, Birds and Poultry.
- No. 7—Caravans and Tents.
- No. 8—Parks, Playgrounds and Reserves.
- No. 9—Streets and Street Traders.
- No. 10—Traffic.
- No. 11—Garbage.
- No. 12—Bridges and Jetties.
- No. 13—Beach and Foreshore.
- No. 14—Bird Scarers.
- No. 15—Signs.
- No. 16—Repeal of By-laws.

MATTER OF URGENCY: UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER: I have to report the receipt of the following matter of urgency from the Leader of the Opposition:

That, in view of the latest labour force figures published last Thursday, this House—

- condemns the Government on behalf of the more than 83 000 South Australians who are now unemployed which is a greater number than at any time in the State's history including during the Great Depression;
- condemns the Treasurer for the tragedy of allowing youth unemployment to exceed 40 per cent, thereby undermining the working future of South Australia;
- condemns the Government for the State's overall unemployment rate of 11.5 per cent which is worse than any other State or Territory and far higher than the Australian average of 10.5 per cent;
- recognises that the main reason for South Australia having the worst economic problems in the nation is the failure by the Premier and Treasurer to properly supervise Government instrumentalities like the State Bank, SGIC, SAFA and SATCO or to take the tough economic and financial decisions needed; and
- calls on the Government as a matter of urgency to now take the following actions to reverse the alarming rise in unemployment:

1. honour the promise first made by the Premier in 1980 to lead a national campaign for the abolition of payroll tax, which is an iniquitous tax on jobs and exports;
2. change our labour laws to allow genuine voluntary unionism and enterprise bargaining which will create jobs based on workplace circumstances, cooperation and increased productivity;
3. cut wasteful recurrent spending and increase capital expenditure on infrastructure projects of lasting value which can create jobs and improve efficiency;
4. restructure WorkCover and reduce levy rates from the current average of 3.8 per cent of payroll to levels competitive with New South Wales where the average is 1.8 per cent of payroll;
5. ensure that no school leaver is unemployed through want of a place in a university, TAFE college, apprenticeship or traineeship scheme;
6. privatise institutions like the State Bank and the SGIC and sell off unnecessary assets to reduce State debt and the annual interest burden on that \$6.6 billion debt;
7. provide incentives for industry, business and Government decentralisation into country and regional towns; and
8. reduce regulation and other red tape that is stifling business and honour the promise first made in 1985 to introduce a 'one-stop-shop' for business.

I ask that the Leader condense his motions in future. Members who support the proposal please rise in their places.

Members having risen:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! A matter of urgency has been raised in this House. I suggest to those members of the

Opposition who are making a noise that it is their motion, and I remind the Government that this is a matter of urgency. The honourable Leader.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): 'South Australia's unemployed want jobs now. We need a new approach to economic management in South Australia. We need a Government willing to take positive action to protect jobs and to develop new employment opportunities.' Those words were uttered by the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier of South Australia, in 1982—very familiar words. He went on to say:

The Labor Party's alternatives are on the record. Our commitment to taking the responsibility of developing the State is clear. South Australia can no longer afford the dubious record of having high unemployment. The State cannot afford the continuation of the present deterioration of our economic position.

That statement was made when unemployment in South Australia was 8 per cent. We all know from the announcement last week what the situation in South Australia is today. Unemployment has reached 11.5 per cent, by far the highest in Australia: 83 100 South Australians are unemployed. The State with the second highest rate of unemployment is Victoria, with 11.1 per cent. There are 7 500 more South Australians unemployed than the national average of 10.5 per cent. During February alone, 110 South Australians a day joined the dole queue in this State. There are now 13 400 15 to 19 year olds looking for work in this State. Compared with the situation in 1982 when we had a world recession—not the man-made recession that we have now—30 000 more South Australians are unemployed. That is equivalent to the total population of Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln.

Compared with the Great Depression, under the leadership of this Premier, 59 000 more South Australians are unemployed today. It is no good for the Premier to tell us that it is someone else's fault; it is no good trying to put the blame onto the Prime Minister or, as he was then, the world's greatest Treasurer, because it was this Premier who was the ALP President and who condoned the policies of the Federal Labor Government. It is this Premier who has set the policy direction for South Australia, and it is this Premier alone who must take the blame.

The Premier cannot blame anyone else for the \$2 200 million loss of the State Bank of South Australia; he cannot blame anyone else for the \$81 million loss of SGIC; and he cannot blame anyone else but himself and his incompetent Ministers for the \$74 million loss involving the Scrimber operation and the failed attempt to buy some timber mills in New Zealand. It is the Premier alone who must take responsibility for the increase in this State's debt from \$2.6 billion to \$6.6 billion. It is the Premier alone who must take responsibility for the average WorkCover levy in this State being 3.8 per cent compared with the New South Wales levy of 1.8 per cent. The Premier's failed policies and the financial mismanagement that has occurred in South Australia under his leadership are his responsibility alone and no-one else's. It is about time he stood up to take responsibility for it. Many South Australian families are hurting badly because of those policies and, at the last budget when he had the ability to take some tough decisions to help the financial predicament of South Australia, the Premier opted not to make any of those decisions.

We saw a real increase of 6.7 per cent in spending at a time when we desperately needed a cut in expenditure; over \$500 million extra was spent under the last budget. We saw a dramatic cut in capital expenditure at a time when South Australians were screaming out for some capital expenditure to be spent: the Premier cut it by \$100 million. This Gov-

ernment has been snap frozen: it has no ability to make any of the decisions necessary to try to get South Australia going again. Even the Labor Premiers of Western Australia and Victoria have taken some very tough decisions in the interests of getting their State going again. For the sake of this State, I urge the Premier to read carefully the proposal we have put to this House and to act on some of the points. It is no good for the Premier to sit there, do nothing and expect something to come good, because it will not. Those eight points we have made are what the Opposition has been talking about for the past two years as options that need to be carried out, and I call on the Premier to do something about the situation and at least to try to make some decisions to get the State going.

In relation to those points, 12 years ago the Premier announced that he was ready to lead a national campaign to abolish payroll tax. What have we heard since then? Absolutely nothing. What about the reform of the labour market that we need so badly? It has been revealed to the South Australian Parliament that the Remm project cost an extra \$100 million because of industrial disputation on that site—\$100 million of taxpayers' money. What about the workers compensation costs that have been crippling business in South Australia? What about the promise that that would be controlled? The cost now stands at double that in New South Wales, one of the other competitor States. What about the desperate need for regional development in South Australia to try to get people in country areas working again? Nothing has been done about that at all. What about this bureaucratic maze of red tape that we see in South Australia? At two elections, the Premier has made a promise to do something about it, and nothing whatsoever has been done, the Premier has failed in all those cases.

The Premier has been pontificating in the past few days about the responsibilities of the Opposition. That is the greatest hypocrisy that I have ever heard since coming into this place. Under his leadership, the State's debt has been rising at the rate of \$1 million a day. Just think of that! Ever since he has been in power, this State's debt has gone up \$1 million a day; yet he has the temerity to complain about the cost of a by-election. For two hours of every day that he has been Premier of South Australia, he has cost us that by-election, so it is absolute hypocrisy to go along that line.

The Premier cannot blame the Opposition for the squandering of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. He cannot blame the Opposition for the problems of the failed instrumentalities in this State. He cannot blame the Opposition for wrecking the future of nearly half our young people and, above all, the future of the 11.5 per cent of people who are unemployed in this State. That is the Government's problem, the Government's responsibility, and only the Premier of South Australia can take the responsibility for fixing it or take the blame for causing it. It is no good whatsoever trying to blame the Opposition. Over the past two years, the Opposition has been very responsible in making sure that the public of South Australia understands the mismanagement of this Premier. I well concede that the Opposition has had some internal problems—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: It is all very well for members opposite to laugh, but I can tell you, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward is out of order.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I can tell you now that we have made some tough decisions to fix it up. I made that decision about South Australia's future because, if South

Australia does not get a Liberal Government in this State, there will not be just 40 per cent of our young people unemployed—God knows where we will be! These people have mismanaged this State for the 10 years that they have been in power. It is an absolute disgrace. I am proud that the Opposition in South Australia has made some decisions to fix up things on this side of the House to ensure that there will be a Liberal Government in South Australia after the next election, and that will give some hope to South Australians. What about the Premier telling us what he is going to do to turn this State around! Is he going to wait for the royal commission to hand down its findings and sit there putting more people out of work in South Australia, or is he going to have the guts to do something about it? I urge members to support this motion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This is no matter of urgency with which the House should be spending its time. It is no matter of urgency at all. It is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair ensured that the Leader of the Opposition had a clear run with his speech and will do the same with the Leader of the Government.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is not a matter of urgency to which the House needs to be devoting its time. It is a pretext, a cover, pure and simple, for the total disarray in Opposition ranks for their own problems. It is a vain attempt in some sort of swan song performance by the Leader of the Opposition to have his colleagues feeling that he is not that bad and they should forgive him and let him stay or, alternatively, let him have his last little say. It is disgraceful, with all the major issues of the day that could be questioned, with all the matters with which this House could be dealing, that the Leader of the Opposition rehashes and reruns this tired old rhetoric that we have had to put up with week after week and month after month.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will deal with some of it in just a minute. This motion, this pretext, this cover up of the problems, has hung around the unemployment figures that were published for the last month. They came out last Thursday and the Opposition has chosen to highlight that month's figures and to use them to hang all this nonsense on. It was interesting that the previous month's figures showed a .7 per cent reduction in South Australia's unemployment, they showed employment growth and they showed us as comparatively not the worst off in Australia. The Leader wants to remember back to month after dreary month of the Tonkin Government.

When these particular monthly figures showed a very good outcome for South Australia—just last month—what did we hear? A deafening silence—not a word was said and not a question was asked—because it was good news for South Australia then and it may be bad news this month; so, this month it is right at the top of the agenda. That is the cynical opportunism with which we are being confronted consistently in this place. That is the reason why the Opposition has a leadership crisis. It is not just the fault of the Leader or of his conniving, scheming and plotting colleagues or those outside the Party who want to do him in: it is to do with the sterility of the Liberal Party itself. It has no alternative to offer, no vision, no drive, no commitment to South Australia, but the constant putting down of this State whenever and wherever it can.

If the news is good, it says nothing; if the news is good there is silence. But if it is bad news, it is trumpeted from the roof tops, sent out in a thousand faxes and commented on by a dozen Opposition spokesmen, and is misinterpreted.

It is outrageous. This morning was a good example involving the hapless Deputy Leader: trying to remind people that he is still around and has some sort of job, he puts out a statement on the issue of debt. He uses ABS figures to deal with debt levels in the various States—we might hear a little about that shortly, too—and yet again he completely misunderstands the figures, which in fact show South Australia to be well placed, indeed, because the percentages he draws on—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —prove the opposite of the case that the honourable member tried to make. This happens time and again. If the news is bad, trumpet it. If it is good, be quiet. That is the sterility with which we are dealing. What have we been doing? Which State—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, they want to block this out; they do not want to hear it. Which State has led the whole campaign for major infrastructure commitment by the Federal Government to get the economy started? South Australia! Where was the Opposition when we did that? Silence! The Opposition was nowhere in support at all. Which State has had the most and major impact in the economic statement by the Federal Government?

Which State has commissioned a major economic study into the structure of our economy, working with industry to try to ensure that we have schemes to go ahead? What about the planning review, which will make us the doyen of States in terms of approvals and the way in which planning is adopted? What about the export drive that has seen the formation of a council concertedly working? ATCF, an automotive panel, is working on restructuring our industry here. We have manufacturing and high tech, and the MFP is a national project that members opposite want to denigrate and put down. We will hear more about that as the day goes by. Time and again we are presenting these things, looking to a vision and to something that can be done, but all we hear from the other side is knocking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Against that background we have the audacity of the Leader of the Opposition talking about our public expenditure and capital works programs. What has he been doing for the last few years but constantly carping and attacking while at the same time he lets his backbenchers and frontbenchers run riot with proposals for public expenditure? They are against anything that requires a cut-back but, at the same time, the Leader is happy to criticise our borrowing levels; he is happy to criticise expenditure and say that he would have a 9 per cent cut across the board. What would that do to the poor and the underprivileged in this State as services were removed?

That shows the hypocrisy of this move. We are attempting to maintain a reasonable level of public services and a capital works program that is substantial, but we are constantly attacked by the Opposition for the means whereby we do it. Look at this motion and the details of it. As I said, we are condemned on this month's figures and we are told that we are doing nothing.

Is there any support by the Opposition for the State Bank, which recently produced its half-yearly report indicating the major changes that have been made to get it on track? Not a bit. I would be very interested if Senator Olsen returns and sits in the Leader of the Opposition's place, because I will ask him about this matter of controlling the State Bank and why he moved certain amendments which make it even more difficult for there to be any kind of Government supervision or control. That would be an interesting little

question, but that is down the track. SGIC is mentioned. We have a select committee and a new Act, as a result of reports to which we are committed to get that organisation into shape. SAFA, which has been returning millions and millions of dollars to our budget every year, is constantly attacked by the Opposition.

Mr D.S. Baker: Sleazy nonsense!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Sleazy nonsense, Mr Speaker. This is the so-called businessman talking. It is absolutely disgraceful. Then we go on to the other long list which includes the payroll tax campaign. Yes, I have led such a campaign. Indeed, this State has reduced, against these economic circumstances, payroll tax. Our rate was lowered in the last budget. In fact, we are between 13 per cent and 3 per cent lower, depending on what level you choose, than interstate payroll tax rates. We have done what we can about payroll tax, and no thanks to the Opposition for that. What about labour laws? What about the restructuring, which is actively supported by us, going on in our industry?

The Opposition raises the question of recurrent spending and increased capital spending on infrastructure projects such as the MFP. What do members opposite want to do? They want to attack it. We have made the big submissions to the Federal Government. We have got the commitment for projects here. We are ensuring that we are doing our bit. I hope that this afternoon will see that support.

The restructuring of WorkCover is mentioned. A select committee is about to report on that, and action will be taken. Meanwhile, there has been the announcement of a reduction in the average payroll levy of WorkCover, and there will be more as we have promised there will be. I will leave my colleague to deal with TAFE. What about this other point? The Leader of the Opposition is going to privatise institutions, sell off the State Bank and SGIC at some sort of fire sale at the lowest level of the market. That will do nothing for our debt and our position. It is a furphy and a hoax on the people of South Australia.

The reduction of red tape and regulation is mentioned. That is a good one; I like that. We established the office of the Deregulation Adviser. We established sunset clauses which mean that all regulations automatically expire. We did that; the Opposition did not. It has opposed the abolition of marketing boards. It wanted potatoes regulated. The Opposition was not going to let South-East potato growers package their spuds in different types of bags. It fought to the death to preserve the Potato Board, and it is still fighting for the Egg Board to maintain its control.

The Opposition opposed the deregulation of petrol selling hours and shop trading hours. It has consistently opposed most of the major deregulation initiatives. This is worth nothing. It is hypocrisy. So, Mr Speaker, what is it about? What are we talking about? We are talking about a very interesting sequence of events—a sequence of events that began with the fair dinkum resignation of the Hon. Ted Chapman, the member for Alexandra. Unfortunately, that member no longer sits in his place in the House. He did that for motives and reasons that have been on the public record for a long time. A former colleague was duded by a member who does sit here, as members of the Liberal Party contested a seat against each other—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Good luck to him, because the electorate supported him. But, this rejected member of 1985 is to come back, apparently through the seat of Alexandra. Well, panic ensues. The member for Bragg has been walking around saying that he has the numbers, and that in about three weeks he will deliver the fatal blow.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, daring to woo and yet afraid to strike. Suddenly he is pre-empted, and there is a great scurry. He and the member for Coles and others get into the act. Then, out of the blue, suddenly the member for Kavel decides that, in the interests of the Party, he will do the right thing and resign so that Senator Olsen, the former Leader of the Opposition in this State, can be brought back.

The current Leader of the Opposition says, 'In those circumstances, faced with such an overwhelming talent returning to our ranks, I am prepared, modestly, to step down.' The deal, I understand, is that he steps down to be Deputy Leader, and bumped along the front bench is his colleague by the same name sitting next to him. Anyway, he is prepared to do that—a noble sacrifice in the interests of his Party: yes, the Party indeed, and nothing to do with the interests of South Australia. He is prepared to bring back someone who was re-elected as Leader but left South Australia to go to the Federal level at that time. Very interesting!

Incidentally, we are told in today's paper that the result of some poll vindicates last week's decision by the Liberal Party to replace the current Leader. I am not sure what sort of decision it is. There are many stages to be gone through. Perhaps it was a decision by the Liberal Party. Did the Deputy Leader agree with this decision? Did the member for Heysen or the member for Coles agree? Indeed, did the member for Bragg, the man with the numbers, agree with this decision to replace the Leader. I would hazard, from the look on their faces, that not one of them knew anything about it. So, we have Ingerson and Cashmore—forget about the Deputy Leader.

The only defeated or resigned member who has not reappeared is Michael Wilson. Perhaps a seat will be made available for him. The member for Adelaide may make the big sacrifice and bring back Michael Wilson. I suggest that there are a few other options. What about Steele Hall? Compare him with John Olsen. Unlike Senator Olsen, he was not just the Leader of the Opposition; he has also been a Premier. He has not just been in the Senate; he has also been in the House of Representatives. Most importantly, he has had multi-Party experience. But no, Mr Speaker, I prefer the low cost option. There it is, with no by-election needed for Senator Olsen which will cost us another \$70 000. There he sits, the man who ran Don Dunstan to within the Speaker's casting vote in 1975—the member for Light, ready, willing and able, at no cost to the taxpayer, to take up the Liberal leadership. This motion is a disgrace!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will tell you what constructive steps we are taking in respect of unemployment. Good Governments need good Oppositions: lift your game!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Custance is testing the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): We can clearly understand why Peter Ward has great difficulty in putting together a biography of the Premier. We know that the Premier has failed to make an impact. He has no substance, no flair, no vision and has given a rotten performance. I thought it was very well summed up when he said, 'We are told that there is a devastating lack of interest in the subject', in other words, the subject of the Premier's biography, and we have had another demonstration of that today. What has the Premier said? He has said that there is no urgency about unemployment and that there is no reason for us to move this motion today. I would have

thought there are 83 000 reasons why we should be moving this motion today.

The Premier stood up here in a grand farce and decided to deflect attention from the figures, because not once did he address the motion before us. However, he did try to hide the problems within his own Party, with Messrs Groom and McKee. We know what is going on within the ranks of members opposite, and nobody needs to be told.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is quite obvious that the Premier of this State has a limited time in this Government, and that will be to the benefit of all South Australians. At least while he is here he could put up a decent performance and address the most dramatic situation that this State has faced since the Great Depression. It is devastating to have 83 100 people unemployed and 13 400 people in the 15 to 19 age group without hope of getting a job. It is devastating that this State's finances have collapsed in such a dramatic fashion.

What does the Premier, with his lacklustre performance, say to his constituents? There are 1 500 young people in the 15 to 19 age group in his electorate. Is he saying, 'I don't care about the 600 youth that do not have a hope of getting a job at the moment'? Is that what the Premier is saying or is he hiding behind the rhetoric we have heard today? What about the Deputy Premier whose main claim to fame has been closing wards and extending queues? There are 2 900 young people facing unemployment in his electorate, 1 200 of whom cannot get a job. What about those people? What about the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology who has been frightening business away from this State?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, he has been. The Minister should look at the figures because they are quite clear. We have lost thousands from manufacturing, and the Minister has presided over a record number of bankruptcies. In his electorate there are 3 300 young people, 1 300 of whom have no hope of getting a job. What does he say to his electors? What about the Minister of Education who is keeping together a very creaky education system? He has 1 900 young people in his electorate, 800 of whom are doomed to no job. What does he say to his constituents? What about the Minister of Transport who has been shutting down buses and opening gaol doors? What does he say to the 2 000 kids in his electorate who are waiting for a job? What about the 800 who cannot get a job?

What about the Minister of Recreation and Sport? He has 2 000 young people in his electorate, 800 of whom do not have a hope of getting a job. What does he say to them? What about the Minister for Environment and Planning who has operated on an open-mouth policy for some time? I wonder what she is saying to her constituents. She has more constituents than any other member. What does she say to the 3 500 young people in the 15 to 19 age group in her electorate and the 1 400 young people who do not have a hope of getting a job? What does she say to them? What about the Minister of Labour? What does he say, when he is awake, to the 2 800 young constituents in the 15 to 19 age group and the 1 200 that do not have a hope of getting a job?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is very hard to protect the Deputy Leader from his own side.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What does the 'Minister of Unemployment' say to his constituents? He has 2 500 young people in his electorate, 1 000 of whom do not have a hope of getting a job. The only thing that he has kickstarted is the dramatic increase in unemployment. What about the Min-

ister of Emergency Services? He is still picking his way through the forests at this time. What does he say to the 2 800 young people aged 15 to 19 in his electorate, 1 200 of whom do not have a hope of getting a job?

What do Government Ministers say to their constituents? We have given the answer. What have we heard from the Premier? The Premier said today that there is absolutely no urgency. It does not matter that 83 000 people do not have a job. It does not matter that all those young people do not have any hope. He said that we are being a bit unkind, that we are hanging on to monthly figures. He has not looked at the trend figures for South Australia. I am not referring to today's figures or to yesterday's figures—this has been going on for two years, and he knows it.

The situation is getting worse, but what has the Premier done? He sits there and smiles. The Premier thinks it is a joke. He said that if the news is good the Opposition is silent. Have we had any really good news for South Australia since he became Premier of this State, particularly in the past two years? Tell us about the good news. What has happened in the past two years to make people smile?

The Premier said, 'We are well placed.' He should talk to the people who are losing their homes, who are being bankrupted and who are losing their jobs, and to the kids who are out on the streets. Why does the Premier not talk to them and see how well placed they think we are? Of course he will not: he wants to use this Parliament as his own forum and for his own devices, not to answer the questions that all South Australians are asking.

We have heard a list of things that the Premier is doing, but they are all talk, they are all words. What has he actually done? Has he made any strong, honest, just decision in this Parliament? Can any member in this Parliament name one decision that has helped this State in the past two years? Quite clearly, they cannot. He says he is looking for a vision—those were his words—but what we have is an absolute mirage, as usual. He has been leading the band to do something about payroll tax, but has he done anything himself? Has he convinced that Treasurer who said this was the recession that we had to have that the payroll tax issue is important? We have convinced the country. The Fight-back package is a reality, and it will be there. But what has the Treasurer done to convince his own colleagues of the worth of that package, particularly in relation to payroll tax?

The Premier said, 'What good does it do to sell off our assets; what good does it do to sell off the State Bank?' I remind the Premier that we went \$2.2 billion down the drain in relation to the State Bank on its own. What happens to State debt under the present interest rates? Obviously, if we can pull back from that State debt situation, we will improve our finance. That is the problem with this Premier and Treasurer: he simply does not understand the most fundamental employment, finance and other statistics. After all the Premier has said, I ask the House, 'What do we have?' We still have 83 100 unemployed, including all those 134 000 young people on the dole queue, not to mention all the other people in the 45 year-plus age bracket.

Leaving aside the problem of youth unemployment—which is absolutely critical, because those people must have some hope for the future—what about the Labor electors who are working-class people and who are proud ALP supporters? What has happened to them as they have lost their job? They are devastated, but the Government does not care: the Premier has said it is not a matter of urgency. Of course, it is a matter of urgency. In 1980, you, Mr Speaker, stated:

It is, however, in the area of unemployed young people where the greatest risk and need is. Unless we can give these people a meaningful life, we will effectively destroy Australia.

That is what you, Mr Speaker, said, and you were right. That was when unemployment was only 8 per cent, not 11.5 per cent and climbing—and everyone knows the figures and knows that they are getting worse. The Premier stands up in this House and raves on about what he has written and what he has talked about but not what he has done. The Premier stands condemned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): We have heard a great deal. What we have heard today is a smokescreen that was designed to prevent Question Time. The Leader of the Opposition's failed tactical response group met last night and asked, 'How the hell do we prevent Question Time tomorrow? How the hell do we cover up the civil war that is going on in the Liberal Party at the moment? How the hell do we stop members on our side of the House, our own troops, who have come to realise that people in our own Party who are unelected have decided that not one elected person is fit enough to lead the Party?' They have to import two Leaders who have failed in the past: one who was the longest serving losing Liberal Leader in Australia's history and the other who was beaten by Stan. That is what it is all about.

In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition talked about guts; he talked about fighting. I heard the same thing on the 7.30 Report on Friday night. He said he was a fighter, but he failed to fight; he said he was not a quitter, but he quit. He also said that he had never failed in anything he did, but he failed to get the support of South Australians and he failed to get the support of his own Party. What we are seeing at the moment is a desperate attempt by a few unelected bovver boys in the Liberal Party—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I knew you would like that—like Nick Minchin, who basically has decided to do a deal without consulting with the member for Coles, the member for Bragg and the member for Mitcham. I can understand the honourable member's rather flat performance because he woke up this morning and realised that he is going to be without a big white car and a bigger salary. Who are these faceless men who tell you what to do? Who are these faceless men who have decided that the member for Bragg, the member for Mitcham, the member for Adelaide—the Dan Quayle of the Liberal Party—or the member for Coles are not fit enough to do the job?

A few fundamental questions need to be asked because this 'bring back John Olsen' scenario has been talked about since November last year. Two weeks ago it was common knowledge in the Canberra press gallery that senior Federal Liberals wanted Mr Baker and his Western Australian counterpart (Barry McKinnon) out of their jobs. Federal Liberal Party polling apparently revealed that both Mr Baker and Mr McKinnon were electoral lemons who were impeding the Federal Coalition's attempts to sell its GST package.

We on this side of the House were told—because we used to get copies of your polling, and you ring us up and tell us what terrible people your colleagues are—it would not happen until after the 4 April Ashburton by-election or, more appropriately in the case of this Opposition, 1 April. The fact of the matter is that Ted Chapman's honourable action in fulfilling a deal that he made in 1985 to facilitate the return of Dean Brown brought on the crisis quickly, and the Leader of the Opposition did not get involved in a noble gesture. He was told that he would be rolled on

Tuesday unless he moved quickly. There are some very important questions that we have to start asking Mr Olsen. Does he regret the cost of these two career-driven by-elections? Does he also regret the fact that he is unable to reveal his parliamentary superannuation arrangements?

I want to talk about a few other things. Mention has been made of unemployment. Obviously, the February figures are tragic news for the unemployed. As I have said time and time again, and as I repeated two weeks ago, South Australia was one of the last States to feel the full impact of the recession and today's figures show that it continues to lag behind any recovery in employment. The latest unemployment figures relate to February, prior to the release of the economic statement on 26 February. Is the Leader of the Opposition trying to say that the One Nation statement has not worked because it has not applied retrospectively? That is how pathetic this motion is. The task is to lock in the gains of the One Nation statement. The funds must begin to flow swiftly.

Tackling the unemployment situation must be a national effort requiring national resolve and commitment. What it does not need are economic Quislings; what it does not need are economic traitors. What it does need is confidence, and that is exactly what we have not had from this Leader of the Opposition. In his swan song, he has tried to tell everyone that he has these things on the agenda. It was a pitiful, pathetic performance. Time and time again—and this is the reason that he has failed—whenever we fought for the MFP, for the submarines or for whatever else is important in this State, people like him have sniggered and sneered from the sidelines. That is why the public and his own party are saying that he is not good enough for the job. We cannot afford to let anyone talk down the gains or deliberately dent confidence in South Australia's future.

The Opposition's policies are surrender policies, surrender tactics. There is surrender in the Party and surrender is its policy for this State. Business and consumer confidence is critical for recovery and eventual job gains. Now is the time for us to work together to ensure this happens. The Commonwealth Government has made a dramatic change to its economic policy settings after months and months of people in this State—the Premier, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and me—lobbying and going to Canberra trying to get the sort of fiscal stimulus we were talking about. The past experience has shown that unemployment does not come down until the economy has moved well into recovery, and that is a continuing tragedy for the unemployed. We will see continuing high unemployment in this State until the national economic recovery locks in.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to 1982, when David Tonkin was Premier, and probably for the first time ever in my political career I have to disagree with the Premier. He said he thought that the member for Light should be brought back in to lead his Party, but I think it should be David Tonkin. Bring him back from London. At least he actually had the guts and was proud to say that under his leadership South Australia was going backwards more slowly.

We all remember that. Today the Leader of the Opposition says that we do not have a world recession at the moment. It is about time that Opposition members actually opened up newspapers and looked at what is happening in Japan, the United States, Britain and New Zealand. They should look at Britain and New Zealand in particular where Parties of their own persuasion are in power. Implications for Australia of the international economic situation continue to be of concern. A national turnaround, although slow in jobs terms, would in time flow through to boost

employment levels in this State. We have to work for that totally and committedly, not with the sneering that we have seen from the Opposition.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is interesting. The hapless number three about to become number five calls out from his side of the House. What single idea of employment have we heard from this Opposition Leader in the past two years? All the Opposition can hold up is a single piece of green paper—like returning from Munich and waving a bit of paper around, as their solution to South Australia's needs.

Reference has been made to TAFE. The simple fact is that last year we worked to secure extra funding for TAFE and recently the Federal Minister, Mr Beazley, announced that the Commonwealth is prepared to offer an extra \$720 million over the 1993-95 triennium to upgrade the TAFE system nationally and to ensure a sustained increase in participation in vocational education. South Australia's share will ensure thousands of extra TAFE places in 1993.

Of course, last year we negotiated with Mr Dawkins for \$9 million in extra funds for TAFE places, for millions of dollars in extra funds for prevocational places, and indeed we have also negotiated with Mr Beazley for extra funds—\$33 million across the nation—for apprenticeship support. But where was the Opposition? When did the Opposition once come out and support the Kickstart State Government strategy? Later today I will be announcing another four Kickstart regions, some of which are in the electorates of members opposite.

Where were they on the conservation corps; where were they on the big boost to TAFE funding; where were they in the big boost to prevocational fundings; and where were they in support for apprenticeship packages? They were silent. All we have ever heard is whingeing from the Opposition, and that is why their own Party, their apparatchiki on Greenhill Road, have decided that this Leader and this Deputy Leader have to go. What is more, they did not have the guts to fight in return.

I want to talk about what the Federal Opposition is proposing in contrast to this \$720 million Federal Government statement. The Government's proposals for a new system of vocational education and training stand in stark contrast to the hollow promises of the Opposition. The Hewson Opposition claims to support the sentiment of the Finn and Devision reports, which this and other State Governments around this nation have endorsed because of its importance to young people.

There is a promise to provide over \$500 million for TAFE over the next seven years, from 1994 to 2000—less than a third of the rate of expansion proposed by the Federal Labor Government. That is in stark contrast. Let us look at the Austrain proposals, work for the dole and cutting the kids off the dole. The Opposition has absolutely no interest in jobs for young people. The only jobs that Opposition members are interested in are those they are scrambling to secure in the current melee in the Opposition. I am sure that in the paper we will see it described as 'Phoenix rising' or some such.

I want to see something about these faceless people who are now telling the members for Coles, Adelaide and Bragg, who had the numbers but not the guts, how they should vote, because we are likely to see a series of profiles in the morning paper, perhaps by Debra Read, of the people who are really running the Liberal Party in this State: it is certainly not the parliamentary Party.

I want to talk about some of the other things that are happening in South Australia in terms of Kickstart and other very important initiatives. The simple fact is that last

year we announced four Kickstart regions. Those regions were designed, because of high unemployment, to try to give support and funding to stimulate a series of initiatives involving local control and ownership.

Today I am very pleased to be able to announce a further development of the Kickstart strategy. Members will be aware that the strategy works with regional employment and training bodies throughout South Australia to develop programs firmly based on the needs and resources of the strategy. The first focus regions in the State, in addition to those already operating in the Northern Adelaide Development Board area, were the western suburbs, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Eyre Peninsula.

Today I am pleased to be able to announce the extension of the Kickstart strategy to the further focus regions of Port Pirie, the Riverland, the South-East and the southern metropolitan area. If any member opposite, such as the member for Mount Gambier, does not want to have this extra money and support for their region—I know that there has been criticism of the idea from members opposite—let me know this afternoon and we will cross you off the list, because Port Pirie has expressed a desire to become involved in Kickstart. It, too, has serious unemployment concerns as well as low levels of economic stimulation and will be the last northern region to become involved, which will enable that entire section of the State to manage the Kickstart strategy.

Examples from the three other northern focus regions have shown that, whilst the organisation of the regional bodies has been slower than anticipated, there is a real need to provide a coordinated funding process that can also link in to Commonwealth funds. I believe that the South-East is an ideal Kickstart region due to its depressed rural and industry conditions. It is ready to look more closely at training and employment opportunities in the tourism and hospitality industries. However, this is not to suggest that broader industry needs will not be a priority. The region itself has expressed the desire to manage the Kickstart strategy. Indeed, it would like to have been the focus region, despite the snipings of members opposite, before this stage. The southern region of Adelaide has a significantly depressed industry base.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understood the Minister to say that I had been slighting the Kickstart program. I have not even been approached about it yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I said 'members opposite', if the honourable member would like to consult *Hansard*. The southern region has had correspondence from me and has stated that the Southern Adelaide Development Board is fully prepared to manage the Kickstart strategy and is already making strategic plans for the region which take into account Kickstart priorities and objectives.

In closing, I return to the leadership of the Liberal Party, because that is what it is all about. Is John Olsen prepared to serve as Dean Brown's deputy? Is Dean Brown prepared to serve as John Olsen's deputy? Are they both prepared to serve as the member for Bragg's deputy? And is the member for Coles happy about the terrible way she has been treated with regard to the lack of consultation, because she has more ability than the other four blokes combined?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): If ever a Government treated a great and tragic issue as a mockery, this Government has done so today. The issue we are

debating today is not the leadership of the Liberal Party, it is the leadership of the State. We are talking about unemployment. Does any member opposite know what it is like to be unemployed? Does any member opposite know what it is like to feel as if you are in a ghetto, completely alienated, socially isolated, losing health, often losing marriage, losing the respect of children, losing one's capacity to live any kind of a decent life, losing respect, losing self-respect and losing dignity? This is what this motion is about. Yet, the Premier and the Minister of Employment and Further Education get to their feet and make a mockery of it. The Premier says 'all this nonsense', talking about last month's figures.

I would like to table the figures, not just for last month but for the month before, the month before that and the month before that, and the Premier will find that it is a steadily increasing catalogue of misery, wretchedness, and ruin for South Australian families. More than 83 000 South Australians are out of work. Of young people between the ages of 15 and 19, nearly 13 500 are out of work. Of those, there are many in addition who are being sustained on Austudy by a Federal Government that is absolutely desperate to reduce the numbers in the unemployment statistics that come out each month. The Austudy payments have blown out by \$17 million in an effort to reduce those unemployment statistics.

The Premier describes it as 'all this nonsense'. Well, Mr Speaker, it is not nonsense. The impact of what this Government has done to South Australians is nothing short of savage, and what the Minister, the Premier and the other wretched looking Ministers sitting in front—silent and ashamed as well they might be—have done in order to relieve this situation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE—does not bear description. Both speakers for the Government did everything they could to avoid the substance of the motion. In particular, the Premier avoided the substance of the motion. The Minister of Employment and Further Education, towards the end of his speech, did address some of the substance of the motion, in respect of technical and further education, and quoted the figure of \$720 million that has been allocated by the Federal Government for technical and further education.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Offered.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Offered. I ask those members opposite who have any capacity for arithmetic to take the figure of \$720 million, deduct from it \$100 million (which has been absorbed into it from what was given last year), divide it by three (because it is triennial funding), then divide it by six (between each of the States), and then divide it between each of the colleges in South Australia. You will be lucky if some of the colleges receive \$1 million. From that \$1 million we must subtract the vast sums that are poured into the bureaucracy that is maintained at Federal and State Government level—sums that are taken out of the colleges and away from the students—and we are left with what South Australian young people and students of further education will receive after this so-called grand plan is brought to fruition. South Australians will see very little of this much vaunted \$720 million, and the Minister knows it.

The Minister himself has complained bitterly that the Federal Government has deprived South Australia of what used to be 21 per cent of TAFE funding, which has now been reduced to about 10 per cent. As to rural TAFE funding, last year South Australia was supposed to receive

its share, which would have been about 10 per cent of \$190 million. It received only 3 per cent, and what did the Minister do about it? Nothing. We received 3 per cent when we should have received 10 per cent, and even the Minister said that the Federal Government was up to conjuring tricks. These are the people who have not only caused the unemployment but claim to be doing something about it.

Job training, skill centres and all the rest of it are not making the slightest little dent in what is happening out there. It is social and political ruin on a very large scale. It will harm permanently the social, political and cultural fabric of this State. It is ruining families, and we will pay for this into the twenty-first century.

I conclude by saying that this Government is not only incompetent but is without honour. The Leader of the Government stands up in this Chamber and assures us that Commonwealth employment statistics and figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics are just a lot of nonsense and are just last month's figures. That is not correct. These figures, which have been steadily building up over the entire term of this Government, are likely to topple us over the brink. As to 'going backwards rather more slowly'—a reference by the Minister of Employment to former Premier Tonkin—this Premier has taken us backwards 60 years to the 1930s when the Treasurer had to borrow money to pay the Public Service. That will be the next step in what has been a truly appalling record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As I said, this debate is about unemployment and about all the things that a Liberal Government believes can, should and will be done to cure that problem. We have the capacity to change our labour laws and to restructure WorkCover—something that should have been done and could have been done by now—and we have the capacity to ensure that school leavers are not cast on the scrap heap but find places in universities and TAFE colleges. No-one of the other side is prepared to do anything about it. The Government stands condemned for its incompetence, for its lack of credibility and, after today's performance, for its total lack of compassion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for this debate has expired.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I rise to express my disgust on behalf of the many people of South Australia who were not here today to witness the atrocious debate that we have just seen from the Government benches. The matter of urgency that this Opposition quite rightfully put before the House relates to unemployment. It disgusts me—as I am sure it disgusts every thinking South Australian—that all this Government could do was to devote its time to focusing very lamely and futilely on the Liberal Party leadership.

On Friday while driving home I heard the Premier of this State on the radio. As is his wont of late, he berated the Opposition by saying, 'Isn't it atrocious that this Opposition should be preoccupied with its leadership when the most important issue of today is the dreadful unemployment in South Australia?' This is the first sitting day of this Parliament following the break. The Opposition has intro-

duced a matter of urgency on unemployment, and this Government cannot debate it. Salacious and stupid comments have been made by the people whom this State pays to be Ministers of the Crown and to run this State. They have come in here and wasted the time of this House and the administration of this Government. They have wasted too much time for too long, and it is time that they were gone.

Members of the Government have the absolute audacity to talk to us about the organisation of our Party. Anyone who reads the newspaper would know that at present we are going through a sifting process, but it is nothing compared to what members opposite are going through—nothing whatever. I say to you, Mr Speaker, without any fear of contradiction, that these benches will face the next election much better prepared and with a much better team than the Government will be able to muster. What is more, we will be the next Government of this State, and we will have a Government which is worthy of the name, and that after the pathetic exhibition of members opposite, is more than can be said of them.

What do they have to boast about? We have the bungee boy on the ever-lengthening piece of elastic who threatens to belt his head in the dirt very quickly, but who is afraid to let go of the elastic. We have 20 members on the Government benches, but that does not make a majority. It is getting to the stage where you, Mr Speaker, will have to install extra cross-benches to fit in all the dissenters and deserters. We have the best efforts from people who have always been bridesmaids but who are never likely to make the station of groom. They will sit pathetically on the middle and back benches and bleat. They will make a wonderful Opposition because they will be better at grizzling than we are, because they are much more naturally suited to it; it suits their temperament.

I thought in this place there was a Minister of Employment and Further Education but, after what I heard today, I believe there is a Minister for sleaze, because I did not hear him say much about employment. I, along with all members on this side of the House, place on record my belief that employment is the most important issue facing South Australian electors. In my electorate I have young, middle-aged and old people who cannot get jobs. It is not a joke to them; it is not a matter for derision, with Ministers opposite yelling out to the member for Coles that she is taking an eastern suburbs approach. How denigrating! If that is the level that this Government is capable of achieving, the sooner it is gone the better. The Minister of Employment and Further Education bleats, 'We tried, we tried.' There is one simple answer: you have failed, and it is time you left this place. You no longer deserve to be the Government here, and you have wasted your chances—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The honourable member is not directing his remarks through the Chair. Mr Speaker, would you please direct him to cease referring to members opposite as 'you'?

The SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld.

Mr BRINDAL: I am addressing the Chair, and I have addressed you, Mr Speaker, on each occasion. If the Whip wants to take frivolous points of order, so be it: two can play his game.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): In the course of interjections from members of the Opposition that were deluging the Deputy Leader and drowning him out, you—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Whip is not addressing the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will take a very dim view of further frivolous points of order in this debate.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: My last word was 'you', Mr Speaker, because I was saying that, in the course of interjections earlier today, you ruled that it was hard to protect the Deputy Leader from his own side. It is obviously difficult for anyone to protect the Leader from his own side in the most unfortunate lame duck position in which he finds himself. On 13 August last year, in a grievance debate, I expressed sympathy for the current Leader of the Opposition. It was no secret, even at that time, that there was a lack of support from those behind him. I praised him and drew a favourable comparison between him and his predecessor. I used the phrase, 'How difficult it must be for the Leader of the Opposition to soar like an eagle when he is surrounded by turkeys.' I was wrong: he proved to be no eagle. He is just one of the turkeys, and now he is a lame duck, something like the Deputy Leader, who sits next to him, who is a dead duck, but who does not seem to know it. This lame duck's goose is cooked and today he delivered his swan song.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: They gave him the bird.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Well, I could say that he is the victim of political murder most 'fowl'. In the 12 years that I have been here, I feel that the current people opposite are the most hopeless team that I have ever seen, racked by internal conflict. They remind me of an anecdote I was told by the Clerk of the House of Commons about a senior Party leader in Westminster who was seen having a drink with some members of the opposite Party. Some young Turks from his own Party upbraided him for fraternising, as they saw it, with political enemies. He pointed out to them, 'They are not political enemies; they are political adversaries. My political enemies are all sitting behind me.' That is certainly the case for anyone who happens to be unfortunate enough to be Leader of the Liberal Party.

This group opposite of branch stackers, carpetbaggers, party hacks and political opportunists can verily be described as a coalition of hate because they are only held together when their supporters occasionally remind them that they are supposed to hate us more than each other. They continue to play out a scenario that was set in motion more than two decades ago by Ren DeGaris and Steele Hall. If anyone wants to study up on that, I suggest they read a book called *Liberals in Limbo*, though they must now feel like they are in purgatory.

We have opposite a Party full of stooges of Hall and DeGaris fighting yesterday's feuds, today's ego trips and tomorrow's treacheries. We see a Party ripped apart by factions, by backroom power brokers and bovver boys, a Party which tolerates political carpetbaggers. A member of the Liberal Party, who quit after he was shafted in here as Leader, who caused a by-election, which nevertheless improved the quality of the representation of Custance as far as local input is concerned, who moved across to the Senate, which he treated as a holding bay for his ambitions or a holiday camp, now wants to seize the opportunity to come in again as a carpetbagger in a completely new seat as a result of a resignation that is to take place. However, we are not given too much information about the certainty of that resignation. Mr Olsen might find the same difficulty that he encountered when Senator Messner stalled at the last moment when he was supposed to resign for Mr Olsen

to enter the Senate. The current Leader might have a little bit of hesitancy, having promised to surrender the leadership, because I gather he did that on the understanding that he would be Deputy Leader, but there is no certainty that he can be guaranteed that position.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: We have a carpetbagger opposite who is going to bail out on the people of Hayward and betray them and stand instead for the seat of Hartley. I think he ought to keep quiet. Mr Speaker, if you want information about branch stackers, you have merely to look at what the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Steve Condous, the putative candidate for Colton, has said clearly on the record. Last Thursday night, at a Maitland Liberal gathering, he was recorded on Channel 7 saying:

I know that we are going to get on all right tonight... because... I am meeting the people and a lot of you are experienced in stacking hay and I am experienced in stacking branches. What we have opposite is a Party that tolerates that sort of activity, even praises it. Now it is recycling for a third time a two-time loser. Using the nuptial analogy of the member for Hayward, it could be described as 'Bridesmaid Revisited'.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I take strong and personal exception to the words used by the Whip. I am the member for Hayward and I will remain the member for Hayward.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no idea of what the point of order is.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the Chair is addressing the member for Hayward, the least the honourable member can do is pay attention. The Chair has no idea what the point of order is.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order.

Mr BRINDAL: It was a personal reflection on me. He accused me of bailing out on my electors. I object to that. It is blatantly untrue and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: In the interests of the harmony of the House, I am happy to withdraw whatever remarks caused such distress to the current member for Hayward.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I intend to add my concern to the problem of unemployment, and I was prepared to talk about the different statistics in the different areas of the State that are affected. However, after listening to the pathetic debate from the Government and becoming aware of the total lack of concern that has been shown by Government members, I have decided to draw attention to the human factor in the statistics—the 83 000 people who are out of work and the nearly 50 per cent of our youth who are out of work. It is apparent that the Government is lacking in compassion. I would like to try at least to bring a human face to those statistics because they do involve individual people in this State who have been savaged by some of the policies of this Government over the last decade, let alone during the past two years that I have been in this Parliament.

I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, and it is to that letter that I wish to refer. It may not be totally representative of all the people in this State, but it is certainly representative of a good group of people who are suffering. The woman is single, unemployed and has three children. She writes also in anger and states:

Seldom am I so incensed over an issue that I drop a line to a newspaper editor in the knowledge that it will probably not be published. At least it gets it out of my system!!! I am so furious

now over a certain issue that not only do I write to someone but I sincerely hope my local politician will do something to fix the problem.

I am, of course, talking about transport services (I do not think STA knows the meaning of 'service'). I am motivated today especially because, having heard our Premier espousing SA's marvellous record for industrial disputes and relative labour costs, I have just heard that the STA employees have, once again, pulled the plug on those workers and students travelling to their workplace!

Why am I so cross? I have just spent the last year or so encouraging my three children to stay on at school, achieve high marks, get into university and be sure to get a good job. In selecting a career and courses I have told them to select something they want to do, can do well and has good prospects.

The woman then goes on to talk about the education experience her children have. She told them that—'the transport system is now under review and will be far more efficient by the time they have need of it'. The letter continues:

My son duly worked his butt off, achieved very good marks in his matric exams and was granted his second choice—a primary teaching course at Magill campus of the University of SA. Lo (or woe) and behold I now find that not only is he not entitled to Austudy and I have to pay his bus fares (a reversal of Government policy) but it takes him an hour and a half by public transport to get from Tea Tree Gully to Magill.

She goes on to explain that that is because the bus her son has to catch leaves at 8.17 in the morning, travels to the city and then goes out to Magill. She goes on to say:

Just to let you know how cynical I have become about the media, politicians and the Government, in particular, I don't want a reply to my letter if all you can offer is sympathy for our plight and the vague promise that you will inform the appropriate department and/or Minister in the hopes that they will fix it up... Because they won't.

In another portion of the letter she explains that she is a 53-year old unemployed, single parent who is 'trying to get my three children through the education system'. The postscript to her letter is also very telling:

It may be that I would have been better off had I spent the stamp on another futile application for a job.

That is a cynical letter and it is one that is full of anger, but it is totally correct. How can I, as a Liberal member of the Opposition, approach any member of the Government or any Minister to attempt to get an answer to this problem when I know well that the Government is not even listening to the complaints that we hear day in, day out from people in the electorate who are suffering misfortune and who come in and tell us about the suffering they go through in all areas, whether it be because of the law and order policies of this State, whether it be because of the health and education policies or, unfortunately, whether it be the area most affected—unemployment.

The Bannon Government refuses to abolish payroll tax when abolition would bring 15 000 jobs into this State immediately. We have a Minister of Emergency Services who should have been removed from the front bench much earlier than this very minute, a Minister who can find \$3.5 million to put more speed cameras on the road to gain more revenue for the Government. We have a Minister of Correctional Services who cannot get the bus timetables right but who can issue a free timetable to a most dangerous criminal to escape at his leisure.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): A news item appeared in Saturday's *Advertiser* hidden amongst the plethora of words written about the present Liberal leadership debacle. Perhaps some members did not notice it, but it made a distinct impression on me, because it concerned something that I have been advocating for a considerable

time. The article entitled 'Liberal MPs slammed as lazy non-performers' states:

Changing leaders would not help the Liberal Party because many of its parliamentary members were lazy and not performing, former senior Liberal Mr Martin Cameron said last night.

The article went on to talk about how it was 'amateurish' to replace Dale Baker with John Olsen, and then stated:

'Even if the Leaders changed, it's still not going to change things unless the Party as a whole changes. The members who are there (in Parliament) are the resource of the Liberal Party and they're just not performing. People are not working hard enough. There are some people who are, but very few of them.'

Mr Cameron said the Party was not projecting an image to the public. The Party and the Leader did not apply enough discipline to members, some of whom had full-time or part-time jobs other than politics. 'There are people in senior positions who are virtually never heard of,' he said.

I heard that from not only Martin Cameron but Alex Kennedy, who said that on numerous occasions when she wrote for the Messenger Press. We all know that Alex Kennedy was a former staffer for John Olsen. I do not know whether John Olsen, when he returns to lead the Liberal Party, will invite her to come back and work for him, but it is obvious that, when she made those remarks and while she was working as a staffer for John Olsen, she would have passed a copy of the articles to him for him to approve, because no way would a Senator allow his staffer to write as a free agent in the Messenger Press. Therefore, one can only assume that what she and Martin Cameron think about the Liberal Party obviously is what John Olsen, too, felt about the Liberal Party.

I have looked across at members opposite in this Chamber (I cannot speak for those in the Upper House) and have tried to work out how many have either full-time or part-time jobs other than in politics. On this side of the Chamber, not one member does not give his or her full-time capacity to the job for which they were elected. But, Sir, on the other side we have the member for Victoria, the member for Light, the member for Murray-Mallee, the member for Custance, the member for Bragg, the member for Chaffey, and the member for Kavel—seven members opposite who have either full-time or part-time jobs other than in politics.

So, is it any wonder that to the public members opposite appear to be a rabble? The only positive thing they could say about the member for Victoria when he resigned, when he gave up the fight, when he quit, when he raised the white flag and accepted the white feather, was that he was a successful businessman—as if that were an excuse. That should have been the biggest condemnation of the member for Victoria: he spends far too much time flogging cut-price flowers to the Japanese. He takes very little notice of what the people of South Australia want. That is the same with the member for Bragg.

Mr Ferguson: He is a millionaire.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Henley Beach tells me that he is a millionaire. In relation to the amount of time he spends in his chemist shop, if he spent more time in the Parliament trying to consolidate his position, he would be sitting there in the front position. But, he has dashed his chances. He was more interested in making money than in leading the Liberal Party which, I accept, is a great Party—it used to be a great Party when it was led by Tom Playford.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I have never seen the Labor Party look so glum as it has looked today. I have never heard the member for Napier, who has just resumed his seat, speak to less advantage. We know he is

the numbers man for Terry Groom in his new quest against the Party machine and that his mind is on other things, but his speech was a pretty poor show. Let us recount the history of the Labor Party's shenanigans since the last election. We recall that Premier Dunstan squealed like a stuck pig back in 1968 when he got 50.5 per cent of the vote and said, 'Democracy is dead.' There was a rent-a-crowd in Victoria Square, they whistled up their union mates, and there he was with the megaphone saying, 'Democracy is dead. We got 50.5 per cent and we do not govern.'

At the last election, the Liberal Party received 52 per cent plus and the Labor Party 48 per cent minus, and members opposite have the gall to sit there and say all is well. They stitched up some arrangements with the Independent Labor members, and there they sit. But what has transpired since? They have had their preselections. What a shemozzle! They reckon we have problems. They still have them. But what did they do? They cast aside that very intelligent, erudite member for Hartley, one of the best performers I have ever seen on the Labor side, for some unknown Party hack whom we have never sighted. They cast him to the wolves.

Mr Brindal: They shafted him!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They shafted him. He should have been up in the Premier's seat years ago, but what has happened? The honourable member who has just resumed his seat, if he has one tiny bit of sense, being the numbers man, could keep him here. What did they do to the member for Gilles, that cultured, erudite, hard-working—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He knows his opera. Don't laugh! That cultured, popular (the electorate wanted him) son of one of the leaders of this State who made such a significant contribution in the '70s, Dave McKee, a man I respected if I ever respected anyone. What did they do to my friend Colin McKee?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to members by the names of their electorates.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have trouble with electorates. What did they do to the member for Gilles? They cast him aside for the most incompetent Minister that this place has seen in living memory. He has cost the State tens of millions of dollars. We cannot understand what he is saying; I do not think he can himself. We all know he is history. If ever a man had a future in the Labor Party, it was the member for Gilles. They cast him aside for the biggest no-hoper Minister that we have seen in living memory.

They say we have our troubles. They have stitched up arrangements with the Independents so they can govern. If Don Dunstan had received 52 per cent plus and could not govern, he would have died a thousand deaths at the wrongs perpetrated on this community. The two Independents are keeping them there. They rejected that very clever member for Hartley, and they now have a brawl among themselves. The member who has just sat down is the numbers man to get him up against the machine, and they have the member for Gilles still hanging, still swinging in the breeze, dangling. A couple of deadlines have passed and there will be more deadlines to pass yet. There he is, the Leader of this State who has cost us not tens of millions but billions, trying to stitch up arrangements.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: He can't even do that properly.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he can't. For members opposite to say that the Liberal Party has problems whilst their own house is in order is one of the

most amusing things I have heard in my parliamentary career.

Mr S.G. Evans: They would swap places tomorrow.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They would swap places tomorrow if they could. The Liberal Party takes decisive action when required. The Labor Party is in absolute, utter turmoil. I feel sorry for the Premier. Peter Ward said that he shot himself in the right foot, the left foot and somewhere in the middle. No wonder he looks miserable!

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I am tempted to respond to the member for Kavel, but I will not waste my time. I want to raise some problems encountered by justices of the peace in this State. Many members are a justice of the peace. From time to time over the 13 years that I have been a member of this Parliament, I would say that hundreds of constituents have requested that I sign a document, whether it be a land transfer, memorandum of mortgage or some other document requiring my signature as a justice of the peace and witness to the fact that these persons freely and voluntarily signed the document in question and that they were—and this is the operative clause—persons well known to me.

Last Friday and again yesterday people came into my electorate office requesting that I witness their signature and fill out the short form of proof. I explained the difficulty that I have as a justice of the peace in filling out a short form of proof where the person is not known to me. There is an opportunity to fill out the long form of proof where a third party may witness the signature of the person signing the document and I, knowing that third person, can fill out the long form of proof.

Yesterday, a very irate constituent of mine was not prepared to accept the fact that I would not, if you like, perjure myself by filling out the long form of proof. Subsequently, I checked the situation with a number of sources, and I am advised that the kernel of the problem is that South Australia is the only State that requires a justice of the peace to fill out the short form of proof. Over the many years that I have been a member of this place—and a JP since 1972—I have absolutely refused to witness a document if I did not know the person involved. A few months ago, a constituent of mine not only forged my name but, indeed, forged my name as a member of Parliament and as a justice of the peace. That person was subsequently dealt with by the police, convicted in the courts and fined \$500. He was lucky that he was not given a 14-year gaol sentence.

I raise this matter seriously because any justice of the peace who witnesses a land transfer document, or any document on which it is stated that the justice of the peace knows the person involved, but who does not know that person, leaves himself or herself open to court action if a property is sold and—

An honourable member: And perjury.

Mr HAMILTON: —indeed, as my colleague says, to perjury. I raise this matter in this place because I believe that the Attorney-General of this State should consider it. Let us have uniformity among justices of the peace throughout Australia. If it is the case in other States that a justice of the peace does not have to fill out the short form of proof, let us have uniformity and let us abolish that practice in South Australia.

Having said that, I want to know what protection a justice of the peace has, because on many occasions I have incurred the wrath of constituents or prospective constituents for refusing, quite properly to fill out a document when I have

not known that person. I believe that every member of this House at some time or another would have refused to sign a document based on what I have just said. I hope that the Attorney-General has a good look at redressing this problem because I think it is important that a justice of the peace who voluntarily gives his service to the community should not be subjected to abuse.

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

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of the MFP Development Bill be until 5.30 p.m. on Thursday 19 March.
Motion carried.

REAL PROPERTY (TRANSFER OF ALLOTMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Property Act 1886 and to make a related amendment to the Strata Titles Act 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: 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.

Explanation of Bill

On 29 January, 1992 the government placed on public exhibition the Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan which is the culmination of more than four years work by State Government Agencies and Local Government.

The Mount Lofty Ranges are a critical area for all South Australians, being an important natural resource area for conservation of native flora and fauna, and scenic beauty the source of a substantial part of the water supply for metropolitan Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges residents; and the majority of the best primary production land in the state.

In seeking to manage the difficult issues of protecting the public water supply and the opportunity for the continuation of primary production, the government has sought to use not only the traditional planning controls over development activities, but to provide an active scheme which benefits those landowners whose opportunities are constrained by the development controls.

This scheme has been referred to throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges Review as the 'Transferable Title Rights' Scheme, and was first canvassed publicly in the Mount Lofty Ranges Review Consultative Management Plan released in March, 1989.

The scheme has always envisaged that where the opportunity to undertake development on allotments of land was constrained through planning controls, there would be created a 'right', which while intangible could be represented by a certificate and transferred to another landowner who would need to have such a 'right' in order to undertake particular kinds of development. Such an arrangement is novel in Australia, although it has some parallels with the transferable floor area scheme applying to heritage listed building sites in the City of Adelaide.

In releasing the Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan the government announced that there would be no further division of rural land to create additional rural allotments in the Mount

Lofty Ranges. The government also announced, that within the rural areas of the water supply protection zone, landowners whose tenement holdings comprised two or more allotments as at 14 September, 1990 when interim development controls were first introduced, would be able to build only one residential dwelling on that tenement, this policy specifically addressed two particular issues. Firstly, it reduced the opportunity for further expansion of residential living in the rural areas of the water supply protection zone. Secondly, it limited the opportunity for fragmentation of rural land into smaller tenements, each generally used for some form of 'hobby' farming rather than optimising fully the benefits to be derived through primary production from the most productive and best available land.

Through the Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan the government has proposed that the owners of multiple allotment tenements within the water supply protection zone will, by amalgamation of their existing allotments, be able to retain the use of their land and at the same time create amalgamation units for allocation to other areas. For the system to operate equitably, a market must be created.

In releasing the management plan the government proposed a wide ranging set of circumstances in which amalgamation units would need to be cancelled in order to register plans of division creating new allotments.

There is general acceptance that more stringent policies are required in the Mount Lofty Ranges Water Protection Area than outside that area.

There is general acceptance that there should be no further subdivision of rural land, and that where rural land has already been divided, there should be an incentive based approach to its aggregation into larger parcels.

There is general acceptance that there should be constraints on further residential and urban development in the Mount Lofty Ranges Water Protection Area particularly in those parts of the area which have a high average annual rainfall.

There is general acceptance that residential development on existing allotments of rural land leads eventually to fragmentation of rural enterprises, and sub-optimal or non-agricultural use of the land, often beyond its capability.

The creation of new allotments involves the division of land and the Bill encompasses within the meaning of 'Division' the division of land by strata plan.

Possession of an amalgamation unit does not provide an as of right opportunity to create an additional allotment. The division of land is still subject to the consent of the relevant planning authority in accordance with the planning criteria contained in the development plan.

The Bill creates the necessary head powers for the operation of the transferable allotment system.

The specification of the areas of the Mount Lofty Ranges within which amalgamation units can be created, and where they will be required to be cancelled in order for new allotments to be created, will be contained in regulations.

The transferable allotment system will be administered by the Registrar-General and will not impose additional costs on Local Government.

There will be a new fee of \$5.00 for the issue of a certificate of amalgamation units created, otherwise the fees remain as they presently are for dealings in land.

The passage of this Bill will open up a new and important tool in the range of measures available for land management in the Mount Lofty Ranges.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends the interpretation provision for Part XIXAB, paragraph (a) defines 'the Mount Lofty Ranges' and paragraph (b) defines what is meant by 'contiguous'.

Clause 4 requires that the Commission's certificate of approval under section 223/g must specify the number of amalgamation units to be allocated to the division and the date on which the application for planning authorisation was made. All applications for planning authorisation to councils are made through the Commission and this date will therefore be known by the Commission. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that the Registrar-General has the information that he will need to administer new Division IVA.

Clause 5 corrects a minor error in section 223// of the principal Act.

Clause 6 inserts new Division IVA into Part XIXAB of the principal Act. The new provisions apply to division of land under Part XIXAB and by strata plan under the Strata Titles Act 1988. New section 223//b enables the making of regulations preventing division of land in parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges unless amalgamation units have been allocated to the division. The regulations will apply to division if the application for planning authorisation under the Planning Act 1982 or the application for approval to the Commission or a council under the Strata Titles

Act 1988 was made on or after 29 January 1992. The regulations will bind the Crown unless otherwise provided. New sections 223//c provides for the creation of amalgamation units by amalgamation of allotments in parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges specified by regulation. The term 'amalgamation units' has been used in preference to 'transferable title rights'. The latter term may be confused with title to land which is a transferable title right. Section 223//d deals with the right to allocate amalgamation units to a division. It should be remembered that it is the right to allocate an amalgamation unit that is of value and which vests initially in the applicant for amalgamation. The amalgamation unit itself is not vested in anyone. The right of allocation can be transferred and can pass on death or bankruptcy like any other property. Section 223//e deals with allocation of an amalgamation unit to a proposed division. The memorandum of allocation should be lodged with the Registrar-General when the application for deposit of the plan of division or strata plan is lodged. If for some reason deposit of the plan is not to proceed the Registrar-General may revive the right of allocation by issuing the appropriate certificate. Section 223//f provides for a public register of amalgamation units and section 223//g provides for forms of documents and payment of fees.

Clause 7 amends section 14 of the Strata Titles Act 1988. This amendment corresponds to subsection (5a) inserted into section 223/g of the Real Property Act 1886 by clause 4 of the Bill.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2525.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise on behalf of the Opposition to support the second reading of the Bill. It is our intention to move significant amendments during the Committee stage of this very important Bill. It is important at this stage to put on the record that after some two to two and a half years of public debate on the MFP Development Corporation, the site at Gillman and related industrial and high technology future developments, this is the first occasion on which the Parliament of South Australia has been given the opportunity to debate the Bill and all the other factors related to this very important concept for South Australia.

It is very important that the Opposition be given the opportunity to place on the record its support in principle for the direction that this MFP Development Corporation is taking and, just as importantly, to place on the record the concerns of the public and members on this side of the House. Our concerns can be divided into four major areas: first, that the viability of the project is absolutely critical in the debate on this Bill before the House; secondly, that the concerns about the suitability of the site at Gillman and all the other concerns expressed by the community be aired; thirdly, the ability of the MFP site to sustain a wide range of socio-economic groups of residents; and, finally, the ability of the project to be commercially viable when a very significant part of the development is to be sponsored, financed and developed by the private sector.

We believe that if these concerns are not met the project should not proceed. That is a very strong statement, but one which we believe is absolutely critical to be made at this stage. It is my belief that most of the concerns if looked at honestly by the Government can be answered. I hope that in his second reading reply the Premier responds to all the concerns that have been highlighted in the many reports and to the concerns of the public of South Australia in respect of the major issues.

It is important that the financial viability of this project be monitored continually. We believe that this whole project should be regularly reported to the Parliament of South

Australia, whoever is in Government, so that this Parliament, on a regular basis, can monitor the spending and question whether the development and the spending consequent to that is in the best interests of South Australia. In brief, our amendments deal principally with the lack of consultation that has taken place, particularly with local government; the need to remove the compulsory acquisition within and outside the site; to place with the directors of the new development board responsibilities and obligations similar to public-listed companies (we believe those sorts of responsibilities are now being put into all different types of legislation in relation to statutory authorities, and we believe that should be the case here); that there should be regular financial reporting of the operations to a structured committee of this Parliament; that there should be protection for the Adelaide City Council in the general negotiation of the sale price of that land on this core site; and, finally, that work on the site should not occur until the requirements of the Planning Act, as it relates to the environmental impact assessment, have been completed.

In putting our position on the record for the first time in the Parliament, it is important that we take this opportunity to go through the background as we see it and make comments on the background and the development of this project to date. I will present the concerns that we have from the report, and I ask that the Premier note that they are genuine concerns and that they are not meant in any other form than that. First, the multifunction polis was first proposed by the Japanese Minister of International Trade and Industry, Mr Tamura, to the Australian Minister of Industry, Technology and Commerce, Mr Button, at the Japan/Australia Ministerial Committee meeting in January 1987. This was followed in September 1987 by the release of a paper prepared by MITI, a Multifunction Polis Scheme for the Twenty-first Century Basic Concepts, otherwise known as (and one of the difficulties that we will have with this presentation is all the jargon that goes with it) the basic concept paper, which outlined in detail the Japanese perspective.

This original idea envisaged a city of the future, based on the themes of people, technology, environment and an underlying ideal of achieving a fifth sphere of living, in which functions such as working, learning and recreation would be integrated. The basic concept paper identified four fundamental trends critical to social and economic development into the next century: first, the internationalisation of business and of national economies; secondly, the increasing rate of technological innovation; thirdly, the fundamental importance of information flows and information technologies for all forms of economic activity; and, fourthly, the ageing of societies in industrialised nations.

The basic concept paper argued that each of these trends has consequences for how people live, implying a formidable challenge to urban life as currently constituted. A joint Japanese/Australian endeavour was proposed to meet this challenge based on the positions of Australia and Japan as industrialised countries in the fastest developing region of the world. As the project has developed, this concept has been transformed into a broader proposal said to be more relevant to Australian needs.

Early in 1988, the Australian and Japanese Governments agreed that there was sufficient commonality of interests for them to undertake a feasibility study of the MFP concept. In May 1988, the Japanese Domestic Committee (JDC) was formed. In July 1988, this was followed by the formation of the Australian domestic committee, MFP Australia Research Limited. The appointment of members of the joint steering committee charged with overseeing the feasibility

study and making recommendations to the two national Governments also took place in July 1988. In June 1990, the joint steering committee concluded:

The MFP idea has substantial merit and is capable of contributing to the enhancement of international relationships, as well as the development of the Australian economy in the long term. We nominate Adelaide as the site for the MFP. However, with the limited resources available to us, and the nomination of the site at the very end of this stage of the project, it has not been possible to carry out all the work necessary to firmly establish the viability of the project at the Adelaide site.

In fact, the committee, after considering proposals from Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, as well as South Australia, originally proposed that the project be located in Queensland. However, the Queensland Government refused to commit the \$320 million of State spending necessary to purchase the Gold Coast site for the project.

In August 1990, the MFP Adelaide Management Board was formed to oversee the work required to develop further the concept and to assess the viability of the MFP. In May 1991, the board published a series of reports to support its view that the project was viable on a site centred at Gillman. In March 1992, a draft EIS report was published, which was based on the conclusion that there were no environmental obstacles to the development of the project that could not be overcome. It should be noted that this draft EIS relates only to the proposal for urban development of the Gillman/Dry Creek land within the core site, some 1 800 hectares.

From that history the South Australian Government developed its plans and concepts which saw significant economic benefits for the State and were two-fold in principle. The first component aimed to create an urban development on a degraded site at Gillman, with housing and light industrial sites. The development would solve the existing difficult environmental site problems using the world's best advanced technology and environmental, engineering and management techniques. The development was to be integrated with the city of Port Adelaide. The second component aimed at developing the housing and industrial buildings, maximising the use of renewable energy and reusable water, to have a significant self-sufficient effluent system, to be of advanced design and to be clustered to allow for easy and accessible transport movements within the site.

The third component aimed to preserve the mangroves next to the site, as they are critical in the life cycle of many important fish varieties such as those that are located in our coastal waters. The fourth component aimed to manage the significant volume of polluted run-off stormwater from the western suburbs that now runs into the Gillman site, clean it up using an intricate system of lakes, then recycle this water within the proposed new site. The Gillman urban development proposal initially was to cater for a population of 100 000, but it has now been reduced to 40 000 over a development period of 20 to 30 years.

The second and important component aims to develop industries based on technological change, which will increase the rate of economic growth in South Australia and Australia to internationalise the economy by developing them into cluster industries here that can compete on a world scale. The industries proposed as the basis for clusters included information, technology and communications; environmental management; education in the advanced learning technology and international management and innovation area; tourism and leisure; health care; space; and media entertainment.

Before I go too far into this speech, it is important to describe the Liberal Party's position as it relates to the MFP in Adelaide. We believe it is vital that the development of enterprise and industry, particularly high technology ones,

should be encouraged across the whole of South Australia. In doing that, we recognise the Government's attempt to achieve part of this development through its MFP proposal, as is defined in clause 5 of the MFP Bill. Those objects of the MFP development are well worth putting on to the record again. They are:

To secure the creation or establishment of—

- (a) a national focus for economic, scientific and technological developments of international significance;
- (b) leading centres of innovation in science, technology, education and the arts;
- (c) a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies;
- (d) a model of productive interaction between industries and research and development, educational, community and other organisations and of the use of advanced information and communication systems for that purpose;
- (e) an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development and in the use of advanced science and technology to serve the community;
- (f) a model of conservation of the natural environment and resource management and of equitable social and economic development in an urban context.

Those objects are laudable and should be supported by every member of this Parliament and by every person in our State. In supporting those objectives, we strongly advocate to Parliament that the MFP project be spread beyond Gillman to include industrial and technological development in regional areas and regional centres of our State such as Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Mount Gambier, as well as the outer suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide. We believe that strict financial controls should be placed on the overall project and that Parliament should be informed regularly before any expenditure on this project is carried out by the Government. We believe that the development of the Gillman/Dry Creek site should proceed only if the private sector is committed to the financing and development of the majority of the site, with the State Government providing only the traditional infrastructure as is normal to a site of that type.

We believe that, along with the development of the MFP site at Gillman, a major study should be made of the Port Adelaide rail route to see whether the redevelopment of existing suburbs and commercial properties on the route could be included in the early development of the MFP project, noting of course that the MFP project is one of some 25 to 30 years in length. In addition, we believe that the redevelopment of Port Adelaide should be integrated into a very early stage of the project. Finally, we believe that this national project needs committed, continual significant financial support from the Commonwealth Government for it to succeed in the long term.

I turn now to the viability of the MFP. In 1988, the joint steering committee commissioned a feasibility study on the multifunction polis by Andersen consultants in conjunction with Kinhill Engineers Pty Ltd. This study put locations in Sydney and Melbourne ahead of the Adelaide project. The following are extracts of the final report published in January 1990:

The results of the economic analysis, undertaken by the National Institute for Economic and Industry Research, indicate that the MFP is viable only if it adopts a specific scale and mix of activities and is located correctly. The economically viable scenario requirements do, however, match with compelling and implementable aspects of the MFP concept: a single-site, city-scale development of potentially 100 000 to 200 000 persons; a population composed significantly of international, highly skilled workers attracted specifically by the MFP; an agglomeration of commercial and institutional activities in the MFP target industries generating 30 000 new and direct jobs and perhaps 130 000 indirect jobs; and financial techniques which, wherever possible, use non-Australian capital while achieving largely Australian retention of investment returns.

Those comments came in 1988 from the joint steering committee commissioned initially by the multifunction polis group. It continued:

Although the economic analysis presented here is indicative only, it does suggest that the multifunction polis will need to achieve a population base of between 100 000 and 200 000. This new city will also need to attract a significant proportion of Australia's migrant intake. Perhaps most restrictively, economic viability appears to be strongest with locations in New South Wales, Victoria and South-East Queensland.

The report went on:

The development costs of an MFP in Adelaide are moderate. However, an influx of another 100 000 persons to the Adelaide area in addition to the current anticipated growth of over 1 per cent per annum over the next 20 years could place significant constraints on the economy. The MFP would add almost 3.5 per cent to the anticipated population growth to the area over the period.

Those comments were made in a study commissioned in 1988. The employment impact of an MFP in Adelaide would be quite significant in South Australia but relatively less significant nationwide. This is because the State accounts for a smaller share of the national GDP and is less economically diverse than either New South Wales or Victoria. The NIEIR population projections also suggest that South Australia would have difficulty attracting the scale of foreign population that is anticipated for the MFP. That is stated in section 4 of the same report.

In July 1990, the National Capital Planning Authority prepared a report for the Federal Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce, entitled 'MFP: An Urban Development Concept'. I have not been able to find any reference indicating that that report has been made public. It supported the conclusions of the Andersen consultancy about the viability of the MFP and the following are relevant extracts from it:

The report explores a range of possible urban development options and evaluates them in the light of the MFP aims and in the light of existing development experience. As the model which best satisfies the aims, the report proposes the development in stages of a discrete urban settlement having a minimum population of 100 000 people. The site requirement for this type of development is an area of at least 3 000 hectares or up to 5 000 hectares in a rural setting, if a rural setting is included. It is essential that, prior to the site selection, the potential to provide trunk infrastructure for a minimum of 100 000 population is identified. Desirably, there should be flexibility to grow beyond this level. It is also desirable that the initial provision be feasible from existing services, say, of up to a level of 20 000 people.

The report went on to say:

The site should have easily developed and preferably undulating land forms with a predominance of moderate slopes. There must be reasonably sized areas unbroken by steep ridges or major watercourses. It must be possible to site units of 20 000 population in distinctive settlement areas with the relatively high site density implied by placing this population within a 2 kilometre square.

The report, which has not been made public, as I understand, went on to say:

It is desirable that the preferred site is contained within a close setting of hills or waterfronts which define the site. The site should ideally have charm and a sense of magnificence, attributes found in a setting such as Lucerne, San Francisco or Stockholm. Canberra, Sydney and Perth have sites with these attributes. While it is acknowledged that a site can be 'made', like Venice and Amsterdam, and have magnificence drawn from urban excellence, the sheer quality of the raw site will assist the image and marketing of the concept and hence facilitate the achievement of other objectives.

At a multifunction polis seminar in Sydney in October 1990, a member of the National Capital Planning Authority, Mr Tony Powell, said:

The latest decision to opt for Adelaide as the preferred location has little or no chance of succeeding, in my opinion. If the project is to be funded and carried out by private enterprise in the main and possibly by international financial joint ventures, South-East

Queensland offers the best and probably the only prospect of success.

A report 'MFP Adelaide, Design Concept Development and Core Site Assessment', published by Kinhill Delfin Joint Venture in May 1991, acknowledged the report by the National Capital Planning Authority but stated it had been produced 'prior to the selection of a site and while potential MFP industries were still being defined'. In fact, the national capital planning authority report was published in July 1990, and the Gillman site was nominated by the MFP Joint Steering Committee in June 1990 as well. The Kinhill Delfin report also claims:

The model for urban development . . . is in general accord with the NCPA criteria for evaluating the various proposals submitted to the joint steering committee by the different States.

I would now like to refer to the viability of the South Australian proposal. In May 1990 the South Australian Government made a final submission to the joint steering committee in the name of Premier Bannon. The submission states:

The selected site for the MFP development meets every criterion of the MFP concept.

This was a correct assertion at the time when related to criteria for population and site size. The South Australian submission went on to say:

It will create a new settlement of up to 100 000 people that will be integrated with the existing metropolis to form MFP Adelaide. . . there are over 3 500 hectares on which the residential, recreational and work sites can develop and expand.

The current proposal is for 1 800 hectares. The South Australian submission was in fact based on putting 100 550 residents on the site in three stages, and requiring 40 000 dwellings in total. The submission also claims:

Based on earlier documentation, the average MFP requirement will be for about 4 000 overseas migrants per annum. This is well within the range of South Australia's recent experience.

For the remainder of 1990, the South Australian Government continued to give 100 000 as the number of people who would live on the MFP site, and 3 500 hectares as the size of the site. In fact, in the *Advertiser* of 30 June 1990, Premier Bannon said:

Up to 10 villages with houses for about 100 000 people to be built over 30 years.

In the *News* of 2 July 1990, Minister Lynn Arnold said:

A further 100 000 people in South Australia in the next 10 to 15 years in addition to the normal population growth is well within the capacity of this State to cope.

An advertisement placed in the *Advertiser* of 15 September 1990, by the MFP Adelaide team, states:

It is envisaged that the population of the new development, while predominantly Australian, will over a period of 15 to 20 years include people of many nationalities, and in that period could grow to 100 000.

An advertisement under Premier Bannon's signature, in the *Advertiser* of 10 October 1990, states:

Planning for MFP Adelaide includes a new settlement to be developed on a 3 500 hectare crescent of land, sea and estuary centred on Gillman, about 20 minutes north-west of the central business district. It will develop over the next 15 to 20 years to eventually house about 100 000 people. Most of these will be Australians and the rest will come from the four corners of the globe.

In a speech to the MFP seminar in Sydney on 30 October 1990, Premier Bannon said:

We have appointed consultants to carry out extensive testing of the site which incorporates some 3 500 hectares of land which is largely Government owned and mostly unoccupied.

In early 1991, however, the MFP Project Team gave the first public indication of a project of reduced size. On 24 January 1991, the *Advertiser* quoted Mr Tony Read, Study Manager for Kinhill Delfin, as saying:

Although it was originally estimated that 100 000 people would live at Gillman, he now believed it was more likely that between 40 000 and 50 000 people would reside on the core site and others associated with the MFP would live in other parts of the city.

This statement coincided with the release of a status report by the MFP Adelaide Management Board which referred to a 'designated core site of 2 405 ha.' However, the status report itself made no reference to any changes to population projections. It was only with the release of the Report on the Feasibility of the MFP by the Management Board in May 1991 that a significant reduction in population on the site was foreshadowed. The report states:

MFP Adelaide is ultimately expected to attract approximately 100 000 people, of whom approximately 50 000 will live on the core site.

The issue of the size of the site and population is important in that the smaller site and the lower resident population may make it more difficult to justify the viability of urban development on that site. The reason for putting this whole thing together is again to ask the Government and, in particular, the Premier to justify why these changes have occurred and how the viability of the project is still within the means of what was initially projected.

The commercial analysis of the project assumed that there would be 17 000 residential housing dwellings for, in this case, 42 000 people. So, we have moved on from that position to the commercial analysis, using 800 hectares out of the core site total land of now only 1 840 hectares. A further 1 416 hectares will be of lakes and canals, and 624 hectares will be used for forest and open space. The developer's costs amounted to \$669 million, while projected net sales are estimated to return \$789 million, giving an internal rate of return of 24.3 per cent before financing.

Later in this contribution I will talk about how people see the situation today with an even further reduced site as it relates to the current EIS. The study did not—and does not—include funds needed to clean up the Port Adelaide sewage problems or the Bolivar sewage problems, for upgrading or extending the City of Port Adelaide or for major connecting roadworks. It is purely and simply the funds required for this specific development. People who have done a study of this whole project will know that it is absolutely critical for the lakes, in particular, that the sewage at Bolivar and Port Adelaide be removed entirely from the lakes system, otherwise the corresponding problems created by the nutrient levels will be impossible to manage.

It is likely that the project would be constructed into a series of long and short-term development projects offering a range of opportunities for investors and developers. The suggested direct cost to the public sector is \$251 million. This is to be partly offset by a development contribution of public works of \$51 million and the deferral cost of providing future services at other locations. Thus the net cost to the public sector is estimated to be \$202 million (in 1991 dollars) or \$105 million in net present value terms over the 25 years of the project.

The report states that the investment by the South Australian Government would be less than the investment in infrastructure and regional facilities normally required for any large-scale urban development. The Opposition questions that statement and hopes that in his reply the Premier will be able to go some way down the track of justifying that statement. It was also stated that the economic impact and economic benefits in particular associated with MFP Australia would come from three sources: the activity generated by the site development and construction work; the contribution made by users of the site to the general economy, principally the industrial activity; and the indirect

impact that MFP Australia would have on local industry by improving the circumstances in which it operates.

The exact nature and size of the institutes, organisations and industries that would operate at MFP Australia is not yet known. This report was done in 1991, and I believe that that situation is still the case today. However, target industries would operate with very similar inputs, and that has made it possible to estimate the impact that a cluster of industries and other commercial activity would have on the South Australian economy if these levels of output, or targets, were reached.

Two sets of industry targets were postulated, and their impacts on the South Australian economy were estimated through the application of a model of that economy. Assumptions were made regarding the extent of new MFP Australia activity as opposed to that transferred from elsewhere in the South Australian economy to estimate only the additional economic activity generated by MFP Australia.

The following broad economic benefits would flow to the South Australian economy from a successful MFP development. First, if turnover in the key industries of information technology, education, environmental management, training, health, media and tourism reached optimistic targets in 2014, gross State product would be increased by an estimated \$2 billion in 1990 dollars. The total additional employment that would be generated is estimated to be over 43 000 jobs.

If annual turnover from four key industries reached a more conservative target of \$950 million per annum by the year 2008, gross State product would increase by about \$319 million per annum, and about 8 840 jobs would be created by the year 2008. Given the conservative nature of this lower set of targets, these are considered to be the lowest likely economic benefits. In both cases, the operations phase of MFP Australia's industrial activity would generate a greater economic impact than either the siteworks and housing construction connected with developing the MFP Australia villages or the productivity effects of MFP Australia on other industries.

My reason for emphasising that is that it is our concern that this whole MFP concept has been focused purely and simply on the urban development principle at Gillman, and the major benefit for South Australia, that is, the development of industries into this high technology future, has at this stage apparently—and I stress 'apparently'—been rejected or at least not followed through to the same extent as urban development.

The conclusions of that study were that most of the core site can be made suitable for urban development. The technical and cost implications of the necessary development process are understood. Secondly, the key ingredients and intent of the May 1990 design concept can be maintained by responding to the environmental, engineering and commercial concerns. Thirdly, the site can be developed on a commercial basis given the assumptions made in the commercial analysis. Fourthly, MFP Australia has the potential to generate substantial economic benefits. Those conclusions were made from the Kinhill study of 1991.

However, this study did not include funds needed to clean up Port Adelaide's sewage problems or the problems of the Bolivar sewage works or any funds to upgrade or extend the City of Port Adelaide. These reports have now been in the public arena for nearly 12 months. The Government has now introduced its Bill, which we are debating today, and it has commissioned, and now produced, an EIS through Pak Poy Kneebone, the CSIRO and other members of the consortium.

In looking at the MFP, the Opposition spent a considerable amount of time consulting many engineers, many people with environmental interests, many people with strict industrial and business interests and a large number of people who were involved purely and simply with the urban development proposal. The range of interested people, both for and against the project, was interesting. Those in favour of the MFP concept were commercial industrial organisations' developers, entrepreneurs and planners—that is, principally people with a business background. They agreed that South Australia needed a major shot in the arm and that this long-term project could be an important part of future State economic development. The majority of people supported both components of the project and, in general discussions, we heard many proposals, particularly proposals that related to Port Adelaide.

Those opposed to the project were the conservation and environmental groups, and many individuals within the community who had a general concern or, more importantly, a misunderstanding of what this whole concept was about. I think that that is one of the fundamental problems in this debate and in terms of where we are today; at no stage has the Government gone out into the community and told people what the MFP concept is all about.

There have been many public meetings and there is some excellent literature on this project, but I do not believe that anyone has sat down and explained to the people who want to know and understand what this means for their children's future and the future of the State. I believe that that is one of the major problems that the Government has to accept and face up to. If this development corporation and, consequently, the MFP Australia is to bear the fruit it should, I think this is the next step. A principal concern was the size of investment required in the project and the possible involvement of more large scale State Government taxpayer funded investment prospects. Those opposed were mainly opposed to the development being at Gillman.

Our committee noted that a reading of the Kinhill proposal, and the Potter Warburg analysis of it, suggests that the financial prospects for the initial property development phase at Gillman seem to be reasonable. However, we note that all the financial analyses are challengeable because of the assumptions made as to population density, required rates of return, the Government's contribution to the infrastructure costs and timing. They are all variables that will change on a daily basis.

Probably the most critical element is the assumption as to interest rates. If the economy has genuinely settled to a low inflation environment and interest rates fall accordingly, the financial viability is greatly enhanced. If inflation rises again, so will risk premiums, and viability becomes more difficult to assess. This is not unique to this project: it relates to any long-term project of this type in Australia or, for that matter, in the world. High inflation expectations have discouraged much investment in South Australia.

The other key element is that the project is very long term. To expect financial analyses to be accurate over 10 years, let alone over the 20 years plus time frame of the MFP, is unrealistic. However, there is still no justification for this Parliament's not receiving continual explanations as to the current financial responsibilities of this Government or any future Government. We recognise that the MFP project can be correctly designated as having those two distinct components—a high technology, environmentally designed development at Gillman and a high technology industry development project right through the State not only in the western suburbs.

There is no doubt that the industry component can proceed without the other, as this industry component need not totally take place on the proposed urban development site at Gillman, even though some site involvement may be desirable. It could take place anywhere in the city, right now. There is no reason at all why the industry component cannot and should not start as soon as possible.

We note that the basis of the whole proposal for the MFP is to increase the rate of economic growth in Australia, particularly in South Australia, and to internationalise the economy by developing industries here that can compete on a world scale. The South Australian economy has a very narrow base. The major wealth creating industries on which the State is based are the rural sector, manufacturing (particularly of metals) and tourism, with mining also being significant and important. The long-term trend is for the rural and manufacturing sectors to become less important in any economy, purely because of changes in technology, which means that they will employ fewer people. It is also apparent that, without major changes in our work patterns and industrial practices, the Australian manufacturing sector will continue to decline at a faster rate than in other countries.

So, there is a need for Australia, and South Australia in particular, to be active in seeking to develop new wealth creating industries, to build on existing structures and strengths and to provide the growth in employment that will not be forthcoming from at least some of the current major industries. I believe it is a legitimate question to ask whether this growth should be obtained by Government intervention and picking winners or by creating the right environment and letting the market choose the winners that will develop. In a perfectly competitive world, the latter would be desirable. However, the world, and even Australia, does not provide a perfectly competitive market. On this basis we argue that Government action to stimulate growth is appropriate, and for many existing workers, particularly the young, very necessary. However, it is not argued that the Government should pick winners only to support those industries that have a considerable private sector commitment by development of cluster industries.

I support this argument and thus need to further discuss whether the approach proposed for the MFP, which is a relatively large scale proposal for South Australia, and not without risk, is appropriate. A recent detailed analysis of this question was carried out by Professor Michael Porter of Harvard in his book *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. In it he clearly identifies the success of clusters of industries as a means of generating growth in an industry. By a 'cluster', he means a group of firms, and possibly research institutions, involved in the same or very similar industries being grouped together. Once a certain critical mass is reached, that industry will continue to grow in that location as the existing industry provides the scope for development of specialised material and machinery suppliers, trainers, research institution, and so on.

In South Australia, this phenomenon is occurring in the defence industry and has occurred historically in the automotive and white goods areas. Other recent prime examples are 'Silicon Valley' based south of San Francisco, the Italian leather industry, and other research parks in the United States, England and France, in particular, Montpellier and Sophia Antipolis. I had the privilege of visiting Sophia Antipolis about 18 months ago. It is a quite magnificent development. If that is the design and direction that we are attempting to adopt in South Australia, it ought to have the total support of the community. Unfortunately, at this stage

we do not seem to have that general direction being shown to the public.

The characteristic of clusters has been apparent since the industrial revolution. Examples are Sheffield (steel and steel products), Manchester (cloth), Switzerland (watches) and Detroit (cars). These latter examples also show that industries do rise and fall and there needs to be constant effort to develop new ones. The Australian Garnaut report also dealt with the issue of clusters to develop future industry growth opportunities.

Reduced to fundamentals, the proposal of MFP Australia is one to develop a number of clusters in South Australia, and that appears to be the best chance South Australia has of winning international support for development of these new wealth creators. As I said earlier, those industries have all been spelt out in the reports of Kinhill regarding information technology, advanced learning technologies and so on.

Whilst the theory has been put down, it appears that some proposals in this arena have come to fruition, and I refer to the BHP Environmental Research Centre, EPA International Information Utility using Digital NTT and Telecom, some education exports, the management centre including labour studies, and some health exports. Generally, there remains a lot of work to be done to bring these important industrial proposals to fruition in a commercial sense. I believe that this area is the one on which the Government should concentrate more; it should make sure that the public understands that this is where the creation of wealth and jobs will occur.

I turn now to the suitability of the site of Gillman. I have spent some time on the industrial aspects which do not seem to be progressing as rapidly as the other. There has been much concern expressed about the Gillman site. As a consequence of that concern, our apprehension as an Opposition is in terms of the money likely to be spent and the possible viability of this whole project. Many site issues relate to Gillman, and I will list just a few. They include soil contamination; the problem of lakes and how they will be built, leaching from the lakes and stormwater pollutants; soil compaction; mangroves, problems with fisheries and mosquitoes, and the future expansion of the mangroves; conservation zones, and concerns as to whether the trees will grow in salt water; small developed areas that require new costings; existing commerciality of the whole area—that is, air, noise and water pollution problems; re-location of existing waste dumps; and the amount of outside fuel that might be required. I will not go into detail in all those areas because my colleague the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning intends to take up those issues in more detail.

It is interesting to put on the record some of the formal constraints that have been publicised already so we can see what they are really all about. They include the unsatisfactory estuarine water quality, the need for lake water intake and outlet structures to be located so as to avoid the mangroves and polluted waterways, the potential contamination from first flush stormwater flows, the high groundwater levels, the uncompacted soils, the low lying land, the peaty soils, the lead contamination on the Dean Rifle Range, the contamination of the Dry Creek radium processing site, the contamination of the former Largs North acid plant site, the existing stormwater ponding basins, the Penrice brine pipeline across the Gillman site, the relocation of industry, the structure of existing land tenure, the landward migration of mangroves, the existence of mosquito breeding, the provision of services to the site boundaries, the entrances to the site, and the relocation of existing power lines, just to

name a few. They are considered to be the category one constraints on the site. Those issues are just on the surface of this development site.

The South Australian Government, in its submission to the MFP Joint Steering Committee in May 1990, stated:

Studies of the engineering, geotechnical, ecological, soil, hydrological and marine aspects of the selected site have confirmed that all of the degraded aspects of the site can be rehabilitated.

The just published Supplementary Development Plan states:

Poor soil conditions exist over a large portion of the core site and would make construction activity difficult. Remedial works would be required and would include removal of unsuitable existing fill, removal of excess organic materials, recompaction of existing suitable fill, and compaction of new fill.

The draft EIS states:

... the characteristics of the soils to be excavated and used as fill, in particular their compressibility, are such that significant additional volumes would be required, and treated, to provide satisfactory platforms for urban development.

While problems relating to development of the site have been long recognised, there are still no clear definitions of solutions and the cost.

A report to the Department of Premier and Cabinet, dated August 1989 and entitled 'Stratigraphic Investigation of the Gillman development site, Port Adelaide Estuary', advised:

Cores taken from samphire and mangrove marshes north of Gillman-Wingfield are used to interpret the shallow sub-surface stratigraphy of the region. A Holocene marine sequence up to 8 m thick overlies late Pleistocene alluvial (Pooraka Formation) and coastal marine (Glanville Formation) sediments. The Holocene sequence comprises permeable, sandy shoreface, back-barrier and tidal channel facies, subtidal *Posidonia australis* seagrass bank facies, bioclastic intertidal sand flat facies and decalcified mangrove and supratidal marsh facies. Overall, the Holocene strata are saturated, loose, organic-rich and permeable, with very low bearing capacity.

This report has not been published. It was leaked to the *News*, which reported its contents in a front page article on 16 October 1990 under the headline 'MFP site report shock'. Responding to the leak in Parliament on 16 October 1990, the Premier said:

In the course of preparing our submission, a number of reports have been prepared internally. These represented the intellectual property of the project that we were developing. These reports included the one which has been publicised, in the 1989 Mines and Energy Department Report. They are all part of the detailed study that is taking place at the moment. When all the information is gathered together, when we have those detailed evaluations and assessments, obviously they will be made public, because it is fundamental to the project that they should be.

The Premier was also asked on 16 October 1990 whether the Mines and Energy Department report had been provided to the joint steering committee, but he evaded the question at that time. In December 1990, Coffey Partners International presented to Kinhill Delfin an 'Interim Working Paper on Preliminary Geotechnical Groundwater and Agromatic Investigations'. This report, which has not been published, highlights a number of problems with the soil on the Gillman site, as follows:

Much of the site is likely to be difficult for long-term vegetation establishment. Problems range from the effects of saline aquifers and other drainage channels contaminated with industrial wastes to sites contaminated with toxic wastes. Industries have occupied the site from time to time over the past 100 years. These have included salt producers and salt evaporation ponds, fertilizer manufacturers, acid manufacturing plants, cement manufacturers, and metal foundries. Some sites have been used for the storage of metal concentrates, such as copper, prior to shipment from the port. Large parts of the MFP site have been filled with a variety of waste materials varying from highly acid wastes from sulphuric acid production to highly alkaline and saline wastes. Limited sampling and analysis of the fill materials have revealed sites containing heavy metals, asbestos and radio-active wastes.

Due to the influence of these industrial and landfill operations, the soils/medium available for vegetation establishment are very varied. Natural soils vary, due to the coastal influence, from

calcareous sandy soils to peat soils low in pH (possible acid sulphate soils) and include highly plastic clays such as found in the Hindmarsh formation. Recommendations for urban forest establishment are difficult to provide without more detail on soils and site conditions. Suggestions have been made of the possibility of mixing problem soils, such as those highly acid, with other highly alkaline soils to produce a neutral mix. Prospects for achieving a sufficiently integrated mix to neutralise large chemical differences between soils without further chemical treatment are difficult to anticipate. It would appear that better results would be achieved from neutralising each soil type individually prior to any mixing, or individually on site.

The report states further:

Plant growth problems and costs can be expected to increase as land use requirements dictate the planting of more exotic species ... salt loading over much of the site severely limits the range of 'productive' plants that can be grown. Additionally, activities to reduce salt loads will bring on structural problems and often change the pH and nutrient or toxic properties of most soils in ways only definable by detailed assessment for each area before development. Many of these changes will occur over a very short time period as soils are excavated to form lakes or moved for civil engineering purposes or otherwise drained.

This report details the results from soil samples taken on the site, and 17 of the 21 samples were:

... high to very, very high in salinity. In these soils, it would be difficult to grow plants which are sensitive and moderately sensitive to salt; only very highly tolerant plants like salt bush can grow.

The report continues:

Because of the highly saline groundwater underlying much of the MFP site at relatively shallow depth, use of this water can be almost totally discounted as a major source of irrigation water and irrigation will need to be done with water brought onto the site from elsewhere.

A report entitled 'Soil and Groundwater Contamination Assessment' and dated September 1989 to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet by the Centre for Groundwater Studies identified sites contaminated by arsenic, cadmium, mercury and lead. The report states:

Arsenic—six sites have concentrations in the range 50 to 100 mg as kg⁻¹ of soil. The range is informally accepted as the 'level of concern'. The six sites all occur along the southern boundary of the study area, from Eastern Parade to the Wingfield landfill. No explanation can be made for the localisation of these higher arsenic values. Further investigation may be justified.

Mercury—An unacceptably high value of 26 mg Hg kg⁻¹ was identified at Site 2, the former sulphuric acid and fertiliser factory area on the west side of the Port River ... the single, very high value at one location raises the possibility of other high values not being identified because of the low sampling density, especially in the north-west sector of the study area where there are measureable mercury concentrations.

The draft EIS states:

Further comprehensive investigation of soil contamination may be needed during the design process.

References to the above reports are not included in the draft EIS. Two major reports have been prepared to assess the risk of industrial hazards on the site. Some of their content has been quoted in the draft EIS but they have not been released in full. A report dated December 1989 was submitted to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet by Dr J.R. McCracken. The following are some extracts:

The cumulative risk of dangerous concentrations of toxic gas, vapour or smoke/fumes (e.g. as might be defined by the 'immediately dangerous to life and health' concentration) arising from credible potentially hazardous incidents, exceeds the adopted criterion for acceptable risk at residential areas ... over the majority of the study site ... similarly, the cumulative risk of fatality to an individual exceeds the adopted criterion for acceptable risk at residential areas over much of the study area ... therefore, most of the study area would appear to be unacceptable for residential development if strict adherence to the adopted risk criteria was deemed to be essential. However, since most of the Gillman site is relatively marginal with respect to unacceptable risk it would not be unreasonable to use at least some of the lowest risk areas for residential development provided that:

only low density development is permitted, and a comprehensive emergency plan is prepared.

In relation to the proposed emergency plan, the report further states:

... a comprehensive emergency plan needs to be prepared for the study area which provides detailed considerations for evacuation or in-place sheltering as appropriate emergency responses to potential hazardous incidents involving major toxic emissions to the atmosphere. This plan should form an integral part of the emergency plan for the region but should identify and be capable of responding to all relevant conditions which are peculiar to its location. The plan should embrace the hazards analysis approach and should therefore involve an interactive process that includes both risk assessments and planning which ensures that adequate access/egress routes to/from all points in the area have been provided. Its capacity to deal promptly and effectively with all identified credible potential hazardous incidents involving major toxic emissions to the atmosphere should be verified and updated on a regular basis.

This report also recommends:

A continuing comprehensive official record on all major hazardous incidents involving industrial mishaps or transportation accidents within the Port Adelaide region... This record would provide a most useful appendix to the main regional and emergency plan particularly for the purposes of updating or undertaking hazard analyses and risk assessments.

Members opposite may be interested to know that there are considerable hazards, industrial and otherwise, at the Gillman site which need to be considered in any development of this type. I would have thought—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order!

Mr INGERSON: I know that I must not answer interjections but, if the member opposite had been here earlier, he would note that the Liberal Party has given support for the MFP concept. That is in the *Hansard* record so that even the member opposite, in his spare time after he retires, can read it. A second report, 'Assessment of risks arising from selected industrial facilities on the LeFevre Peninsula and adjacent to the Port Adelaide River', was submitted in April 1991 by Australian Centre of Advanced Risk and Reliability Engineering Ltd. This report states:

Although the assessments in this report and in the report by McCracken were undertaken entirely independently, and differ substantially in many details both in assumptions and method, the risks as assessed are generally consistent with each other. While the precise positions of risk contours differ between the reports, the general conclusions about safety of broad areas are comparable.

The draft EIS states:

It is clear that Tweeddale and Sylvester considered that the application of risk originating from the four highest risk industrial sources to inhabitants of the core site was of a lower order than did McCracken.

However, the following are comments of Tweeddale and Sylvester about the four sites:

Penrice Anhydrous Ammonia Facility: The results in the two reports are broadly consistent.

That relates to the down-wind concentration of ammonia gas. They did say that there was another requirement for other emergency measures to be put in place. The same applies to the ICI chlorine facility, concerning which the report states:

In this revised report, it has been possible to take account of the discontinuation of manufacture of chlorine at the ICI facility. At the time when the McCracken report was prepared, the plant was manufacturing chlorine.

Again, they have said that in the case of emergency we need to have a plan. At this stage nowhere has the Government put down an emergency plan, and it has not explained to this Parliament how these sorts of standard industrial issues need to be considered in the general plan for the development of Gillman. In relation to the CIG sulphur dioxide facility, the report states:

The risks as assessed in the draft ACARRE report were generally slightly higher than those in the McCracken report. In this revised report, it has been possible to make allowance for discontinuation of liquefaction of sulphur dioxide at the facility.

In relation to PASA, some general comments are made involving the risks of gas leaking and the probability of ignition. The report states that in both cases it was low. However, it is still a risk that needs to be treated. The South Australian public has the right to know how that pipeline, which is an important part of the electricity delivery system in our State, will be handled. The report also recommends:

New residential developments should not be undertaken on sections of the proposed MFP sites as follows:

- the southern section of the Pelican Point site
- most of the Largs North site
- the south-western section of the Gillman site
- the northern strip of the Gillman site
- a strip along and near the eastern boundary of the Dry Creek site.

Within those areas, any proposal for a development (such as a shopping centre), which would be expected to attract large numbers of people for many hours on many days of the week, should be viewed with caution.

Those comments are not mine but direct quotes from a report which the Government has and which until recently had not been published, and I stress that last sentence. As the draft EIS lists only three of those sites, one must ask what has happened to the non-inclusion of the Largs North and Pelican Point sites? Perhaps there suddenly has been a change of emphasis or decision by the Government. Originally, it had been proposed to include village development within these two locations. The Government's submission to the joint steering committee in May 1990 proposed 'a marina and waterfront residential development on Lefevre Peninsula'. While the Pelican Point and Largs North locations remain within the core site for the MFP, the Government has budgeted to receive \$3 m for their sale. Again, that is a question that needs to be answered. Why have the Largs North and the Pelican Point sites not been included in the general development proposals?

In relation to the social mix of residents within the MFP site, the Government's May 1990 submission to the joint steering committee proposed 'an international city'. It explained, 'By controlling the rate of establishing new villages, the range of housing types and the special emphases in each village plan, we will be able to counter any tendency for racial or socio economic elites to develop, and moderate the pace and demographic profiles of the new settlement development.' In other words, the original joint steering committee proposal was that we would have a development very similar to that of Golden Grove in which there would be a mixture of development and groups of people who could live there. However, the May 1991 MFP Adelaide Management Board Feasibility Report stated:

MFP Adelaide will consist of a network of communities that are culturally and socially diverse, that encourage interpersonal and intercultural communication and that express their diversity to create positive community identity. MFP will be linked with and embrace the social fabric of existing communities.

This report listed the project's social planning and equity objectives to include 'facilitation of the attraction of people from a broad range of age and socio economic groups, nationalities and occupations'. It stated:

The MFP Adelaide development has the potential to provide improved work opportunities and residential amenity for local residents of surrounding areas. It also has the potential to create social division between the communities in the new development and those in surrounding areas unless positive measures are put in place to provide equitable access to facilities, job opportunities and improvements in residential amenities in those communities.

However, a document entitled 'A Report on Housing Market Issues for the MFP Development, North-western Adelaide' has raised questions about whether those objectives

can be met. The report was prepared by Mr John Cooper at the request of Wendy Bell, planning consultant for the MFP, and is dated 14 November 1991. The report has not been made public. It states:

A critical factor is the market perception of market environment and this is a function of aesthetic, physical, historical and psychological images held by prospective purchasers. Taking these issues into account, it is concluded that North Haven presents more of the fundamental market characteristics of the MFP than West Lakes. However, there is one extremely fundamental difference: ocean access and its accoutrements. This aspect should not be underestimated and it is felt extremely unlikely that any future built into the MFP housing environment will be able to compensate for the lack of this particular feature of North Haven. Under these circumstances it will be necessary to devote substantial expenditure to development and implementation of an effective marketing strategy, designed to minimise the negative images possessed by Adelaide residents in respect of the MFP locality and to promote an image of desirability from both physical and economic standpoints.

Referring to community mix, the report states:

It is understood that the MFP is to be developed with an integrated mix of household form from a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds. This aim is at odds with normal housing market mechanisms which are used by households to maximise satisfaction by minimising social mix; there may be some argument about the details of this proposition and its worthiness, but the fact remains that this is a strong feature of the market and is exploited by property marketeers. It is considered that the overall appeal of the MFP as a desirable housing environment will be reduced, especially in respect of higher priced housing by an attempt to integrate housing of widely varied price levels.

The resulting environment may eventually be seen as being acceptable, but it is likely to be an impediment to successful marketing of housing in the project from the outset. The extent to which the 'natural' evolution of housing sub-markets has produced price and socioeconomic segregation of housing in the study area should not be dismissed lightly. . . . it would be a major marketing error to attempt to develop the area as an extension of existing peripheral suburbs, none of which would offer any attraction to the type of households upon which the commercial success of the MFP housing market must depend. The development will need to be insulated from these areas rather than integrated with them if the economic advantages of purchasing a dwelling in the project are to be maximised.

This latter point contradicts a proposal in the MFP Adelaide Management Board feasibility report, which was published in May 1991, as follows:

The first village should be located as close as possible to Port Adelaide. This would not only strengthen and support Port Adelaide as a regional centre but also establish links between the two communities.

The possibility that the project will have problems achieving a mix of socioeconomic groups raises questions about the equity of Government funding of the project, given that other areas of Adelaide and South Australia may receive reduced Government priority, particularly in capital spending for housing. This issue was raised by a consultant to the planning review (R. Bunker), in a paper dated 17 September 1991 entitled 'Relationship of MFP to Planning Review Strategies for Adelaide'. The paper has not been made public. It states, with respect to the commitment of public capital:

One of the major questions about the future character of Adelaide concerns the ways in which capital for public works will be mobilised and deployed. How this is to be done, and how priorities and programs are then defined are major exercises. In the process of the review's public consultations, fears have been expressed that MFP core site development could divert money from necessary infrastructure extension at the fringes of Adelaide. The Gillman site development can be seen as an exercise in urban consolidation, diminishing the need for fringe growth. But not only is this tied up with the issue of population growth . . . the heavy capital expenditure needed to provide infrastructure and create land at the Gillman core site highlights the need to avoid lumpiness in such investment and to minimise State exposure.

There are still no precise estimates of Government funding of infrastructure for the project. The submission by the

South Australian Government in May 1990 to the joint steering committee estimated public costs 'in the order of \$6 billion' of which \$200 million would be provided by the South Australian Government, \$1 billion by the Australian Government, and \$4.8 billion by 'other'. This was based on a sharing of public sector costs in proportion to likely benefits. This estimate was soon upgraded. In June 1990 the Premier said:

Adelaide's selection as the site for the \$7 billion multifunction polis would not cost taxpayers. The MFP would cost the Government about \$280 million for infrastructure development. Much of the expenditure will be the sort of thing we would be spending anyway on roads and water systems . . . the project will be required to meet its full development costs.

That was reported in the *Advertiser* of 20 June 1990. A report in the *Advertiser* of 20 March 1991 stated that it would cost an estimated \$705 million to clean up the Gillman site, as follows:

Premier's Department Director Mr Bruce Guerin said this estimate, in today's monetary terms, was for development over 20 years. It was to the stage that land could be sold and houses built . . . the greater proportion of costs would be borne by private developers.

I note that we still do not have any private sector developers nor any consistent costs. In Parliament on 21 March 1991 the Premier said:

That figure is the best currently available estimate of the cost over the whole development period of the project—and incidentally, we are talking about a time of up to 20 years or more—to bring that core site up to the building stage, which will be done progressively and have it ready for that development. The estimated figure includes public infrastructure and private development costs which are, of course, associated with any large scale project. Let me say again that the sum of \$705 million is not what the Government is contributing to this project; on the contrary, that amount of money includes everything that is involved, including the large private contribution to the project.

In fact, our public sector costs for the land development are still subject to detailed assessment, but they will be a comparatively small proportion of the total cost and will reflect simply the normal sorts of costs that would be involved in any similar type of development. We will be contributing infrastructure to it. The extra cost of some of the particular areas of the site is matched by the access of infrastructure to the site, something which we do not get in some of our broad acre outer suburban developments. So there are checks and balances. We will contribute only a proportion of that—a fair proportion—but at the moment it is not possible to estimate how much. An indicative figure will have to wait.

The May 1991 Management Board report identified infrastructure to support urban development on the core site as including roads and pathways, stormwater drainage, sewerage, water supplies, energy systems, communications, waste management and public transport. The Government's May 1990 submission to the joint steering committee proposed that 'the transport system, for example, will be an advance on Adelaide's dual-fuel guided busway system'. The costs of this project are becoming astronomical with all these side issues, which do not directly involve the site itself. In June 1990 Premier Bannon promised 'a network of state of the art transport links to integrate the development with suburban Adelaide and the city'. In relation to infrastructure for sewerage and protection of the marine environment, the draft EIS states:

The input of effluent from Port Adelaide sewage treatment works into the estuary should be reduced by at least 75 per cent (or eliminated) to reduce the nutrient load in the North Arm input river. The input of effluent from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works into the sea at St Kilda should be reduced (or eliminated) to reduce the nutrient load in Barker Inlet input water.

The Bannon Government has a commitment to eliminate all sludge discharges from Bolivar and Port Adelaide by 1993. However, this does not extend to effluent. Environment Minister Lenehan told Parliament on 21 March 1990:

We are talking about sludge out of the gulf by the end of 1990 ... sludge out of the gulf involves one commitment; effluent is a totally different one.

It has been anticipated that the cost of removal of sewage from both Port Adelaide and Bolivar is of the order of \$100 million, yet that is not included in any of the costs of this site project at Gillman. As you would know, Mr Speaker, unless the water in the lakes is of good quality, this whole project is in jeopardy. The MFP Management Board has the 'Initial Report on Design Rules/Parameters for lakes associated with the MFP, impact of dinoflagellates' which states:

At present the toxin levels in the Port River are dangerous to human health for four to six months each year. If the Port Adelaide sewage effluent is not removed from the river there is a high probability of dinoflagellate problems in any canal developments off the Port River.

Another issue relating to public costs for the project is the cost of purchasing the 323 hectares within the Gillman site occupied by the Wingfield Rubbish Dump. It has been reported the Adelaide City Council is seeking 'at least \$6m' for this land (*Advertiser* 29 November 1990). In relation to the cost of cleaning up the site, Senator Button has told Federal Parliament:

An EIS is being conducted at the moment. When that is complete, if there are environmental problems it will be the function of the development corporation to clean them up.

Senator Button has also said of Commonwealth funding for the project:

... in general principle, any money which is made available by the Commonwealth would be in the nature of an untied grant.

It is fairly interesting to run that quote out now when we have seen that \$40 million has been taken out of the Better Cities project. That seems to be inconsistent with the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce's statement to the Parliament.

In relation to commercial viability, the principles set by the joint steering committee for development of the project include:

Further work should be undertaken on the assumption that the proposal will only proceed to fruition if it can mobilise significant private investor support, particularly in Japan and other countries, which results in a net addition to available capital resources in Australia.

The May 1990 South Australian Government submission to the joint steering committee made the following references to the development of basic industries within the MFP:

We have commenced preliminary negotiations with significant overseas institutions, including two in Japan, and we are confident that reciprocal arrangements with the World University will be established. The following specific commitments to the concept of a university city have been obtained—

- the establishment of an appropriate range of residential accommodation within the City of Adelaide as well as in the new settlement. Short-term requirements of students and lecturers, affordable long-term student facilities, and the development of a 'student quarter' are being negotiated;
- plans are well advanced for an annual program to be called 'the Adelaide Conferences' modelled after the Dahlem series and bringing to MFP Adelaide and Australia the best people in a chosen field;
- the South Australian Government's current negotiations with three of the largest international information and telecommunications technology companies to establish a major data processing node in Adelaide.

All these issues were canvassed in 1990 and put forward as logical, sensible extensions, but to date none of them has come to fruition. On 30 June 1990 Premier Bannon was quoted by the *Advertiser* as stating:

Already, more than 100 international firms from Europe and the United States have registered their interest in being part of the MFP development.

On 3 December 1990, the Project Director, Mr Rod Keller, was quoted by the *Advertiser* saying the level of Japanese interest was very high but it was too early for companies to make firm commitments. The Management Board Report on Feasibility of May 1991 identified the following development opportunities for the project:

Advanced Information Technology and Telecommunications Education Facility.

Advanced Software Foundation.

The Hon D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I know, and I will be getting to that point in a minute. It continues:

A national environmental protection agency.

Environmental instrumentation.

Distributed water and wastewater treatment plants.

It goes on. There is a list of centres of management and technology areas, all of which were being investigated in 1991. I hope that the Premier will be able to tell this Parliament for the first time whether any or all of those institutions are coming here to South Australia.

I would now like to touch on the Japanese view of the project, because recently there was a delegation here in South Australia. The delegation made a report that became public and it dealt with dreams. There were some interpretations as to what was meant by that word. The delegation put out an extensive report, and I would like to comment on it. In early March 1992 the Japanese summary of an MFP Investment Environment Survey Mission which visited Australia in December 1991 was made public. It raised questions about the commercial viability of the project and Japanese interest. The following are extracts from the Japanese report:

Unless we set a premise that Australia will compete in the world market, we cannot expect development of industries. When we compare Australia's competitive edge with that of neighbouring nations it is not superior at all (for example, low growth in labour productivity).

As far as our survey is concerned, we had an impression that Australia had not reached a stage to bring merits of Japanese management into full play ... it is a matter of question which comes first—egg or hen? In materialising the MFP, it seems to be important to have successful examples of Japanese management in the manufacturing sector so that both sides can renew our perception.

I further quote:

Some of those plans (in other States visited by the mission) were, however, attractive as they were ahead of the Adelaide plan and were full of realistic ideas.

That quote refers to a representation to the Japanese group to visit Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane to talk about possible development in those cities. The delegation found in each of those other cities that not only were there projects available for them to get involved with straight away but they said that their plans for future development of the industry side in those towns were well advanced: the plans were realistic and they were not in fact dreams or concepts in the future. That is a worrying situation, because that is really what the foundation of this whole exercise is about, that is, developing industry opportunities in the high technology area for our State. I refer to the following quote:

... if Australia defines MFP Australia as 'MFP elsewhere in Australia', private companies which have certain plans and are eager to invest in Australia in several years time may have to choose other areas where they can have a clear outlook to some extent about construction of infrastructure. It is because land reclamation has not been started yet at Adelaide and, what is more, even details of fund procurement, a period for development and the first phase development have not been released at present.

This is another quote:

Australia needs to clarify a plan for construction of infrastructure in the timetable of the development plan and show it in a quantitative way in order to give firm confidence about realisation of MFP to private companies that are potential investors.

A further quote:

Development of the MFP core site is a project with a dream as it sets a target on 30 years time and as the concept of MFP Australia is a physically extensive idea. We therefore need to take a long term view on investment.

I further quote:

It is, however, not certain who is going to procure funds for this investment; private sector developers, the State Government; the Commonwealth Government or Development Corporation. (Under the legislation, there is a framework in which Development Corporation has capacity to borrow funds and the State Government guarantees for loans. As the budget has not been appropriated yet, it is not certain how much of this framework is expected to function.)

The report also states:

The report of the Management Board describes needs for soil improvement. Although it says that this problem can be solved, the South Australian State Government needs to elucidate the present situation of pollution at the MFP site and clarify a posture of the Government (that is, who takes responsibility for potential impacts of pollution in the future, the Government or buyers of land?).

I further quote:

It is primarily a responsibility of the State Government or the Commonwealth Government to develop land, construct infrastructure such as port facilities and roads and supply energy and water.

Another quote:

What is important is that the public sector must make investment before participation of the private sector in construction of the site. Although they say that they will seek participation from private developers for development of the core site, conditions are not clarified.

I further quote:

... it is not clear whether this idea (information utilities) is realistic apart from a model case of Government investment.

These are not my comments; they come from the Japanese group which came here to look at investing in this concept for our future. They highlight what we need from the Premier. To support the object of this exercise we need answers to all the questions that have been posed by the Japanese. More importantly, the community of South Australia wants to know the answers to these questions, some of which are: what is this project about; where is this project at; and how much will it cost the taxpayers? All this report does is put it down in its final case.

Finally, I wish to talk about Premier Bannon's economic justification for the project. In the *Advertiser* of 17 May 1990 the Premier states:

When you look at what's happening in the rest of the world, you realise Australia's got to catch up fast... what we lack at the moment is a sense of urgency... international economic changes could make Australia irrelevant unless the country's exports could keep up.

In the *Advertiser* of 30 October 1990 he states:

South Australia was in danger of sinking to a peasant economy if it failed to pursue projects such as the MFP... the prospect of a peasant economy faced any State or nation which was not prepared to look at the international demands on industry, commerce and Government.

In the *Advertiser* of 2 March 1992 he states:

If the project failed South Australia would face declining living standards, fewer job opportunities and a diminished role in the nation's economy.

Those comments do not place the MFP in its proper perspective. The MFP will be a very important part of the industrial and urban development of this State but, in reality, will be no more than about a 10 per cent share of our State's total GDP. What the Opposition and the people of South Australia want from this Government, through this legislation and through this debate in the Parliament, is for the Premier for the first time to put on the record what the dream is all about, when the plans at Gillman will occur

and when the cost of the project will be put before the Parliament, so that everyone in this State can make a decision as to whether or not it is a feasible, logical project and whether or not we will have a continuing debate on this project as it develops over the next 10 to 20 years. On behalf of the Opposition, I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My colleague the member for Bragg has covered a very wide range of subjects in relation to the legislation presently before the House. I want to concentrate purely on environmental issues and some matters relating to the planning objectives. For some time now the Liberal Party has said that, on behalf of all South Australians, it will seek as much information as possible about this project so that it can make an informed and objective assessment of it. I believe that it is essential that we leave no stone unturned in a bid to ensure that the environmental concerns particularly are addressed as part of the continuing debate.

One area of concern to the Liberal Party relates to the provision, in the Planning Act, of environmental impact assessment procedures. Section 49 of the Planning Act provides:

(1) Where a person proposes to undertake a development or project that is, in the opinion of the Minister [for Environment and Planning], of major social, economic or environmental importance—

(b) The Minister may require the proponent to prepare a draft environmental impact statement...

I also know, as do all members of this House, that, if a private developer wishes to proceed with a development that comes under this provision, that private developer must comply with this section and I think that that is appropriate if we consider the magnitude of this development. Although I have some significant questions about the project, it could be of major importance to this State and, as such, I believe that it is appropriate that we go through the normal environmental impact assessment procedures, as any private developer would have to do. The Planning Act clearly points out what these procedures are: the proponent prepares a draft EIS (and that has happened) and the draft EIS is placed on public exhibition. The draft EIS in this case has been on public exhibition for six weeks, although I understand that if there is a cause for that period to be extended to eight weeks that will be acceptable.

That is of some concern to me. I have made it my business to look at other environmental impact assessments that have occurred in recent times, and I know of many examples where environmental impact statements have been on public exhibition for much longer than six or eight weeks and for much lesser developments. I would have thought that it was appropriate for more time to be made available in this case. However, that is a decision for the Government of the day and for the Minister, and that decision has been made. But, it is of concern that public exhibition occurred for only six or eight weeks (whichever the case might be).

The Planning Act provides that the draft EIS is to be placed on public exhibition; submissions are called for; and the document must be on public exhibition for a minimum period of six weeks from the date of publication of the advertisement. In other words, the Government has determined on this occasion that it will go for the minimum period of six weeks. We realise that all submissions received are forwarded to the proponent and the proponent is required to respond to the submissions. However, I am concerned about the next process particularly because section 49 of the Planning Act clearly provides that an assessment report prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning

is to be forwarded to the Minister. This report advises the Minister on the adequacy of the documentation for official recognition and on the environmental implications of the project. Having considered the public submissions and the proponent's response to these, together with the assessment report, the Minister then determines what amendments need to be made to the EIS and signifies in writing to the proponent that the statement is officially recognised.

If I had my way, I would not support this legislation until the assessment was known and had been reported on. I believe that that is a normal requirement for any private development, and for the life of me I cannot see why that should not be the case with a development the size of this one. I am pleased that my colleagues have determined that, at the appropriate time, an amendment should be moved at least to ensure that no major work is carried out on the development site prior to all the provisions under section 49 of the Planning Act relating to environmental impact assessment being completed.

I have many concerns about the Gillman site in particular, and that is really what I want to concentrate on in this debate. My three main concerns relate to the technological solutions—and I refer to them as 'solutions', because that is how they are referred to in the EIS—incompatibility with the local environment, and environmental health problems. I would suggest that the technological solutions are not solutions but merely technological paths, and their implementation poses more questions and uncovers further problems than would be the case in normal events. Expert consultants and engineers have made it quite clear that what we read in the EIS indicates that we are guessing at ways to address some of the environmental issues that are to be considered under this project.

The proposed method of dealing with saline groundwater, we learn in the EIS, is to pump it out. That is a very poor solution, I would suggest, which seems to ignore the fact that the area is right next to the sea and that, by definition, groundwater must be very close to the surface. I would suggest that it would require many pumps to draw down the groundwater to a sufficient depth to allow plantings and the survival of what we learn to be urban forests, and these pumps would need to be operating for 24 hours a day, pumping out hundreds of megalitres of water per hour.

Questions are also raised about the further impact of draw down of water to the north of the area, and I certainly realise, as would the Minister of Water Resources, that market gardeners in that area already are experiencing tremendous problems with water supply. In the EIS, contaminated soils are recognised as a problem that can be solved, but I question that because, if the technology exists, why is it not being used now to deal with current known soil contamination in Adelaide? We all realise that, in places such as Bowden and Brompton in particular, sites that have been recognised as being contaminated, the only solution that we appear to have is to remove soil and to put it into a landfill area somewhere out in the countryside. I would be delighted if somebody could prove to me that we have the answers to soil contamination. Nobody can argue that it will not be a major problem in the Gillman site. However, I do not believe that we have the answers to that vexed question.

One subject on which I will spend some time in the short opportunity that is available to me is mangroves. With the amount of information that I have, I would have liked double the time that we are allotted. In the EIS, and ever since the site was determined for the MFP, we have been promised by those who we are told have some authority that the mangroves will be retained. The environmental

impact statement does nothing to give me confidence in that claim. It is a biological fact, also, that mosquitoes breed in mangroves. I would suggest that nowhere in the world has human habitation and mangrove growth proved to be compatible. We can talk about solutions, but again I do not believe that they are real solutions but suggested ideas of how we might overcome some of these problems. The EIS refers to chemical remediation—in other words, spraying—as one way of dealing with mosquitoes. It goes into no details about what sprays would be used and what damage could be caused to human and animal life.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And marine life.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Marine life is of very real concern, and I will be speaking about that in more detail a little later. We all know that mosquitoes form part of the food chain in the marine environment. I would suggest that getting rid of the mosquitoes and the mangroves will threaten the viability of the South Australian fishing industry. The mangroves are an essential nursery and feeding ground for most of South Australia's commercial fish species. It amazes me that we have not heard more about that point. South Australia prides itself on its fishing industry. When one thinks about the amount of legislation that has passed through this House with regard to the fishing industry, quite appropriately, to protect that industry—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —and the export income, coast protection and so many of those areas, one is intrigued: there are so many inherent dangers that could bring an end to the fishing industry in parts of South Australia, and I am amazed that more concern is not being expressed about it. Then there are environmental health problems, and I do not intend to go into much detail about that, but it is of grave concern. The recommendation that contaminated areas be capped with clay is, I suggest, in itself a very dicey situation and does not appear to be a viable solution. The EIS refers to some of the artificial lakes being of primary recreational value. We all realise that these lakes are the planned replacement for the existing ponding basin which receives a large percentage of Adelaide's polluted stormwater. I doubt that any of these lakes could be suitable for recreational activities.

I now want to refer to one of the many letters to the editor that I have collected on the subject of the MFP. This letter was written by a Mr Ken Hughes. He would be well known, particularly to the Minister for Environment and Planning, as he is to me, because he writes to me on numerous occasions and I know that he writes to the Minister because, on most occasions, I am advised that that is the case. In this situation, Mr Hughes wrote to the *Advertiser* and the letter was published on 9 November last year. His letter was in response to correspondent A. Bertram Cox who expressed concerns about the MFP. Mr Hughes states:

Cutting of numerous waterway channels will intersect the already high water table admitting oxygen to subsurface deposits of peat and other organic matter. Acidity will rise, the solubility of zinc, lead, nickel and aluminium metals—widely present—will elevate toxic pollution levels. Extensive relocation and placement of excavated spoil material will raise the water table and increase both the hydraulic gradient and groundwater discharge to the North Arm and the Port River.

Ecologists are alarmed. Aluminium concentrations cause mucus formation upon fish gills. Deprivation of vital oxygen uptake will bring death to fish life. The liberation of ammonia, methane, nutrients and a wide range of both organic and inorganic pollutants present in unknown amounts has the undoubted potential to annihilate this resource so vital to the fishery industry and coastal waters.

These and many other facts are revealed in reports that have been made available to the Opposition only after request in the past week or so. I have also been contacted

by a person who has lived in the proposed MFP site area for some 60 years. He telephoned me the other day very incensed because he had just seen the Minister making a statement on television regarding the development of the Garden Island Conservation Park. This person indicated to me that on that day the Minister, in order to arrive at a small boat ramp where she gave a press conference, would have had to drive past two dumps. One of these dumps is located on the left-hand side and it contains mainly heavy metals; it was covered with earth three or four years ago but is now leaking back to the Torrens Island Power Station. According to this person, this is causing major concern to local residents who know the area very well.

The Minister would have also had to pass a second dump site that has a wire fence around it. I have looked at this area, which was a tidal area with grounds for fingerlings. There is now evidence of oil coming back into the North Arm with significant pollution in the area. One can only question how the Minister can give a press conference in the middle of that area saying that it is her plan to turn it into a conservation park.

I refer to a draft management plan prepared for the Port Adelaide and St Kilda mangroves in August 1986. I only wish, as I do not have the time to refer to all of it, that the whole document could be tabled. I urge members on both sides of the House to read it. The report states:

The organic matter produced by mangroves and seagrasses form the basis of many . . . food chains. The value of these ecosystems to the fish ecology cannot be overstated, and for that reason alone warrant conservation.

The report goes on to indicate how very important the Port Adelaide-St Kilda mangrove area is for birdlife. It states:

Any loss or degradation of mangroves would have a deleterious effect upon the extensive birdlife . . . the mangroves and the ICI saltfields have become bird observation areas of interstate and international renown.

I and many other members in this place are aware of that. The report continues:

The value of the mangroves as a marine resource and an area of intrinsic beauty leads to the conclusion that this area must be protected from further destruction. This area should become part of the national park as soon as it can be arranged.

That report was compiled in 1986. It lists 50 species of fish recorded in marine waters adjacent or close to the Port Adelaide-St Kilda mangrove area. I only hope that members on both sides of the House will study these reports and these environmental issues that are of concern to me and to the people of South Australia.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Of all the controversial Bills that I have debated during 14½ years in Parliament, this is probably one of the most controversial and the one with the most serious cost implications. Therefore, it should carry with it a cost benefit statement, but that has not occurred. I say at the outset that the goals of the multifunction polis as outlined in the Bill and in the Government's own MFP papers are goals which I believe the majority of South Australia would support. They are certainly goals which I support. Clause 5 provides:

The objects of this Act are to secure the creation or establishment of—

- (a) a national focus for economic, scientific and technological developments of international significance;
- (b) leading centres of innovation in science, technology, education and the arts;
- (c) a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies;
- (d) a model of productive interaction—

if one can identify what is meant by that rather gobbledygook phrase—

between industries and research and development, educational, community and other organisations and of the use of advanced information and communication systems for that purpose;

- (e) an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development . . .
- (f) a model of conservation of the natural environment and resource management and of equitable social and economic development in an urban context.

It is important to examine those objects and how they will affect the city of Adelaide and the State of South Australia. The MFP papers identify MFP Adelaide as 'the vision'. They describe Adelaide as an Australian city with a world vision. I do not believe that there is one member in this House who would not support Adelaide as an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development and in the use of advanced technology. Not one of us would not support Adelaide as a leading centre for innovation in science and technology, education and the arts. In fact, I believe that we can already be described in that way. We cannot yet, but I hope that one day we will, be described as a centre of national focus for economic and technological development. We cannot yet be but should move towards the goal of being described as a model of conservation and management of resources in the natural environment. As yet, we are a very long way from that goal. However, I submit that we do not need an MFP to fulfil that or any other goal described either in the Bill or in the MFP papers.

The papers go on to urge that we be a focus for investment in international business development based on new and emerging technologies and a social model for the twenty-first century based on equitable social and economic development. Until the advent of the Bannon Government, from the 150 years since settlement, Adelaide and South Australia have indeed been a social model based on equitable social and economic development. Those words embody the reasons for our settlement origins and the historic development of this State. So, to suggest that these things are central to or dependent upon the MFP is to ignore totally South Australian history, culture and development.

I think there has been far too much trumpeting of the MFP as the salvation of this State and far too little concentration on our potential for change and development with the existing structure and infrastructure that is part of our State and our capital city. As I have said, the goals are unexceptionable and can be supported by us all. The method of achieving those goals is embodied in the Bill and gives rise to the deepest disquiet on the part of the Opposition.

Let us look at the powers provided under this Bill. Under clause 3, the Government may declare by proclamation areas to be development areas for the multifunction polis. That simply means that the Governor in Executive Council, upon the decision of the Cabinet, can declare any area in this State to be an MFP development area. That in itself may not seem a draconian power but, when it is linked with the power embodied in clause 12 for compulsory acquisition, one realises that, by a simple proclamation and without reference to the Parliament, the Government can compulsorily acquire any area of this State that it chooses for the purpose of the development of the multifunction polis. We believe that that is a power that should not be granted to any Government, that it would not be supported by the majority of South Australians and that it is one that is unjust, particularly because clause 6 of the Bill enables the corporation to enter into partnerships and joint ventures.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: We are not giving it to the Government: we are giving it to the corporation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As my colleague says, we are not giving it to the Government; we are giving it to the corporation. This provision gives the corporation a status and a power which no private corporation could possibly obtain. It gives it rights and powers which would enable the acquisition of any part of this State for commercial purposes by what is essentially a business venture. I do not believe that that is a right and proper power to give to the Multifunction Polis Development Corporation, and I certainly do not believe that South Australians would support it. Not only can the corporation enter into partnerships and joint ventures as provided for in clause 6 but it can form, acquire, deal with and dispose of interest in companies and other entities. Over recent months in this Parliament, we have heard of the adventures of the State Government Insurance Commission and the State Bank in terms of their formation of companies and embarking upon joint ventures. There is nothing to say that those kinds of adventures cannot be undertaken by the Multifunction Polis Corporation.

In addition to the powers I have outlined, clause 33 of the Bill exempts the corporation from the provisions of the Planning Act. I would have thought that this Government would learn from bitter experience with the ASER and Wilpena developments that, when a Government tries to exempt major developments from the Planning Act, it causes intense resentment and hostility, acute injustice to individuals and other corporations, and rides roughshod over the rights and the responsibilities that the rest of us are required by law to observe and uphold. The exemption under clause 33 of the Planning Act is a serious provision, which will give rise to extremely difficult and contentious matters that will rend this community in future as it has been rent in the past whenever this provision has been applied to a project.

On top of all those contentious provisions, the most contentious is contained in clause 28, which outlines the borrowing powers of the corporation. Clause 28 provides that the corporation may borrow money from the Treasurer or, with the consent of the Treasurer, from any other person. We know how the Treasurer's consent has been used in the past. We know how the Treasurer's consent was used when the put option was taken out on the Collins Street building in Melbourne, and the cost of \$520 million under the liability of general revenue. However, that clause also indicates that a liability of the Treasurer under a guarantee—and all those loans are guaranteed by the Treasurer—arising out of this Bill is to be satisfied out of the general revenue of this State, which is appropriated by this clause to the necessary extent.

It is incredible that the Premier and members opposite could come straight-faced into this Parliament when we all have a debt in excess of \$2.2 billion, as a result of calling on the general revenue guarantee, and seek a similar unlimited guarantee, when it is attached to the provisions which I have just outlined—an unlimited guarantee linked with the power to form companies, to embark on joint ventures, to acquire land compulsorily, to have such land identified by proclamation and to deal with a whole range of matters which will profoundly affect the political, social and economic future of this State. I do not believe that is a power that should be given to any Government, particularly not in the present circumstances.

The Hon. H. Allison: Even foreign agencies couldn't do it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As my colleague the member for Mount Gambier says, foreign investment is being sought for this. It is foreign investment that would

be guaranteed by the South Australian taxpayers and to an unlimited extent. I find it hard to believe how this Bill could have got through the ALP Caucus room after the absolute disasters that have beset this State. It is an outrageous proposition and one that the Parliament should on no account entertain.

As we are looking at guarantees, let us look at the costs. The official estimates of the project have varied so grotesquely that it is a wonder that anyone can place any confidence whatsoever in any figures given by the Premier. Currently, the project is valued at about \$839 million, to be spent over 20 to 30 years, with public sector inputs valued at \$251 million. I will say here and now that I regard that \$251 million as being fantasy. In fact, we can virtually prove that it is fantasy, because we can quote the words of the then Director-General of the Premier's department. At an MFP Adelaide meeting on the feasibility study on 26 May last year, Mr Bruce Guerin said:

We took a net input of \$15 billion. We divided that by six—five or six—I don't know why we chose that figure; we didn't want to get into the blue sky stuff, and on that basis we decided it was feasible.

If anyone can give any credence whatsoever to the Government's figuring when we have that statement on the record made by the Government's representative, we are indeed in what Mr Guerin described as 'blue sky stuff'. Granted that we need investment, we then listen to what the Premier of South Australia had to say:

We need not look offshore at raising capital. The Australian pension funds, for example, are heading for a \$600 billion investment total by the end of this decade. We believe that the time is right to provide incentives and entice funds such as these away from non-productive sectors and into positive nationally significant infrastructure.

So, the Premier has in mind that the pension funds will be raided in order to support the MFP. That is not something that will be attractive to those South Australians who have retired and invested their funds. Federal funding for this project has been limited in the extreme, with \$5.5 million being provided by the Federal Government over three years to help establish an MFP Development Corporation to oversee the project and for the promotion and marketing activities. That has then been supplemented—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Mount Gambier and Napier are out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: —not by a significant grant for the purpose but by the State Government's choosing to redirect funds that should have been directed to the Better Cities project and spent in the northern and southern suburbs of this city and, indeed, in regional cities which desperately need some kind of renewal, restoration and support. That \$40 million has been directed away from where it should have been spent and put into the multifunction polis project. I do not believe that that is either rational or fair to the people of the City of Adelaide. On a global basis, a \$7 billion project would require at least \$705 million of Federal funding to clean up the site. The Premier says that that will be privately driven. After the meal break, I will table a list of the costs associated with this project.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* two purely statistical tables detailing an analysis of the project costs of the multifunction polis for both the developers and the South Australian Government.

Leave granted.

Project Costs: Detailed Analysis

Table 5.12 of the report summarises the project costs that would

be borne by the developer. The lake and canal system has an estimated cost of \$239 million and forests and parks \$26 million. The report deduces \$61 million from the sum of these figures because of 'community use'. The \$61 million is then added to the total regional costs. In summary the total project costs for the developer of \$669 million breakdown as follows:

Earthworks	\$204m
Levee banks	\$8m
Major roads and bridges	\$46m
Stormwater disposal	\$5m
Internal servicing	\$16m
Decontamination	\$5m
Relocation of brine line	\$2m
Village infrastructure	\$144m
Fees	\$65m
Unspecified costs	\$49m
General contingency	\$74m
Development Contribution to Public Works	\$51m

Regional costs, those costs assigned to the South Australian Government, are primarily infrastructure costs. These include entry and services to the site and are financed through Government taxes and charges.

The total regional costs are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Total Regional Costs

Costs	Costs (\$millions 1991 dollars)
Port Adelaide entrance including land acquisition, road and canal	22
Entry roads to site	17
Services to site boundary	10
Land consolidation	26
Contribution to open space and lake system ..	61
Relocation of existing industry	10
Placement of powerlines underground	38
Off-site stormwater disposal	5
Subtotal	189
Fee and contingency on costs (excluding \$47 million land purchase)	62
Total Regional Cost	251

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I want to deal particularly with what are called the regional costs, which are those assigned to the South Australian Government. They are primarily infrastructure costs and they are identified in the table with the total amounting to \$251 million. It is important to note that those infrastructure costs do not include four critically important projects which must be undertaken if the MFP at Gillman is to be successful and, indeed, a healthy place in which to live. They include the upgrading of the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, the relocation of the Wingfield dump, the completion of the Gillman highway to Port Adelaide and the construction of the Port River causeway.

Anyone examining both the developers' costs and the regional costs, that is, those of the Government, will note that they have been predicated on the basis that innovative technologies will be used to solve some of the extraordinarily difficult site problems that have been outlined by my colleagues the member for Bragg and the member for Heyesen. I believe the House should be aware that innovative technologies can be developed only by working on site specific problems. Because these problems have not been addressed before, I maintain, as does the Opposition, that it is impossible to cost accurately the means of dealing with these problems. The very fact that they are innovative technologies means that they have not been used before and, therefore, costing and cost effectiveness simply cannot be calculated.

I conclude by referring particularly to water quality. On page 2, the draft environmental impact statement claims

that a high standard of water quality is required in any constructed lake system. This can be achieved by creating conditions leading to biological diversity and hydraulic efficiency. Provision of recreational water quality and biologically diverse environments can be achieved in many of the lakes. At the same time, a position paper prepared by the Institution of Engineers (Australia) MFP Adelaide working group states that it is of the utmost importance that water quality for the proposed lake system be upgraded as recommended but not costed in by substantial reduction or complete elimination of the effluent discharged from the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works.

I believe that proves the point that the costing is misleading and inadequate. This whole project will cost the South Australian taxpayer many more millions of dollars than the Government has indicated to us. In short, whilst the goals of the project are supported, the structure of the corporation is in many respects extremely flawed from the point of view of accountability. The environmental aspects of the site are highly suspect and the Opposition will want considerably more information from the Government before it can give wholehearted support to this project.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I understand that the Premier and his Government have chosen Montpellier as a possible model for the establishment of the multifunction polis in South Australia. Last year I visited Montpellier in France and a number of other cities which are MFPs. France has some 40 MFPs approved and developed by the Federal Government and at least 20 of those are centred on currently large cities. Those cities are essentially a national initiative with strong national and regional funding. They are integrated at both local and national levels and, interestingly, there is also a high degree of cooperation from city to city. There is strong and imaginative local leadership, as I viewed it, while the French cities also serve a very large local population base and they are lucky enough to be able to integrate into the whole of the European Economic Market (EEC) to serve it and overseas markets, as well as to receive expertise from a population of 500 or 600 million.

MFP Adelaide certainly has problems if it intends to use Montpellier as a model. Montpellier is centred on the old French city which had Roman connections 2 000 years ago. There are a number of separate parks including science, agriculture, electronic communications, medicine, industry, a rail and road centre, a tourist convention and administration centre, *cap alpha* for new or sunrise technology, and two other parks for a variety of activities. It is a very impressive conglomeration. MFP Adelaide may well have to go alone compared with Montpellier. For example, we do not have the Montpellier markets, although we might tap into the oriental markets in due course. We do not have the investors, nor the hundreds of businesses which Montpellier has been able to acquire over the past few years. Nor do we have a conglomerate such as IBM, which was one of the main catalysts for the establishment of Montpellier as an MFP, as I understand it.

We certainly do not have the cash. We do not have Federal support, but I will refer to that a little later because we do have \$40 million for the Better Cities improvement program. We do not have the network of cities cooperating; instead, here in South Australia we are experiencing more hostility than cooperation from New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and Victoria, which may be envious of our start. At the moment, we do not have the skills. We

are trying to establish a more skilled population by spending money on our universities and our TAFE colleges but we have a long way to go in Australia, with one semi-skilled person to each person with a degree, compared with Europe, where there are eight or nine semi-skilled persons to each person with a degree. There is a great pool of technological skill in Europe.

France also benefited from migration from the declining French colonies in North Africa. Those people brought their entrepreneurial, business, commercial and trading skills and they have established themselves in the south of France around Montpellier. Montpellier has centrality to the whole of Europe, Africa and the Near East. It also has site desirability because it is adjacent to a substantial number of wonderful Mediterranean holiday resorts which complement the old city. So as I see it, we do have a dilemma. All political Parties in South Australia recognise that we share Australia's economic problems and we desperately need new industry here in this State, preferably low pollutant industry because of South Australia's major water problems, regarding quality, quantity and lack of storage facilities. In addition, there is an adjacent, easily polluted shallow coastal gulf and a lack of fast flowing streams and rivers with any volume to cleanse the State and the gulfs.

We all know, too, that South Australia needs housing and suffers from the lack of Federal funds. With regard to funding, has the Federal Government really made a commitment to MFP Gillman? It is reported that South Australia has earmarked the \$40 million for Better Cities for the Gillman development, which means that by comparison with the other States we are using money, which should be for housing development around the whole of the State, for a specific MFP project.

In other words, MFP Gillman may well become simply a Housing Trust development of some substance but with a number of associated problems. Much of the money will be spent on cleaning up the Gillman swamp, a fact that is offset by the cheapness of land at Gillman. So far as costing is concerned, estimates seem to vary from \$850 million up to \$2 billion and could go even higher.

In other words, the Premier's commitment to Gillman really represents an open cheque book and South Australia currently does not have the funds. We have a huge deficit: \$6.3 billion in State debt and a State Bank which, as we all know, is at least \$2.3 billion in deficit. I wonder whether the Premier has really considered a number of other options. The first one is simply to approve Gillman by this Bill and get on with it. The Premier is certainly committed. He needs a project—the whole Government needs a project to get it out of the mire. The Premier probably loses face if he stalls or cancels it. I suggest that his track record is really not all that good for us to give him a blank cheque. Look at the Remm Adelaide development. Look at the SGIC Collins Street put option which the Premier did approve, even if a little belatedly.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Look at Jubilee Point, as the member for Coles says; look at the SASFIT-ASER guarantees; look at the adverse environmental impact statements issued by Mr J. McCracken of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, by ACARRE and by the South Australian Health Department, from 1960 to 1986; and look at the EIS by PPK Consultants 1992. We are all aware that these highlight problems repetitively associated with MFP Gillman, and I will develop that point later.

Other ideas are that we could develop other areas, for example, Technology Park, the northern and southern metropolitan suburbs of Adelaide and rural cities such as Mount

Gambier, Port Lincoln, Renmark, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta and so on. We could refer the Bill to a select committee or to the Economic and Finance Committee to help tidy up a number of important questions that rest in my mind.

We could hold Gillman in reserve for development in more affluent times when we really have money. We could develop parts of Gillman for South Australian Housing Trust low density housing, as recommended by McCracken, in selected areas away from pollution, and then we could reduce the pollution at Gillman over the next few years by cleansing the soil and water, reducing current industrial air pollution and relocating the Wingfield operation, although that in itself will incur considerable additional waste management costs to our local government bodies. It is unavoidable if trucks have to travel much further to deposit waste in another dump.

I heeded the Premier's warnings of the past and reiterated in today's *News* that Gillman is essential for South Australia, but he says that, if MFP Gillman fails, South Australia faces declining living standards, fewer job opportunities and a diminished role in the nation's economy. I ask members to think about that. If we look at other alternatives—and I have already put a few to the House—these threats become irrelevant, if the MFP can still proceed but along those alternative lines. The other possibilities may prove to be more effective, cheaper, more successful and serve South Australia's interests and the taxpayers much better. I have just quoted the overseas experience in Montpellier, where our model is certainly built on different lines, with all the multiplicity of parks centred around the corum, which is the administrative and tourist centre with some fine convention facilities attached.

With regard to the suitability of MFP Gillman, the Pak Poy Kneebone environmental impact study 1992 gave us a cautious all clear—and I note the word 'cautious'—to the MFP, but identifying potentially serious and significant problems with the site.

Other environmental impact statements include those of J.R. McCracken, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, December 1989; Australian Centre of Advanced Risk and Reliability Engineering Limited (ACARRE); the South Australian Department of Health reports 1960-86; and Dr Joseph Wayne Smith, Flinders University, 1992, and others.

These various environmental impact statements refer repeatedly to the problems, not the least of which might be health. For example, can the Premier assure us that in the Port Adelaide-Le Fevre Peninsula area—which already has a reportedly high morbidity rate from bronchitis (plus 41 per cent), lung cancer (plus 75 per cent), and a higher incidence of illness such as mouth cancer (plus 81 per cent), upper respiratory (plus 73 per cent), other respiratory (plus 67 per cent), asthma (plus 59 per cent), pneumonia (plus 45 per cent), etc.—those problems have been or are being addressed? I would associate those generally with a higher incidence of industrial pollution, existing, old existing, current and future.

Geophysically, the Department of Mines and Energy in August 1989 reported saturated sediments under Gillman: soft clays, loose and unconsolidated sand, compressible mangrove swamps, low-bearing strengths for all of these soils but, of course, easy excavation and dredging. Members should look at the associated problems of high organic content, humic acids and saline groundwaters, which will result in a high adverse reaction to concrete, steel piles or footings.

The Kinhill Delfin report refers to the risk of liquefaction which can occur during a seismic shock in saturated loose

sands, which occur at both Dry Creek and Gillman. Indeed, these are part of San Francisco's ever recurring problem on the earthquake belt. How can the Premier dismiss this issue when the environmental impact statements are so clear on the point?

With regard to the greenhouse effect, I note that the Government has an inconsistency of attitude from Minister to Minister. The effect on Gillman is assessed by the IPCC as minimal—a one metre rise to the year 2100, yet the possible chaos incidence of high tides and earthquakes are totally ignored by that IPCC report. Of course, the Minister of Lands ensures that coastal shacks elsewhere in South Australia are demolished because of the risk to shacks by floods. The floods result from high tides, storms and the chaos factors. One department says 'Yes', and another says 'No'. The Government cannot have it both ways.

With regard to water quality and quantity, increased settlement means increased industrial and domestic demand and increased effluent. South Australia has long had problems regarding water. We are the driest State in the driest continent, and availability of water in South Australia is already a problem. There is deposition of heavy metals, as has been pointed out (and I will expand on that later); and there are toxic substances, the presence of toxic algal blooms the red tides at Port Adelaide and the high nutrient value of sewage from Bolivar, even if the sludge is removed. There may also be a threat to existing mangroves while the spraying of mosquitoes may have to be a permanent exercise which, in turn, could destroy the mangrove areas as an important fish breeding ground for the State. The E&WS Department report in 1990 indicated that there were a number of possible long-term solutions that we will have to examine, but cost is an important factor.

Can the Premier say how the soil contamination problems can be or are being safely resolved? In addition to known sites there could be a number of unknown toxic sites, but I will deal with the known sites. First, at the Largs North Acid Plant there are wastes such as lead, zinc, arsenic, sulphur, mercury (and mercury is responsible for the Minamata mad cats' disease where adults, children and neonates have been imbecilic and physically handicapped), pyrites and lead acid leachates. Secondly, there are the Pelican Point alkaline wastes with caustic mud, cement kiln dust and coal gas waste.

Thirdly, at the Wingfield dump heavy metal leachates are common in both existing and disused dumps, and that will be a long-term problem even after relocation. Fourthly, at Gillman/Dry Creek there is stormwater ponding which contains zinc, sulphur, lead, copper, chromium and mercury. Fifthly, the Dean Rifle Range has large quantities of, fortunately, recoverable lead, and there may be a profit there. Sixthly, on Garden Island there are household and asbestos waste dumps. Lastly, there is the Dry Creek radium waste which is a radiological hazard requiring the removal of material.

With regard to air pollution, there is also industrial air pollution and other hazards which will not go away. Can the Premier give an assurance that something will be done about that? For example, Adelaide Brighton Cement has just spent \$130 million on expansion. There is bulk loading at Port Adelaide which is dusty, and the largest petrochemical storage in the State at Birkenhead. These will not go away and industry will not go away. After all, Port Adelaide needs to be developed if the State is to go ahead. So, we have short-term and cumulative long-term risks from toxic gas, vapour and smoke and fumes; the potential hazard from accidents; and the continuous release of chlorine, sul-

phur dioxide, anhydrous ammonia and methyl mercaptan which cause air pollution.

There are also potential dangers from CIG Port Adelaide, ICI Osborne, Penrice Soda Osborne, five local warehouses storing biocides and substances in transportation. That list is far from exhaustive. There is also visual pollution such as the existence of smoke haze, power pylons, the Wingfield dump and industrial buildings with the diversity of unpleasant smells which generally contribute to an unfavourable scene. Reforestation is recommended, as my colleagues have said, but only shrubs will prove economical. Wingfield concealed will still smell the same.

The South Australian Pipelines Authority has a high pressure gas pipeline running beneath the site, and its potential dangers will mean that only limited use of adjacent land will be possible for sport and recreation. With regard to the population source for MFP Gillman, although promoted originally by the Japanese it is clear that we will have to develop it in South Australia, and an 80 per cent Australian population is predicted. Overseas investment will be slow and the risk will be predominantly our own.

Recent Japanese comments indicate that the Gillman climate and location are less attractive to them than sites in northern New South Wales and southern Queensland. We have to combat that. I note that the construction of at least one golf course could be a costly additional requirement. It appears that we will have to make our own luck and, I suggest, use the \$40 million Better Cities grant to the very best advantage. Is the Premier dismissing decentralisation forever? The northern and southern suburbs of Adelaide have a high concentration of Housing Trust homes with little or no industrial development and no jobs. Also, there is extremely high youth unemployment. These districts are worthy of consideration for MFP development. Decentralisation is being paid only lip service at the moment by the Government, yet a number of rural South Australian cities (the ones I mentioned previously among them) are crying out for development. Interestingly, these options experience none of the Gillman problems although land acquisition could be a cost factor.

Perhaps interested local government areas could join in the MFP project by proclaiming development areas and making bids for inclusion in it. With regard to the reliability of various reports, assurances as to the suitability of Gillman and the great variance of costings indicate that some serious checking should be carried out before funds are committed and the decision is made to develop Gillman. There may be some serious omissions of cost which could further escalate the cost to the taxpayer. I hope that the Premier listened to those comments and that during Committee he will give a suitable response and proper assurances.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I think we have to have a very close look at the MFP and what the Premier has been trying to do over the past 12 months. There is no question that the Liberal Party supports the goals of the MFP and development in South Australia, and that has had bipartisan support ever since I have been in this Parliament. However, when the Premier announced that we were in the running for the MFP he started to build up this MFP dream. He wants an open chequebook on the MFP. With all the rhetoric that the Premier can produce he wants us to embrace the MFP because he wants that dream to carry him to an election campaign in South Australia in 1993. He wants us to support that in a bipartisan fashion without questioning the finances.

This is the Premier and Treasurer who is responsible for the greatest financial disaster in South Australia's history because he did not have the ability to look after the financial management of the State Bank. This is the Premier and Treasurer who in the past five years has managed to get SGIC into a financial position where it lost \$81 million of taxpayers' money this year. This is the same Premier and Treasurer who has stood up in this Parliament for the past five or six years telling us what a great benefit the Scrimber project was going to be to South Australia while it lost in excess of \$65 million of taxpayers' money. This same incompetent, irresponsible financial manager in South Australia wants an open chequebook for the MFP dream when all his other dreams have turned into nightmares.

I do not believe that any responsible Opposition can allow that to happen with such an irresponsible Treasurer, and that is why the Opposition is and has been very careful in its criticism of the MFP—it has been restricted entirely to the financial accountability of the project. As the project gets further and further away, as it becomes a bigger and bigger dream, the Premier is desperately looking to hang the problems on the Opposition. Well, he will not do it. The contribution that was made by the member for Bragg as lead speaker, and the member for Coles, the member for Heyesen and the member for Mount Gambier, put our position quite squarely on the table. The goals of the MFP will be supported by the Liberal Party in South Australia, but we will make sure that this Treasurer is absolutely accountable to the Parliament and the taxpayers of South Australia.

One of the things I wanted to go through briefly this evening is the difference in attitude that the Premier has to this project compared to his attitude to the Roxby Downs project. Apart from calling it a mirage in the desert, as the member for Kavel will no doubt bring up—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: A multifunction pipedream.

Mr D.S. BAKER: A multifunction pipedream, as the member for Coles said, and no doubt the member for Kavel will bring that up in his contribution.

An honourable member interjecting.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think the honourable member opposite who is laughing has quite a few shares in the project which has added considerably to his wealth. It is factual to say that the Premier took a completely different attitude to the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill and the enabling legislation, and for him today to stand up and try to hoist the Opposition on the potential failures of the MFP smacks of the greatest hypocrisy I have ever heard in this Parliament. Almost 10 years ago when we debated the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill, when speaking as Leader of the Opposition, the now Premier said:

The State cannot and must not be locked into terms and conditions in this project. Whether or not it includes uranium mining in 1982 we will vote against the Bill at the third reading.

Fancy having the temerity to vote against the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill because, as he said, he did not know its financial ramifications. The Premier opposed Roxby Downs on a wide range of matters and said:

It is vague and imprecise. Indeed, its lack of detail in so many areas confirms that this indenture is premature.

This is from a Treasurer who wanted us to debate the MFP Bill before the EIS was announced. This is the same person. What hypocrisy, to turn around and have put back to him what he said in 1982 as Leader of the Opposition, when he just squeaked out of that by doing some sleazy deal with one of his members, to now say that we should debate this Bill before we receive the EIS.

Mr Venning: He's a wimp!

Mr D.S. BAKER: No question about that. The then Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Roger Goldsworthy) said about the indenture:

Basic Government facilities in the town, such as schools, hospitals, police station and courtroom, recreation and sporting facilities, and half the cost of a sealed road from Pimba to Olympic Dam, all other infrastructure including powerlines, water pipelines, roads and other development and subdivision costs in the town site will be met by the joint venturers.

So, very specifically in that Bill the exact cost to the taxpayer, the exact cost to the Government, and the exact cost to the joint venturers was set out very clearly for everyone to see. Above all, it was very clear in that Bill that, if the decision was taken not to go ahead with the venture, any money spent by the Government would be reimbursed. There cannot be tighter financial accountability than that. This is the financial accountability that the then Leader of the Opposition, the now Treasurer of South Australia, was critical about in those days because he said it was not precise and he could not understand the financial accountability or the need for it. We can certainly understand the need for financial accountability of this Treasurer on his performance in the past 10 years.

It is very interesting to note that the fiction, as the Premier called it, of the Indenture Bill goes on now with what the Premier is trying to tell us about the MFP. The fact is that as yet there is not one firm investment in the MFP project. We are told that we have to provide an open chequebook for a project that at best is a dream, without one major company stating that it would invest in this dream. The scathing attack by the Japanese, both privately and publicly at the State dinner put on for them, when they came over here and were carted around the project, prematurely, is damnation to the management of this project by the Premier of this State. He has had no ability at all to manage this project through its delicate early stages. He has not been able at any stage to attract a major Australian company to invest in it. He has claimed that he has one. He should show us the contract. He should come in here and show us the details of what this company will put in. Once again, it is a dream and he is hoping that the dream will not turn into a nightmare.

Let us look at the aspects of the MFP that really concern the Liberal Party. One is the viability requirements. There have been at least four different reports on the viability of this project. The feasibility study, published in January by the National Institute for Economic and Industrial Research, concluded that the viable option for the MFP was between 100 000 and 200 000 people. It said it would have to have a lot of internationally skilled workers who would have to be attracted from overseas if this project were to be viable, and that the MFP financing needed to use mainly non-Australian capital.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Guaranteed by the Government.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, and as the member for Coles said, you can understand the problems that we have got into in this State with a Government guarantee, because the Treasurer has been throwing those around for 10 years, and this is why we have our record debt. The next committee that had a look at it was the economic evaluation of the MFP by the Federal Government's Bureau of Industry Economics in July 1990. Here is another report that had not seen the light of day until recently. It said that the MFP, to be viable, needed 100 000 people, had to be on a discrete core site and had to be developed within 15 years and, if it got to that stage, it would grow further. The State Government expenditure—and this is interesting—according to this report,

required \$180 million per year for 15 years, a total of \$2.5 000 million.

The next report was the successful South Australian Government submission put to the joint MFP Secretariat in May 1990 that stated the MFP had to have a core population of 100 550 residents (and I do not know how it could be so specific). It would need a \$6 billion investment from the public sector, with the South Australian Government paying only \$200 million, the Australian Government contributing \$1 billion, and other OECD countries contributing \$4.8 billion. It is a big wish to get overseas investors to put in \$4.8 billion when we do not have anyone to put their hand up to say they will put in anything. The fourth report is that of the management board on the feasibility of the MFP in May 1991. That started to scale down the project. It stated that the project would involve approximately 50 000 people, so they had knocked off 50 550, and the—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It must have been too toxic.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The land must have been too toxic. Perhaps those 50 550 people could not live on that polluted site. The \$250 million State infrastructure cost was to be offset by \$150 million speculative increases in land prices. If ever I saw creative accounting, that is it. They were going to offset future land prices with the speculative value that they may hold in today's terms saying that we will not have to put as much money into it.

The Hon. H. Allison: The Kipling principle.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It is the Kipling principle, as the member for Mount Gambier said. The great danger of this whole project is that it has to be a certain size to be viable. There are four or five reports around stating what that size must be, and the size proposed by the Premier and Treasurer today is nowhere near as big as all those reports say it must be to be viable. It relies absolutely on Commonwealth investment of funds. It relies on a massive input of overseas capital, and it relies on massive immigration of highly skilled labour into South Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: When we have high unemployment.

Mr D.S. BAKER: When we have high unemployment, which we tried to talk about today but the Premier and Treasurer said was superfluous and that it was not necessary to talk about. We have heard all about the \$60 million-plus that the Premier was to receive from the Commonwealth Government to get this project up and running. There were many press releases from the 'Minister for Unemployment' and the Premier and Treasurer when they stated that we have had the world's greatest Treasurer—now the world's greatest Prime Minister—over here to look at the site, and he says that it is magnificent. He will give us \$64 million, and that was the big question. That offer was totally rejected by the Federal Government, and I think it was rejected because Prime Minister Keating may have had that little niggle in the back of his mind that this Premier could not manage those dollars efficiently and in the interests of the taxpayer.

All we have received as a result is our share of the Better Cities program which every other State has received. Every other State has received the same thing—no special treatment for South Australia—and we are pouring \$40 million of that straight into this hole of the MFP to try to get this polluted swamp in good enough shape coming up to the next State election, so that a few people in South Australia might be conned into believing there is some dream for our future. I think it is despicable. Of course we get behind the goals of the project, but we will not allow this Premier to go down that path and pour \$40 million into it to the detriment of South Australians.

The member for Napier has desperate problems in his electorate. I was at Elizabeth the other day and I heard people crying about the problems in that electorate. They have whipped off the money that should have been spent in the Elizabeth-Munno Para area and poured it into this swamp. Now I hear that the member for Napier is getting behind the independent member because he has totally lost confidence in what is happening in his area. I can understand that.

If we do not have total financial accountability, if we do not make this lame duck Premier be financially accountable to the Parliament through the economic committees, once again his ineptitude in handling financial matters will throw this State into further debt. The Opposition in South Australia will not let that happen. The member for Coles and the lead speaker, the member for Bragg, talked about environmental problems.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: And the shadow Minister.

Mr D.S. BAKER: And, of course, the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: At least I can remember who the Speaker is, but I cannot remember who the last one was. Still, I will talk about that another day.

Mr Ferguson: I can't even remember who the last Leader of the Opposition was.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I can tell the honourable member that, after the next election, he will be able to remember that very well. The reports on environmental problems on the MFP site that are coming to light would make any person who cares about the environment in South Australia shudder. I do not think that any of us knew about the problems on that site, and I do not think that we were told the full story in the EIS. However, as these 28 or 29 reports are teased out of the Premier and as we look at them we find that the problems are gathering momentum to such a degree that it would not matter how much money we spent because I am not sure that the MFP site would ever be viable. That is our problem, and that is why we are going to make sure that the Government is held accountable.

The load bearing capacity of the soil on the MFP site, as shown in one of these reports, is frightening. Of course, problems can be overcome with dollars if enough are poured in, although we have had some real problems with the State Bank despite the fact that we poured in a couple of thousand million dollars. The MFP must be viable. We have already heard that it will require 100 000 people, and all the reports say that it has to be viable. That is fine, but if we have to pour these dollars into an area that, quite frankly, can never be a viable building site, there will be further problems for South Australia. The pollution and degradation problems on that site are much greater than we ever thought.

In conclusion, it is fair to say that we absolutely support the goals of an MFP. Of course we support high tech development in South Australia.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Napier is interjecting and laughing. He will have a chance to make a contribution, and I hope that it is a little better than some he has made in this House recently. I thought that this was a pretty serious subject involving millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that the Treasurer wants to spend without accountability. I think it is fair to say that the MFP—and we have been discussing it in this House—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order.

Mr D.S. BAKER:— should be available to all South Australians. There is no question that we desperately need development, but trying to dress up a site by pouring millions of dollars into it that are desperately needed not only in the District of Napier but all around South Australia may not be the best way to help this State. That is why we will argue in this House tonight and why we will question the Treasurer tomorrow, hour after hour, to make sure that he is accountable to this Parliament and to all South Australians. That is why we want to impose strict limits on spending on this project, because I assure South Australians that, if this is going to become another sinkhole, another dream, we will not let that happen.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I have a real problem with this Bill. I have lots of problems, but I have a real one with this Bill because, believe it or not, dreams, visions and mirages have never been my long suit. All I have read about this MFP—and I have done a lot of reading—is that it is a dream, a vision and that, if we believe it, it will happen. One of my colleagues reminded me tonight that we are dealing in the realm of mirages. I am glad that I am reminded that the Premier described Roxby Downs as a mirage in the desert when we were desperately trying to get that Bill through this House. I had almost forgotten that in my declining moments in this House.

Let me remind the House yet again that the Labor Party desperately tried to defeat that project. It was a real project: it was not a dream. It transpires that it is now a jewel in the Government's crown, and it does not have too many. We put it in that crown. We are dealing with dreams. I will not mind if I am quoted *ad nauseam* over the next 50 years. I believe that this is a dream in the mangroves.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Quite right. This is a mirage in the mangroves bordering the Gillman swamps. If ever there was a mirage, this is it. I do not mind if I am quoted *ad nauseam* by the Premier or his successor—and we will soon have one—because that is the way it will be. How on earth can we pursue a dream on a stinking site that is mosquito ridden, infested with sandflies and highly polluted?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I said it is stinking, and on this site we are going to erect a dream!

The Hon. H. Allison: The emblem looks like a frog hopping into a swamp.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. I could not work out why we spent all that money.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not at all enthusiastic about this mirage.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If we could put some clamps on the Premier, we might let him get somewhere, but I will come to that later. I have looked at the principal provisions of this Bill and the objects of the legislation. I read the objects of the legislation with some interest, but I must confess that I am still confused. We say we support the aims but I am not too sure what they mean. I admit that I get confused pretty easily, but I am certainly confused about these objects. We support this airy fairy stuff when it means something, but I still do not know what it means.

When it comes to the way in which the Premier wants to set about realising his visions and his dreams, there is no way in the world that I for one or my Party can go along with him. The member for Coles made some cogent points. The Premier is asking that he be empowered to declare by proclamation any site as an MFP site. He is asking for compulsory acquisition powers to acquire those sites and for exemption from all planning powers and restrictions. He wants to acquire companies and enter into joint ventures, and he is asking for an open cheque to do it all.

I recall the Premier appearing on television when the Japanese had backed off from any vestige of support for this project. He was waving a great big cheque saying, 'I have an open cheque to get this project going.' This is the man who has cost this State \$3 billion. He wants an open cheque so that he can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a dream in the swamps. I would not send him down to the corner shop with sixpence to buy me a sticky lolly—he would embezzle the money on the way—let alone trust him with an open cheque to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of our money to pursue a dream in these stinking swamps.

I think that members could understand why we are less than enthusiastic about the Premier's dream. If members think I am telling lies—and I try not to—I refer them to figures which were cited by the member for Coles and which related to the estimated cost. The total cost just to get the project under way is \$251 million. This sum of \$40 million that is nosed abroad is just a little nudge. What is \$40 million when we have lost \$3 billion. That is just a sweetener to con the public into thinking this might be a goer. All that will do is pay a few consultants and pay Mr Guerin to flit around the world to try to convince people that they ought to become interested in this project.

That sum is just peanuts. We would be looking at \$251 million just to get this project started. On top of all that, there are uncoded works: the upgrading of the Port Adelaide sewage works; the relocation of the Wingfield dump, which the Government will compulsorily acquire without compensation (how is that for a business deal?); the completion of the Gillman highway to Port Adelaide; and the construction of the Port Adelaide River causeway. In round figures, I would say we are probably up for about \$400 million before the Japanese will even look at us. That is our money. Here we have the Premier waving an open cheque, wanting to spend that sort of money to pursue a dream in the stinking swamps. Can members understand why I am not—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: There is no guaranteed return on investment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: None at all. We let the Government have its head with Scrimber, but that involved only \$60 million—only peanuts. It started in the last Parliament. Because the unions said that they could not keep dolphins they blew \$8 million at Marineland. People were shocked, but now they are shell-shocked. The Government that had only 47 per cent of the vote wasted \$8 million. What hope does it have when it has done \$3 billion—and members of the Government know, of course. The Premier has the gall to come in here after the hapless—and that is the Premier's phrase—Minister of Forests has assured us that all is well, that Scrimber was a wonderful new project and that, if we spent this money, millions would be made; \$60 million later, the Government decided to cut the painter, and say, 'Bad luck folks, we have just cost you \$60 million.'

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What did they say they'd spent in the first instance?

The Hon. H. Allison: Don't you worry about that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Don't you worry about that, no. The first shock of this Government involved \$60 million, then we have the State Bank. There is the matter of Beneficial Finance: the Premier thought there were four off balance sheet companies and there were 64. Then there was SGIC, which lost only tens of millions of dollars by crook swapping between different accounts. When we find out what SAFA is up to—and I have been asking questions about that for a number of years—which has swallowed up the debts of the State Bank as best it could, and when we look at all the billions of dollars it has borrowed from overseas, all guaranteed by us, the taxpayers, we will find that we have not yet heard the end of the story. Members could understand my being a bit cynical when I hear the Premier saying that he has an open cheque, written on our savings, to develop his dream. In my estimate, it will have to be for at least \$400 million before anyone will come and look at it.

Mr Such: Trust me.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, trust me! Blimey! I said I wouldn't send him down to the corner shop to buy a sticky lolly. It is not on. I do not wish to make a long speech, but I want to let members know that I am not enthusiastic about this proposal. I do understand mines and industries that make something. I do understand the service industry in which a service is sold, and so on. However, I do not understand dreams or hallucinations. I have not changed my stance from when I was invited to put some thoughts on paper some time ago relating to this multi-function polis. I did some reading and, as a result, I wrote an article.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Was it for a Gumeracha paper?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it was for a modest little publication that circulates in the Gumeracha district, where electors want to know what their local member is up to. I wrote one article on the MFP, one on what my travelling scholarship for the CPA was all about—nobody knew, so I told them about that—one on the Monarchy versus the republic, one on the Prostitution Bill and another on the MFP. It is a pretty important little publication that has a limited circulation. I have not changed my stance on this matter. In the article, I say (and this is the first time I have quoted myself in this place in 22 years):

It is not easy to come to grips with the undefined and intangible. The multi-function polis is a concept. But of what? I have read a number of articles on the MFP and I am none the wiser. Here are some recent quotes. John Gilmour in *Australian Business* July 1990 under the heading 'Multi Function Bulldust', wrote the following:

Most business ventures are pretty simple. BHP mixes iron ore, limestone and coal, which are cheap, cooks them at extreme heat and makes steel, which is expensive.

In all words spoken about the polis, there has been no simple explanation of benefit generation for its participants. We have heard of Japanese investment, hi-tech wonders, concentrated resources and the like, but how will it make money?

At the risk of revealing your correspondent's primitive commercial intellect, it looks to him awfully like an exercise in that old Austrian game of property speculation.

If the bankers and other touts who push the polis were half genuine about their national development dreams, they would not be trying to make futuristic cities out of urban dross and sprawl—they would be spending real effort and money on decentralisation. And they are talking—talking multifunction nonsense.

Then I read Gavan McCormack, who had an open mind but who was very sceptical. In September 1990, in the publication *Australian Society*, he said:

Some of the less speculative elements of Japanese capitalism may well be attracted by the vision and seriousness Adelaide is projecting. Like Mitsubishi, Bridgestone and Fujitsu (all established already in Adelaide) these companies could well make a

positive contribution. As of now, however, the evidence from both Government and private sector in Japan suggests an inclination to seek a distance from the project.

Since that has transpired, the Government has backed off a million miles. Mr McCormack also said:

The Bannan Government has produced a serious and interesting vision. It deserves a serious response.

Japanese born academic Mr Yuki Tanaka said:

I don't see why taxpayers have to pay for such uneconomical, unnecessary projects.

Likewise, another Japanese, Tessa Morris-Suzuki, who teaches economic history at the University of New England, says:

If the MFP is to be publicly funded on a large scale, it needs first to be considered whether the taxpayers' money could not more effectively be used to revitalise and expand existing educational, health and welfare systems.

Members have probably read Dr John Harwood's entertaining and interesting articles in the *Adelaide Review*. He is from the Flinders University. In September 1990, he had a few hard things to say:

These grandiose projects may well be connected in the millenarian dreams of bureaucrats and corporate planners, but in the cold light of economic (and electoral) reality they look less like golden geese than king-size turkeys. One can only wonder what possessed the Government to bet the farm on a knock-kneed, broken-winded, overpriced election-loser like the MFP.

Further in my article, I say:

There are some enthusiastic advocates for the MFP. Many are involved in the studies in one way or another. William Coledrake, a Research Fellow in Pacific Studies at Australian National University concludes:

The onus is on us to address the serious issues and to offer our own solutions so that the MFP will meet Australian needs in the 21st century.

Finally, Denis Gastin, who works in the MFP Secretariat, writing in *Search* June 1990 states:

Multifunction polis may provide us with an instrument to shape our future, so long as we are strong enough in our convictions and bold enough to set our goals high.

In that article, I concluded by saying:

If you are confused, so am I. The trouble is that I have never been much good at lateral thinking. Let them go through the feasibility studies so long as Governments don't spend great licks of hard-earned taxpayers' funds on a pipe dream, which is the way it seems to be shaping up.

I signed my name to that on 31 October 1990. Precious little has happened since I wrote that article to change my view. In fact, the further it goes, the more alarmed I become. The Premier gets up on TV waving a cheque book so he can write an open cheque on our money when he has blown \$3 billion of it on ill-conceived projects. I for one will not give him an open cheque. The only possibility of getting any grudging support from me for this Bill is if we keep a firm hand on the cheque book, and that is what our amendments will seek to do.

I am quite happy to go on record as saying that I think it is a mirage in the mangroves. I will be quite happy to have that quoted for the next 50 years because there is no way in the world that this thing will be anything but a dream. In my book it will be a dream for a long time to come. If the Japanese expect us to spend \$400 million of our own money before they even have a look at it, I think we are crazy to go along with it.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I support the concept of the MFP, as I have done for a long time. A cynic might suggest that this is a stationary Grand Prix, that the Premier has developed it in order to win elections, that it is an election ploy. I trust that the Premier and the Government are more serious than that and that this is a genuine attempt to create investment, jobs and opportunities in South Australia. The

MFP represents a major challenge to the people of this State. We know from the reports that have been written that there are serious problems with the Gillman site but that represents a challenge that must be addressed. We know that there are risks involved in terms of location and some of the industrial plants that are located nearby, the gas pipelines, and so on. Once again, that is part of the challenge that must be faced in advancing this project.

In a sense, the MFP must tackle the problems that are common in this day and age. In essence, it represents a microcosm of the problems that we face going into the next century, problems such as protecting the environment, dealing with pollution, creating high tech industries, creating jobs, developing new forms of transport, and so on. If the MFP is only West Lakes II, I believe it is worth while. If it is only a high-class residential development, that represents a move towards urban consolidation that I believe is desirable and worth while. I trust it will be more than that.

It is worth reflecting, if nothing happens at the Gillman site in respect of the MFP, what will happen to that site in the long term? Something must be done to address the problems that exist there, and I believe that the MFP is a good vehicle for doing that. The MFP provides a good opportunity to tackle the challenges of that site so that we cannot run away from Gillman. If we do not tackle those issues now, they will still be there in the future. The MFP should and must represent more than just a residential development. It must represent new ideas, creativity, technology and education. I believe that the Gillman site, whilst it has a lot of difficulties, of which we are all well aware, can be and must be only the core site. It must be the nerve centre for what will be other developments, not only in the metropolitan area but also in regional centres, and I trust that the development will not be limited to Gillman and that a narrow focus which will limit the vision purely to that site is not taken.

South Australia and Adelaide demand more than that. I do not believe that the project precludes an outreach to other areas—the northern and southern suburbs and, as I indicated earlier, regional centres. The MFP must be a vehicle for investment, imagination and innovation. South Australia needs investment; we know that only too well. Among other things, investment means jobs. I am not talking about just any kind of investment. I am talking about investment which is within environmental guidelines and which is constructive and productive. I believe that in South Australia and in Australia generally we must get rid of the investment phobia that we have. If as a community we are not prepared to invest with our own savings, the only alternative, as those members who have studied economics will know, is to accept investment from other sources—from overseas. I have no problem with that because people from overseas who invest here, whether it is in the MFP or elsewhere, cannot physically take their investment out of Australia. So, the sooner we as a community get rid of our investment phobia, the better.

In recent times, people in South Australia have lost confidence and that process has been assisted by this Government, which has done a multitude of things to undermine that confidence, and I refer to the State Bank as an example. We can understand why South Australians and others have lost confidence in this State. We must get that confidence back. We must create the domino effect and get confidence and investment back into our community. The MFP provides an opportunity to do that. You only get investment if people who are investing see the potential for a return. In other words, there must be incentives to invest. People, whether local or from overseas, will not invest purely for

the sake of it; they will invest in order to get a return. With a project such as the MFP, they are looking for a long-term return. Once again, it comes back to the fact that the Government must create the economic circumstances and the incentives so that local and overseas investors will want to invest in this State.

Within Australia our superannuation funds are accumulating enormous amounts of money. One hopes that some of that money will be used for productive, creative investment which will result in long-term jobs, resulting in turn in security for the people of this State and country. We have to get away from the short-term investments that have given us a surplus of office space and shopping centres. In terms of investment, we need to shake off the negative mantle that so many people seem to have taken on board.

As I said earlier, it is understandable, given the performance of this Government and the Federal Government, that people have lost confidence. As has been indicated already and as will be indicated by other speakers, the Opposition indicates its support for the concept and principle of the MFP but insists on proper safeguards. That is particularly understandable given the track record of this Government in recent years. We have seen what has happened to public money when this Government has got its hands on it, so it is not unreasonable and not unexpected that the Opposition would try to ensure that there are adequate safeguards to protect moneys belonging to the taxpayers of this State.

The Opposition's amendments involve adequate financial monitoring but are not draconian measures: they are reasonable monitoring measures to ensure that taxpayers funds are adequately used and not squandered. The Opposition is insisting on appropriate environmental standards and completion of EIS and other environmental requirements. Once again, that is essential and it is a reasonable request.

Furthermore, we seek to ensure that land acquisition and the securing of land by the MFP occur on a fair and equitable basis, so that the MFP does not have carte blanche to go around the State seizing land and getting an unfair advantage compared to other financial entities. One point worthy of consideration is an alternative name for the MFP. One of the most unfortunate aspects of this whole process is that we have been stuck with the title 'MFP', which has led to much confusion about what the project represents.

The sooner an appropriate name is selected the better, and the MFP corporation should urgently undertake a competition allowing South Australian people to suggest a more appropriate name for the undertaking. Even members of this House may be sufficiently innovative to suggest a more appropriate name for this project. We need a name which symbolises what the MFP should be about, a name that encapsulates the notion of challenge and vision for South Australia. I reiterate the importance of coming up with an appropriate name quickly.

I indicated earlier that I wished to say only a few words. In conclusion, I want the MFP to succeed, and I believe it must succeed for the future of this State, but it will succeed only if it is controlled by reasonable safeguards insisted upon by this Parliament. If the MFP is a goer—and I hope it is—then the Opposition's amendments will in no way impede its progress. If the MFP is so fragile that our amendments hamper it significantly, the whole project has to be questioned.

In summary, I support the MFP, as I have done for a considerable time. I hope it is not just a political election ploy—I hope it is something of substance. South Australia critically depends on the creation of new investment and I see the MFP as a suitable vehicle for bringing that about.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I congratulate the member for Fisher on his comments. I have listened to every Opposition speaker in this debate, and thus far there has been only opposition to the Bill. The member for Fisher has put forward the most positive viewpoint of all opposition speakers thus far. The honourable member emphasised the need to invest some of our own money so far as this development is concerned, as it will prove to be wise ultimately. His attitude has been in contrast to all other Opposition speakers. Over the years I have had the pleasure of listening to debates on development, including the Grand Prix and the Entertainment Centre, and the Liberal Party always follows the same pattern; every opposition member is careful to express support for development. However, for the remainder of their speech they give us every reason why we should not support the development, in this case, the MFP. It is an old story. I have sat through hours and hours of debate on the Grand Prix, the Casino and other developments in South Australia and on every occasion the Liberal Party has tried to destroy whatever development the Government proposes. The MFP project has proved to be no exception. The Liberal Party has taken every aspect it can to ensure that this proposition is destroyed.

The member for Bragg made one of the worst speeches I have ever heard in relation to any development proposals that have come before this Parliament. He went through every report and there was hardly an original word in his speech. He took his speech from all of the various reports that have been presented from the time the concept of the MFP was first put to us. He took the worst aspects out of every report about the MFP and wove them into his speech. He then had the temerity to say that he actually supported the proposition. He went on to tell us about the problems of the mangroves, contamination in the pipelines, compacted soil, mosquitoes, powerlines and every other possible impediment that he could think of that would be put in the way of the MFP.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member took the worst aspects out of every report that has been put up, made out that these were his own thoughts, and then suggested that the MFP ought to be destroyed.

Mr INGERSON: On a point of order Mr Speaker. A reflection was made on what I said in my speech in terms of content. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that reflection.

Mr FERGUSON: I do not have the slightest intention of withdrawing because the honourable member quoted word for word reports on the MFP, taking absolutely the worst aspects of those reports, wove them into his speech and tried to destroy the concept of the MFP. That is what the Liberal Party is trying to do. I do not have the slightest intention of withdrawing. The member for Mount Gambier suggested that unless we have all the elements that Montpelier has in France—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Yes you did. I sat here and listened extremely—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Listen to them trying to deny what they have said. The member for Mount Gambier suggested that unless we have all the elements that Montpelier has then we should not go ahead with the MFP. That is the suggestion they are trying to make and I have never heard a more ridiculous suggestion.

The member for Coles was even worse. The honourable member made no secret of the fact that she is opposed to the MFP. For political reasons she may vote with the Gov-

ernment on this Bill, but her every word was in opposition to the MFP. She talked about the Government's being handcuffed and bound at the legs and being thrown into the ring with a world champion boxer, like a multi-national company. Some multi-national companies have a bigger turnover than the whole of Australia in terms of gross national product. These are the sort of people we are dealing with. The honourable member is suggesting that we do not use financial guarantees. That is what the member for Coles said. Do you know, Mr Acting Speaker, that off Tapleys Hill Road there is a huge tract of land that was provided for Philips Industries by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford? He provided to that international, and multi-national company that tract of land at bargain basement prices, using South Australian money.

I was one of the people who lived in the western districts at that time and who cheered the decision by Sir Thomas Playford to provide land for that multinational company so that it could provide employment, technology and the technical transfer we needed, and in the end it did a good job for South Australia. In this set of circumstances all we are proposing is that we take the lead that was given to us by one of the most conservative Premiers—Sir Thomas Playford—that this State has seen and follow what he did, and try to provide the same sort of employment and technology for South Australia. Sir, what do we find? We find that the Opposition is trying to step in and throw a spoke in the wheel. That is the proposition—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I sat here and listened very carefully.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: They are biting, Sir. They do not like it. They have been throwing this at us all night, Sir, and when the rebuttal comes they do not like it. They cannot sit there in silence. The Opposition has been trying to torpedo this proposition. It is making out that it supports it but it is putting up every reason why it ought not be supported. One after the other we find that members opposite are nitpicking. I think that the Leader of the Opposition is feeling very tired. He did not put in his best performance and was not thinking about the State when he made his contribution tonight; I think he was thinking about himself. It is time he gave it away and went back to the farm. It is time we had a more vigorous and better led Opposition. The contribution of the Leader of the Opposition in this debate tonight was absolutely pitiful. In order to try to rebut the proposition the Leader of the Opposition went back to debates that are more than 10 years old. He wound back the clock more than 10 years in order to try to find something to support his opposition to the project.

The Leader of the Opposition was very careful to say—and I wrote it down word for word—that he supported the MFP and development in South Australia. Then, for the next 20 minutes, he proceeded to tell us that there ought not to be development in South Australia. He spoke about the open chequebook, and I could not help thinking about the open chequebook that has been used successfully by past Premiers of this State. GMH, that huge multinational organisation, was practically given a huge tract of land at Elizabeth by the State under very favourable terms, and that was paid for by the South Australian Government. It was supported by the then Labor Opposition—and I do not mean the mealy-mouthed support we are getting now from members opposite where they are trying to destroy everything that is being put up but are saying that they support it, but the support that was well and truly given all this time.

The people we are dealing with do not belong to philanthropic organisations. They do not come over here merely to help out South Australia. The huge multi-national companies we are dealing with come over here to make a profit, and they have something to give to us—they have what is called employment. They have technological exchange—they will teach us something. We will get something out of it, and so will they. They come over here to make a profit: these huge Japanese corporations do not mind having a 10 or 20 year lead time, but what they come over here for is to make a profit.

I do not mind their making a profit, because we will be getting something out of it. In order to do that, we are in competition. Believe it or not, the South Australian people and the South Australian Government are in competition with other States and other countries in order to get hold of the investment dollar. These people are not going to come over here just because they like the colour of our eyes. In order to get them here, we have to offer some form of bait and provide guarantees. In some instances, we have to provide them with tax holidays, and we have to give them a good deal.

On several occasions members of the Opposition have said 'We are going to stick a limit on spending'. That phrase has already been used twice by members of the Opposition—'We are going to stick a limit on spending so far as this proposition is concerned. There will be financial monitoring and there will not be the open cheque book.' What they are really saying is, 'We will be putting so many restrictions on your Government that you won't be able to negotiate with the multi-national companies', and they are going to kill the whole deal.

They are trying to kill the project by stealth. They are trying to put so many restrictions on the Government's vision. In a sense, I accept the word 'dream'. It is a dream, a vision—and there is not too much vision coming from members of the Opposition. I have not heard their alternative. What is their alternative to the multifunction polis? Why will the Leader not stand up and tell us his plans? I think his plans are for retirement. Why did the member for Mount Gambier not tell us what he wants to do?

What he really wants to do is to kill off the project. That is the real motivation behind the debate put up by the member for Mount Gambier tonight. This is South Australia's opportunity, and this is the only opportunity we have on the horizon at the moment. This is the time when we can do something for our children, the time when we can make advances and the time when we can bring science and technology into South Australia. It is a time for us to do something and not a time to sit back and criticise, throw mud pies and try to throttle it off, which is what the Opposition has proved in its debate so far.

The multifunction polis is here to create a rational focus for economic, scientific and technological development of international significance. This is what South Australia wants, and this is what South Australia needs. It is what our children need, and what we need to create. We need to create leading centres of innovation in science, technology, education and the arts; to create a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies; to create a model of interaction between industries, research and development centres, educational institutions, community activities and the use of advanced information and communications systems for that purpose.

This is something that should receive the support of every member in this House. Every member should be prepared to support a project that will bring that sort of advancement, education, investment and technology to South Australia. I

have been very disappointed by the nitpicking that we have heard from members of the Opposition so far in this debate.

I know that I am not allowed to talk about the amendments, although nearly every other speaker opposite has, but I do hope that members opposite are not so stupid as to introduce and expect to carry amendments that will hobble the Government so far as its negotiations are concerned with national and international companies. When an international company negotiates with a Government, it expects the Government to be able to answer 'Yes' or 'No' immediately. It expects the Government to be able to negotiate on behalf of the State, and I hope that we do not receive stupid amendments that will tie the hands of South Australia and prevent the introduction of this proposal to our State.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am reminded that there are none so blind as those who do not want to see, or so deaf as those who do not want to hear. That is concisely the summation of the contribution we have heard from the member for Henley Beach. He claims to have sat and listened but, in actual fact, he has not heard. He certainly has not wanted to see much documentary evidence that is available, because he would see from the material referred to by members on this side of the House tonight, in a typical and expected opposition debate on a piece of legislation that opens new horizons which are not fully explained and which are a great concern to the public of this State, that the public has not been able to get answers to simple questions.

The Government is fully aware of the questions which are being asked by important members of the community. I do not refer to people from the political scene, but I am talking of those at the universities, in the business world, in unions and those who make up the great community of which we happen to be a part. The questions referred to by members on this side of the House are questions being asked universally within the community, because the answers have not been forthcoming.

In essence, the member for Henley Beach was saying that the Opposition is cynical. Why would the Opposition not be cynical, having regard to the poor track record of this Bannon Government over a period of almost 10 years that has seen us in financial chaos?

Why would Opposition members not be cynical and not question the future for their children, their grandchildren and their great grandchildren getting out of the mess we are already in without proper answers to the subject matter currently before us?

The member for Henley Beach said that somebody on this side of the House was wrong in going back 20 years. Perhaps he does not realise that Sir Thomas Playford left this House almost 24 years ago. Yet the honourable member referred frequently to Sir Thomas Playford; but that is not the point I want to raise. I wanted to draw that distinction because I want to go back to the early 1970s and indicate why this Opposition and the public abroad are cynical of what the Government is doing at the present moment, at the same time being prepared to support it—that has been stated publicly, in this place and in articles that have been written—subject to the answers being provided to our questions, whether they be on the EIS, financial viability, or the core site and how extensive it is having regard to the amount of pollution on that site. All those questions need to be answered.

I want to draw attention to a number of quite important projects in South Australia which have been debated in this House in the time that it has been my privilege to be a

member. I refer quickly to Roxby Downs: thought through, discussed, and questions answered. The resource was available, it was identified, and work is now being undertaken. I refer to the natural gas fields in South Australia: thought through, talked about, resource defined. That resource has been worked up further and further as time has gone by. The infrastructure was provided by this Parliament without equivocation so that the materials which we recognise as important to our future could be sold on the world market and could play a significant role in our own market.

I want to talk about Redcliff—a project which really was a dream, a project which was run out on two occasions leading up to an election as being a matter of tremendous financial importance to this State and something which the company was begging the State to allow to proceed. At that time I travelled overseas to the home of the company which was to develop Redcliff, only to find that the main board of the company, which we had been told was waiting to develop and start tomorrow, if not three weeks before, did not even know the ramifications of the project. It had not even considered the project at international board level. It was a project being worked up locally by ICI. There had been a brief report to ICI in Great Britain as to what was involved, but no commitment from ICI headquarters, no full knowledge of what was envisaged and no detail of the potential returns: only a concept.

I refer to Murray New Town. The Opposition did not destroy Murray New Town. The Opposition did not vote against Murray New Town. With a considerable degree of reluctance, it severely questioned the intent of Murray New Town. They questioned some of the promotion that was put forward by the Premier of the day regarding Murray New Town, which was to have new transport technology to take people from village A to village B in electric bubble cars. We were to have all sorts of urban development with a great deal of benefit for this State.

On the same trip to which I have just referred when I went to ICI headquarters on the Teesside in Great Britain to learn how little they knew about Redcliff, which had been trotted out by a Labor Government as the ants pants, something that was just waiting to happen, I also took the opportunity to look at a number of new town developments in England, Scotland, France and Canada. When I visited those places, I indicated that I was particularly keen to look at what they were doing, because we were to have a new town. In Scotland I visited Livingstone, East Kilbride (which, at that stage, had a branch of the South Australian Brush Company, which had expanded), and Glen Rothes, which is just outside Edinburgh; I also visited other places closer to London such as Stebonheath and a series of new towns not far from Montpellier, not exactly the promotion that my colleague the member for Mount Gambier mentioned this evening but a series of five new towns that had been developed specifically for tourism, each with a housing commitment for 110 000 to 125 000 people. They were working and providing opportunities for people across the whole of Europe to visit on special train packages to spend a week or a fortnight at the seaside and then return.

At each of those places that I visited I was asked, 'On what industry is your new town based? Why is it being built in that location? What resources are available to it that will make it a goer?' I had to say, 'I am sorry, but we haven't got any resource out there. It is a bit closer to the Murray River and therefore it is close to water to sustain an urban development, but it really has no particular resource.' The next question was: 'What then are you going to keep these people satisfied with on a work related basis other than the service industries that go with an urban town?' People were

amazed when they found that no such industry was contemplated and that no-one had accepted any involvement.

Having returned from seeing those establishments and talking about the problems as the people there perceived them, we got the then Government's idea that we would draft the Public Service to populate the new town, that the Department of Agriculture and a number of other departments would be situated at Monarto, and we would have a new town of a special type. I mentioned Murray New Town because it was supported: it is on our statute book, but what happened? It was not very long afterwards that we found we had expended a considerable sum of money on infrastructure, we had a very heavy financial commitment to the Commonwealth, and we were servicing a debt and getting no return.

It is to the credit of the Tonkin Government that during its term of office it paid off that very large Commonwealth debt so that we were not continually haemorrhaging, bleeding all the way, finding funds year after year for what had been a dream and a promotion of a Labor Government for the benefit of South Australia.

It did not eventuate. Like Redcliff, it did not eventuate. There have been other projects. The member for Henley Beach laid claim to the importance of the Grand Prix. Yes, the Grand Prix is operational and serious questions have been asked about it, but who initiated the Grand Prix? It was the Minister of Transport in the Tonkin Government, Michael Wilson, who set that project rolling just as it was Minister Michael Wilson who set the O-Bahn going. It was a Liberal Government that commenced the activities directly associated with the Casino. It was not a Labor Government. It was a project that was thought through and was controversial, but one which could be seen to have a potential financial benefit. It was supported, but that did not mean that it was not questioned or that various aspects of its operations since have not been questioned. It is right that they be questioned.

Why then should there be criticism of the Opposition tonight for being cynical? There are too many examples of wasted effort, of wasted funding and of no answers to pertinent questions that might have alleviated some of the heavy loss and heavy debt in which this State finds itself at the moment. They are the reasons why these questions are being asked: they are pertinent to the development. They are the reasons why the people of South Australia, be they in the business world, the unions or be they the Tom, Dick and Mary's of this world, are asking serious questions. One only has to look at the letters to the Editor in the *News* and the *Advertiser* and the frequency with which questions arise relative to the MFP. They are not politically inspired nor set going by this or your Party, Sir, or the Independents but set going by people in the community who are concerned to know what it is they are being asked to finance.

We have had already explained earlier this evening the very serious circumstances of the failure of the Federal Government to give adequate funding even for the project to get started. I do not wish to develop at any great length the loss of funds for the Better Cities project in this State, but I know that there are members on both sides of the House, particularly those in the western and northern suburbs, who are seriously concerned about the promises made to those communities about how they will benefit from that \$40 million, which looks like being done in the eye and they will get nothing.

Another point about the \$40 million, indeed about the first \$200 million that this State is committed to putting into this project, is that the vast majority of it will not be

seen once it has been expended, because it will virtually all be in underground infrastructure. It is right that there be underground infrastructure, but it has only one use once it is put there and, if there is no industry and no external interest—whether it be from the Japanese, the South Africans, South Americans, the English or whoever—to establish industry or projects that will capitalise on the expenditure of this vast amount of money, there will be no pay-off for the people of South Australia.

There may well be housing, but it could be put in a number of other places in South Australia. That could be done by way of infill, which would not cost anything like the cost per block to develop that this waste land will cost. There would not be any problem of what to do with the waste materials that are on this site already and where to put them once they are dug out to make way for the envisaged project.

If there is an answer, and it is a simple one, it ought to come now from the Government. The Government ought to be in a position to share with the members of this House, as it does with members of the public generally, information about the bottom line as to where those toxic materials will go and who is likely to suffer from their existence in the future. On an overseas trip which I took for parliamentary purposes I spent some time in Los Angeles looking at the collection and disposal of rubbish in that great metropolis. In that area at that time, if any toxic material had to be disposed of, it had to be taken more than 138 miles away. In fact, a large number of companies that had been out of existence for upwards of 20 years were being chased financially to pay for materials that they had quite correctly put into previous rubbish sites under State, Federal and local government ordinances. However, because they suddenly found a leachant, a gaseous material or some other problem some 20 years later, those companies were being charged with the cost of cleaning up the project. Their simple questions have not been answered. It is all very well to say that it will happen in due time, but it should happen now.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I support the Bill and the MFP development project. It is an important project for the State, and it is one that we as a State were lucky to get. As a Parliament, as a consequence of the way in which the MFP project came our way, we must deal with this development in a way that fosters international confidence in South Australia and our ability to see this project to fruition. I am sure that other States now view with a great deal of envy the success that has come to South Australia in our attracting this project, because the MFP in plain, ordinary terms in this economic climate means development and jobs for all sections of society, particularly, our young people because of the high level of youth unemployment in the community. In general terms, it does mean an increased measure of prosperity for South Australia. It is an ongoing project that enhances and makes South Australia attractive internationally. So, the MFP is a vital development that should not be impeded by this Parliament.

I am sure that the environmental concerns that have been raised can be addressed irrespective of the Bill. In other words, the Bill to establish the corporation is a priority, and the environmental concerns can be addressed in the process. I know that the Government is most sensitive to environmental issues. However, environmental issues should not be used as an excuse to delay or impede the Bill. I am sure that those environmental concerns will be dealt with in a sensitive way.

I also remind the Parliament that the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, as part of the functions of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, effectively established a monitoring role; that committee, which is a joint committee of both Houses, can inquire into and consider any matter referred to it dealing with the environment or how the quality of the environment might be protected or improved, any matter concerned with the resources of the State and how they might be better concerned or utilised, any matter concerned with planning, land use or transportation, any matter concerned with the general development of the State, or any other functions imposed on the committee by the Act or indeed by resolution of both Houses.

There is an adequate opportunity for both Houses of Parliament to monitor the environmental aspect of the MFP development project. I will not support any amendments that are designed to impede or delay the MFP Bill or to detract from South Australia's desire to increase its international reputation in the way in which we as a State handle this project.

The matters of some concern to me deal with the essential criteria for accountability of a Government corporation or statutory enterprise of this nature. Approximately one or two years ago, the Public Accounts Committee reviewed the criteria and laid down what it considered to be essential for accountability. Those criteria were control and direction by the Minister, audit by the Auditor-General and an annual report to Parliament. Clause 7 of the Bill sets out that the MFP is subject to direction by the Minister but does not use the word 'control' in conjunction with the word 'direction', and that matter may need to be examined in the debate. Indeed, the Minister should be responsible to Parliament for the administration of the corporation. At least that criterion of direction is referred to in clause 7 but, as I said, it may need further examination.

Clause 29 (2) provides for audit by the Auditor-General, and that was lacking in respect of the State Bank, SAMCOR, which later requested the Auditor-General to audit the board, and WorkCover, which is also not audited by the Auditor-General. Audit by the Auditor-General is an essential criterion for accountability to Parliament by a governmental enterprise of this nature.

The third criterion of the Public Accounts Committee dealt with an annual report to Parliament and clause 31 requires that an annual report be made to Parliament. Events in recent years have shown that statutory authorities, whether in this State or outside, need strict policing, strict accountability to the Minister and accountability to Parliament. I also think that, in relation to certain statutory authorities, we have seen examples of people sitting on various boards conducting themselves in a way that can only be referred to as a conflict of interest in relation to their own financial interests and those of the corporation. I believe that people who sit on corporations perform a public duty. They are lucky to be appointed to those positions and they ought to do their duty without seeking in any way personal gain or the use of information for personal gain as a result of their serving on a statutory corporation.

As has occurred and as has been reported publicly, there have been lapses in relation to statutory authorities in this State and elsewhere in relation to that standard, and I believe that the public will demand and is demanding a higher standard of accountability on the part of people who serve in official positions on statutory corporations. I will

be looking at Opposition amendments with a great deal of care and scrutiny in relation to the accountability standards not only for the Minister to Parliament and for the corporation itself but also for the persons who are appointed to office on the corporation. In the light of the experience of recent years, the public expects Parliament to demand from people who serve in a public position such as that a high standard of care and responsibility.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: It has already been reported publicly and it is a proper matter for concern in the light of events that have taken place in South Australia and elsewhere in relation to the conduct of officers of statutory corporations. This was foreshadowed by the Public Accounts Committee several years ago when it decided to initiate a review into statutory authorities and lay down the essential criteria for accountability.

One additional matter of concern that arises from this is that the development is of great financial significance for South Australia. South Australia has a low tax base, and the MFP cannot be developed solely out of South Australia's resources. We need financial support from the Commonwealth Government and from Governments abroad because of the international flavour of the project.

So far as this Parliament is concerned, the MFP needs to be monitored. It needs to be scrutinised, and I signal that I am quite receptive to an amendment that would give the Economic and Finance Committee a monitoring role. That committee has that role of its own initiative but, if the Parliament saw fit to lay down a better standard of monitoring than would ordinarily be the case in relying on the committee of its own initiative to cause inquiries, I would be receptive to an amendment to enhance the monitoring role of this Parliament in relation to the MFP because of its financial significance and the exceptional nature of the development.

As I indicated, we have seen that statutory authorities need careful monitoring, scrutiny and accountability to Parliament, particularly with regard to the financial area. The Better Cities money has been raised in this debate. That was a cause of great concern when it was announced that the \$40 million allocated by the Commonwealth for this project would come out of South Australia's Better Cities money.

If this \$40 million is initially taken out of the Better Cities money as a first take, it would impede and retard proposed projects for areas such as the northern suburbs. I know that the members for Elizabeth and Napier, who have been vitally concerned in recent years about Better Cities money, would be most disturbed, as indeed I would be, if the northern suburbs were to suffer as a consequence of the way in which the \$40 million has been allocated to South Australia but only out of the Better Cities money.

There is no doubt that, if it was a first take, if the MFP took first and what was left over was to be distributed pro rata somehow or other in the State as a result of the Better Cities funding, the northern suburbs will suffer, and certainly all sitting members—the members for Napier, Elizabeth and I—would be particularly vigilant in relation to that. Indeed, the member for Elizabeth and I wrote to the Premier immediately to secure the Better Cities money for the northern suburbs to ensure that those disadvantaged areas did not bear the brunt of the \$40 million allocation going to the MFP to the detriment of those areas.

That aspect will be monitored carefully because there is no question that, if it was a first take, the northern suburbs would suffer, and the sitting members for Elizabeth, Napier and I will be most vigilant to ensure that the Better Cities

money to go to the MFP is not at the expense of disadvantaged areas such as the northern suburbs of Elizabeth and Munno Para.

In summary, I support the Bill. It is a vital piece of legislation for South Australia and it ought to be dealt with in a responsible way which enhances our international standing as a State and makes us attractive for international development. I will not support the amendments that are designed to do nothing more than impede this project and downgrade South Australia in the process.

However, there are some Opposition amendments that I think are quite positive in nature, and I will look at them carefully to ensure that the Bill that emerges from the Committee stages will be in the best interests of South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): It is refreshing to hear the member for Hartley's comments, which are quite constructive: it is something we have not heard this evening from the Government benches. I refer in particular to the comments of the member for Henley Beach. Most of his speech was devoted to denigrating the Opposition and the attitude we have taken to this Bill. If the honourable member compares the Opposition's attitude on this measure with the Labor Party's attitude to the Roxby Downs legislation previously before this House he will note the vehement opposition to that legislation at the time. Today we have the Premier and his Government regarding Roxby Downs as one of the jewels in the crown of its success, and yet the Labor Party did everything in its power to defeat that legislation.

Government members will have heard the speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bragg, who took the leading role in this debate, clearly indicating that the Opposition supports this concept, but it has some concerns, and rightly so. We have financial concerns about this measure, because we have seen a series of disasters in this State under the control of the Premier. We do not have to run through them all, but they involve thousands of millions of wasted dollars. It is not the Government's money; there is no such thing as Government money, it is all taxpayers' money.

What the Opposition is trying to do in the amendments foreshadowed by the member for Bragg is ensure that there are some checks and balances on this Government. That is exactly what the people of South Australia—the taxpayers of this State—would expect us to do. Any suggestion that the checks and balances should not be there—especially when the Government has just revamped the standing committees of this Parliament for exactly that purpose—causes concern. Quite obviously, if the Government were not going to allow the appropriate committees to maintain a check on what is happening in relation to this major project then, of course, the Opposition would be negligent in its duty and completely abdicating its responsibility to the people of South Australia if it did not try to remedy that situation.

My first question in relation to this project is: why Gillman? Why does the Government have to pile every conceivable development in this State into the metropolitan area? It does not happen in other parts of the world. Why should it happen here in South Australia? We have a vast area within this State and yet every conceivable development is forced into the metropolitan area. If it were not for the Roxby Downs project, which the Labor Party strenuously fought right to the last, of course there would have been no real development in the country areas of South Australia.

There is no reason on earth why a development of this nature cannot be at Mount Gambier, in the vicinity of the

Riverland or even in the vicinity of the northern towns of Port Pirie, Port Augusta or Whyalla. In fact, the Government has already spent a significant amount of money in the Port Pirie area. It built a bridge there some years ago that is commonly known as the first bridge to nowhere in South Australia. It was a bridge to an island on which a site was to be designated for a uranium enrichment plant. Unfortunately, the Labor Party controlling body, or whatever it is called, decreed that uranium was a dirty word and that the uranium industry was out. Therefore, the site that had been prepared with the building of a bridge was suddenly no longer required, because the uranium industry was just not to be part of the agenda of any Labor Government in this country. So, we have a situation where the Labor Party wasted millions of dollars building a bridge to create a site that has never been used to this day.

The member for Hartley wants to know why we want these checks and balances in this case. It is our responsibility to ensure that and, contrary to what the honourable member suggested, any checks by the Parliament will not impede the progress of this development. It is absolutely essential, in light of what has happened in this State in recent years, that that occur.

Why Gillman? It is a sensitive and highly polluted area, and it will cost millions of dollars to correct the pollution problems there. Above all else, it is extremely important as far as the mangrove swamps are concerned, because they are a vital part of the fish breeding cycle in St Vincent Gulf. Enough damage has already been done to that area by the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, which has had devastating effects on mangroves in the area. South Australia does not have a great area of mangrove swamps, and it is essential that we protect the ones we have, especially since the fishing industry and the Department of Fisheries have recognised that they play an important role in the fisheries of this State.

Why build a major development at this location which could have significant effects on the mangrove swamps when there are plenty of other suitable sites throughout South Australia? I imagine that the people who will inhabit this city will be more than happy to live in the South-East in the Mount Gambier area, or even in the Riverland.

The Hon. H. Allison: We have water there.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Yes, in both cases there is water and a good climate. Both areas are on main links to the Eastern States. The Riverland is on the main highway to Sydney and Brisbane. The South-East is midway between Adelaide and Melbourne. So, what is the problem? Why is the Government locked into a situation where it can only consider a major developmental project in this State being inside the greater metropolitan area? Until the Government can explain that, I will have great difficulty understanding why it is forging ahead with a site which has so many problems when there are numerous other attractive sites where people would be more than happy to live.

Is it because the Public Service is not prepared to shift out of the metropolitan area as was the case with Monarto? That project failed because public servants refused to shift from metropolitan Adelaide 40 or 50 kilometres away to Monarto. The Labor Government of the day had absolutely no control over the Public Service of this State at that time, and Monarto foundered on that one factor, the people who were to inhabit the area refusing to go there.

Is that why the MFP has to be built at Gillman, within the greater metropolitan area, without giving due consideration to the environmental aspects about which this Government has always claimed to be a great advocate? In this instance it is showing little concern whatsoever for that

issue. At the conclusion of the second reading I will be interested in the Premier's response to some of those questions. The Opposition is not opposed to this project, but many unanswered questions need a response. In this case the attitude of the Opposition is extremely responsible, unlike the attitude that was adopted by the Labor Party to the Roxby Downs project, which is now of major financial benefit to the State.

After all, the Government is in a big enough financial mess as it is: imagine the mess it would be in without Roxby Downs to help prop it up. One can live in hope. While the Japanese regard the MFP at Gillman as a dream, members opposite are not concerned that that is how it is regarded. I only hope that it is not an impossible dream. With the way things are going, the Government has to come up with some sensible answers and satisfy the taxpayers of this State that it is being responsible. It will have a great deal of difficulty in doing that, because the Government's track record at the moment is absolutely appalling. It is the worst in Australia and probably, is the worst, other than those of some third world countries, that one could imagine.

These are some of the questions we want answered, and I hope and trust that, if the Government wants the support of the Opposition, it will address the problems that have been highlighted. They need to be answered, not only for the Opposition but in the interests of and on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Most of the foxes that have been out and running in relation to this measure and the debate relevant to it have already been well and truly discovered and shot. They have been hounded from their cover, into the open ground and taken by my colleagues. There are some points, however, that I wish to place on record. Unquestionably, this State must show that its relevance relates to its ability to identify the direction in which society ought to go in specialist domains of human endeavour and sell the techniques and the products that arise from those techniques, so developed, to the rest of the world.

We have done that ever since settlement, since we were fortunate enough to have had a statute passed by the Westminster Parliament more than 150 years ago. In fact, it is now over 160 years ago that the debate took place in Westminster and the legislation was finally passed to enable the establishment of this province. It was never a colony: it was a province established by statute, not by military fiat. In those days Colonies were established by military fiat, the decision was taken by, the military representative of the King or Queen of Britain, simply to raise a flag, fire a few musket shots in the air and claim the territory for the crown and the empire.

That was never done in South Australia. We had a model settlement which, in its time, in concept of the way in which it would be settled by the people willing to come here, was more of an innovation than the MFP proposal. So, it is nothing new to us. Along the way our forebears in this State have provided us with a continuing example of innovation of that kind. After all, it was in this State that we discovered the necessity to apply phosphorus to Australian soils to make them more fertile and capable of growing legumes incorporated in a pasture to fix the nitrogen in which our soils were also very deficient. In the process, it enhanced the soil organic matter levels and made otherwise infertile soils far more productive than any such soils anywhere else on earth had been at any point in human history.

We also discovered the necessity to have trace elements incorporated in soils where they were either grossly inadequate or where no such trace elements existed, and that in

turn also made other areas on this globe capable of more productive agricultural output. We discovered the necessity to use selected strains of rhizobium bacteria in conjunction with legumes to nodulate their roots and live in symbiosis with those legumes to fix atmospheric nitrogen. Symbiosis means to the mutual benefit of both life forms—in this case, the legume or clover, if you want to use the vernacular to describe it, in the soil, and the rhizobium bacteria that formed nodules on their roots, fixing atmospheric nitrogen and providing the plant with all the nitrogen it needed to grow.

In addition, we have historically a world famous capacity for the invention of mechanical devices. For instance, take the impact of the labour shortage during the gold rush years about 130 years ago when there was not enough labour available to harvest the crops. A man by the name of Ridley invented the forerunner of modern grain harvesting equipment used throughout the world, the Ridley stripper. Ridley is the name by which the electorate of Murray-Mallee will be known after the next election.

Further, we developed the stump-jump plough to enable us to bring scrub land into production, after crudely logging it using horses. We could then cultivate it without damage to our newly designed implements. This illustrates the nature of the capacity for innovation which South Australians have demonstrated.

We developed mining technologies in the early copper mines, and we avoided the hazards which had killed Cornish miners for centuries. They brought their techniques here and we came to understand the relevance of those techniques and the reasons for them. For instance, crimping the Cornish pasty provided a handle by which to hold the crib (or food), on the crimp of the pastry. The food was eaten and the crimp of the pastry was thrown away because the miners' fingers were contaminated with arsenic, coming from the cupric arsenate, and so on. The relevance of those practices, whilst they had become part of the culture of underground mining in Cornwall, were not known or understood, but we discovered the relevance in South Australia.

It was Lord Florey who discovered penicillin, and that is in another domain of the kind of scientific endeavour and innovation for which we have been famous. I have mentioned things that were discovered as a consequence of our having had a man of the foresight of Peter Waite, who established the Waite Institute to do those things. The mosaic tobacco virus was discovered there, along with many other things. The Waite Institute came into existence because we established here the first agricultural college, and turned agriculture into an applied science, and a scientific analysis of techniques was undertaken. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

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

Motion carried.

ROAD TRAFFIC (PRESCRIBED VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr LEWIS: That would not have happened were it not for the fact that we had a Royal Agricultural Society which had stimulated debate about and then compelled the Government of the day to establish an agricultural college. Let us look at some other facets in which we have been world leaders. The understanding of genetics in poultry was an item of early research here. We became effective and successful stud breeders of other animals, which showed our ability for excellence in that regard. South Australia's merinos are famous not only nationally but internationally, as are South Australia's Dorset Horn, Poll Dorsets and other British breeds and the discovery of the polling gene in animals and how to pass it on, so poll Dorsets were first bred as polled sheep here in South Australia. I could mention the names of people who have been involved in all this—fellows like Scott-Dolling and the excellence of his work in genetics in merinos.

These concepts are not new to us. In an adverse environment, harsh to the endeavours of civilised human beings, these factors have made it extremely difficult, if not impossible, in other societies to get anything like the measure of prosperity from such scarce and forbidding surroundings and resources. We have done extremely well and there is no reason why we cannot go on with that tradition into the twenty-first century. It is from that point that I say I have no problem with the concept of the MFP. South Australia has been one for over 150 years constantly and we have been modest about it. Given that we have such a small population, for goodness sake, the firsts that we have contributed to the world are enormous. There is no need for us to tug our forelocks and cringe about whether or not we are adequate to the task. We are.

I do not see the need for us to go begging the brains of people from other countries and cultures because they have had stimulating economic and education systems in recent times, unlike our own which have wandered away from the course which produces excellence. They have produced excellence, they have sought out ability and excellence and encouraged and rewarded it. We need to rediscover that again. There is no shame in producing the very best from those of us capable of doing it. Indeed, there is a great deal to be derived from encouraging everyone to do their best and rewarding them for doing so and ensuring that they do not feel inadequate because their very best may be comparatively less than someone else's 'best'. We have the means of doing that. We have done this sort of innovation of which I speak in the science and psychology of education, and we ought to get on with it.

The vision which has been projected by the Government and the people related to this multifunction polis would indicate to me that they think of it in terms of a macro fun park and not something as innovative as it ought to be. I believe that to rely so much on very high technology and an assumption that we will continue with a high consumption/disposal type society is bad news.

I draw attention to two letters to the editor in today's *News*: one from Steve Felton of Peterborough and another from David Munn of South Brighton. In his letter, Mr Felton states:

At last the truth about the MFP—

these are the sorts of things we ought to be considering— is emerging and the questions many people have asked are proving to be justified concerns. More than \$5 million has been spent already on shallow glossy publicity and kowtowing to the Japa-

nese, and the reality is that the focus has been more on the chasing of finance, and potential profits.

The philosophical criteria has been a secondary function, shaped to fit the selfish primary purpose. It's time for some basic questions. Who needs the MFP and why? No-one in Adelaide needs it! Adelaide is big enough.

The town of Peterborough has endured a greater percentage population shift in the last 20 years—

I challenge that point—

than any other town in South Australia and what have our Governments done to support the quality of life in this area? Nothing!

The paltry \$40 million from our Federal Government would achieve more for the future of South Australia spent in Peterborough. The MFP could be more cheaply built and its philosophical base could be more honestly fulfilled. Come up and have a look Mr Bannon. I bet you're not game.

Just put any town, whether it be Tailem Bend, Lameroo, Cummins or Ceduna beside Peterborough and you will understand that there is no reason at all in the future of this State why we cannot decentralise from Adelaide. Indeed, I am aghast at our even contemplating the use of this site at Gillman. As other members have said, it is crazy! If they have not used those exact words, in summary that is what members on this side, whom I have heard in the debate, have said—it is crazy!

If we dig out the pollution from that site, the stuff that is causing the trouble and concern, where the hell will we put it? Where will the Government put it—somewhere else and cause a problem there? It will not go away; matter is not created or destroyed. It will have to be shifted, and if it is to be shifted why is it appropriate to take it from Gillman and dump it somewhere else in a costly unnecessary exercise? Just because there happens to be urban development in the immediate vicinity of Gillman is no reason on earth for any conceivable purpose to fiddle with it. Instead, why do we not build an island for the MFP in the middle of the gulf?

Mr Groom: That would kill the fish.

Mr LEWIS: It would not kill the fish; it would enhance the fish population—there is no question about that. It would increase the surface area exposed as shoreline. The island could be built of stone quarried from somewhere nearby. There are plenty of places where stone is adjacent to the coastline where deep water occurs because a fault line causes the coast to be so located. I am not saying that we should do that: I am simply saying that it is damn stupid—and there is no other word to apply to it—to use the site at Gillman. It is crazy! If the dollars belonged to members opposite, they would not do it but, because they think of it as taxpayers' dollars, it is okay. They are as inane, irresponsible and immoral as Geoff Virgo was when he said, 'Why worry about it, it's only taxpayers' money?' He said that in this place. It is implicit in the argument being advanced by the Government now that it is only taxpayers' money and it does not matter.

I refer to the letter to the editor from David Munn which is headed 'Eco-city alternative'. In that letter Mr Munn states:

A city built on truly ecological principles would provide jobs without harming the environment, and thereby win the support of those whom you call 'green extremists' and 'Luddites'.

Unlike the MFP, such a city, to be genuinely ecological would be planned in an open and democratic manner with central importance given to the needs of the most disadvantaged members of the community. South Australia should be striving to become a world leader in the field of renewable energy technology rather than the military technology which is planned for the MFP.

Hear, hear! There is no reason at all why we could not use the concept of an MFP to develop an urban setting and lifestyle dependent far more on renewable energy sources

than is the case and likely to be the case on this Gillman site.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The amount of energy taken by the member for Henley Beach, who interjects from out of his seat, is equivalent to the amount of energy that would be taken to create shelter and jobs for any person ultimately employed in any of the opportunities for employment that might arise on the Gillman site, which would be far higher than it would be if it were located anywhere else. It is crazy to invest dollars at Gillman because they will be less efficiently invested in that.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Anywhere at all other than Gillman—it is not safe. One can still develop parts of Gillman which are stable from seismic shock and are not polluted by unacceptably high levels of chemicals. Why, some of the levels of chemicals are suitable for commercial mining. We are crazy! We will dig them up and shift them somewhere else where they will become another problem for us. It will be expensive to do it. Leave it alone—get away from it and put it where it can be more efficiently established, where the same jobs can be more cheaply created. It should not be so much dependent on generated energy from the burning of fossil fuels or any other mined source of energy but more in emphasis on renewable sources of energy.

We have plenty of water at Lameroo. Did you know that we could close down all the irrigation industry at present in South Australia and start it all in the Mallee on the amount of water we could have from there, annually recharged, in the Murray basin? All the problems of the Riverland, irrigation, which return salt water to the Murray River, could be solved. We could close it down and put the whole lot in the Mallee: there is enough water to do that. There is no reason at all why a city could not be developed there. The kinds of reasons that the Government advances to locate the MFP at Gillman are not adequate, not sensible, not responsible and indeed smack of the same kind of problems that we have had with the State Bank legislation.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): We have a vision for the MFP and it does include siting it in South Australia but it does not include siting it on the Gillman site—a site which I will demonstrate shortly is polluted, mosquito infested and not suitable for a development such as this. About 18 months ago I had the privilege of being able to undertake a study tour around Europe. At that stage I was invited by seven countries to look at their community welfare systems. I took the opportunity when travelling along the south of France to detour and look at Sofia Antipolis. I came home very impressed: it was an impressive sight. It had a technical area. Many overseas companies had moved into Sofia. IBM was there and a lot of major agricultural and pharmaceutical firms were also represented. Aerospace firms had moved in and made it their world headquarters. Nearby in the undulating hills, somewhat like the southern region of Adelaide, there was a link with the universities, the living areas and the housing. It was all strategically placed, environmentally sound and carefully planned so that one face did not intrude on the other.

Financially a massive amount of Euro dollars was invested in the project. It was not simply French francs, Japanese or United States input but the deutschmark and Italian currency were also heavily invested. There was also some interest coming in from Eastern Europe. It was to be a success right from its inception because, first, geographically

it was well suited and, secondly, it linked in with other MFPs springing up in Europe. It was well financed by many countries and indeed the link with the private and public sector was well driven. There is no doubt that the motivating force behind it was the French Government. A Minister in the French Government drove the project. The mix was there, the money was there and the geographic location added to the project. I will demonstrate that all those attributes and assets that went with the Sophia Antipolis MFP and also the Montpellier MFP (referred to by the member for Mount Gambier) are not duplicated at the Gillman site. Government members know that they have a problem at the Gillman site.

When we talk about the acceptance of an MFP for this State, the Government and the Opposition are not far apart. The argument is over the site. I know the Australian Democrats in the Upper House will have much to say about the site, and we are all having a lot to say about the site; collectively we cannot all be wrong. I know that members on the Government benches have privately expressed concerns about the site, and they wish that the Government had not rushed in and accepted it. They know by the discussions that were being carried out with their Federal counterparts that they were advising against the site. However, they also knew of the political reality that, to help the Premier out of a difficult situation, the Prime Minister of the day—God bless him—who now pursues a career in media, saw fit to see that the Premier was let off the hook.

This afternoon, I was doing some research in the library, and I came up with an old newspaper of 18 years ago which had the headline 'Redcliff given the go ahead'. I can recall that because I happened to live in the Port Pirie area at the time. The member for the Port Augusta district will know of those heady days as well. It started in the early 1970s, when Don Dunstan and Hugh Hudson dined out on this project election after election. I can recall the hype that led up to the 1973 election when Don Dunstan announced that Redcliff was a goer. That subject filled up all the local newspapers in Port Augusta, Whyalla and here. By 1974, the subject made massive headlines—and I know that I am unable to demonstrate it to the House, but members can read the newspapers. The Labor Party dined out on this project in 1973, 1975 and again in 1977 and 1979.

The headline of the newspaper which I have in front of me and which is 14 years old, states, 'South Australia on the brink of a new era'. We were told of the establishment of this \$1 000 million petrochemical complex. That \$1 000 million would have multiplied in value in today's terms. So, it is a very similar situation. We had the promise of this great complex, which would be the saviour. What concerns me greatly is that this Government will dine out on the MFP in 1992 for the 1993 elections and, heaven forbid, it will not be around the place again. However, no doubt, if the Government has the opportunity, it will dine out on this dream for many years to come.

It has been demonstrated by the Japanese that this project is a dream. So far, Japan is the only country that is involved in the project, and that is nothing like the situation at Sophia Antipolis in France which involved multi-Euro dollars. The Japanese were involved here but only to the extent of an idea, nothing more than that. It is purely and simply an idea. When the studies, to which I will refer shortly, were done, it was apparent that this was not the preferred site. I can recall talking to someone who went on the bus tour when the Japanese delegation came here. When an attempt was made to include Japanese dishes on the tour, it was a farce. The Japanese were taken to the site and treated as though they were Japanese tourists off a ship down in the

harbour, not high-ranking Japanese businessmen, and that point was not lost on the delegation.

The Japanese businessman told the fellow to whom I spoke that they did not want to come here. The Japanese were polite, but their interest was in Queensland and, to a lesser degree, Sydney and Melbourne. They spoke highly of the Queensland, New South Wales and Victorian Governments and their presentations, and their impression of what was an offer and what those Governments there were prepared to put in. What came out of the discussion was that Bruce Guerin and his organisation here were so ill-prepared that those Japanese businessmen went back to Japan with the feeling that South Australia had not even thought through what the idea and dream was.

It has also been put to the Opposition by senior members of the Government in Canberra that they would like to see Bruce Guerin out of this exercise straight away because he is not a good asset as far as the Japanese are concerned. He is a stumbling block. If we are to get this off the ground, the management of the project must be questioned. Once again, I am telling Government members something they already know. I really think that the Government and the Premier will have to do something about the concerns of Japanese businessmen and those of the Federal Minister about the manager of the MFP Australia project. We are being told by too many people in Canberra that the Federal Minister has a problem with the management of the project. If he has a problem with it, we all have a problem.

I would like to refer to some of the problems that I see with the viability of the project. In 1988, the consultants said that, for the project to be feasible, it needed a population base of somewhere between 100 000 and 200 000 people. That would be a huge task for South Australia. Nevertheless, the Government took it up and attempted to bring the project forward. At that stage, the Opposition could not have been construed as anything other than supportive of the whole concept. Indeed, we always have been supportive. In July 1990, the National Capital Planning Authority compiled a report for the Federal Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce. It supported the conclusion of the Andersen report that the project should aim for a population of more than 100 000 people.

Planning proceeded until the stage was reached at which reports came in saying that, prior to the site selection, it was essential that the potential to provide trunk infrastructure for a minimum of 100 000 people had to be identified. That is when the warning bells started to ring. It began to look very clear in 1990 that we did not have the trunk infrastructure to support 100 000 people; nor did we have the ability to attract 100 000 to 200 000 people to the proposed site. These problems started to emerge.

The geography of the site was compared with other sites overseas and it was found that geographically and aesthetically the site did not stack up in comparison. In May 1990, in the name of Premier Bannon, the South Australian Government made a final submission to the joint steering committee. At that stage he was still claiming that the site was satisfactory, that it could take 100 000 people and that it could be integrated into Adelaide to form a metropolis as part of MFP Adelaide. At that stage he was still claiming that he had 3 500 hectares on which to build a residential, recreational and working site, and everything else put together to form an MFP. At no stage did the Government acknowledge that the MFP could be built and spread over the whole of metropolitan Adelaide or decentralised into other regions. Heaven forbid! There was every opportunity for that to happen. As it progressed, the Bannon Government began to run into trouble.

In early 1991, the consultants from Kinhill Delfin made some further projections. They decided that, although it was originally estimated that 100 000 people would live at Gillman, Tony Read, the State manager, said that it was more likely that between 40 000 and 50 000 people would reside on the core site and others associated with the MFP would have to live in other parts of the city. By 1991 there was a dramatic change of thinking on the part of the Government. Indeed, that change was being driven by outside forces which were starting to knock a few heads together to make the Government realise that the Premier's original dream, which he was starting to put together, was something that just would not stack up.

Let me look briefly at the suitability of the site, because therein lies many of my concerns. As I said, I have a vision for an MFP in South Australia based on what I have seen overseas, and I will argue to the end of the day that there is a place in South Australia for this type of concept, but the problem with the site at Gillman—I know the Government agrees with me but politically members opposite cannot get up tonight and say so—is that studies of the engineering, geotechnical, ecological, soil, hydrological and marine aspects of the site have confirmed that all these aspects referred to can be rehabilitated, but the cost involved is something we know nothing about. We can develop the area: nothing is impossible with engineering nowadays if you have the money. We can go and rip off a metre of the topsoil and replace it, but a cost is involved—

An honourable member: Where do you put it?

Mr OSWALD: As the honourable member says—and I was going to lead to that—where do you put it? North of St Kilda are areas that we cannot crop, but we cannot dump polluted soil there. As the rest of South Australia is an arid area, we cannot dump the material on valuable farming land. The problem in South Australia that seems to have been overlooked is that we cannot dump that material anywhere. If we lived on the periphery of an arid zone and if there were massive hectares of salt lakes, we might be able to talk about that, but in Adelaide there is nowhere to dump that stuff.

Not only is there nowhere to dump it but if it is left as it is and if we expect to build on it, the problem, as I understand it from the technical papers I have read, is that the strata underneath is saturated, loose, organic rich and permeable with very low bearing capacity. This means that, wherever we build a structure, the foundations have to be laid in such a manner as to support the structure on top. That means that massive raft foundations, piers or other engineering works are concerned, but that is a huge expense to put onto the developers, and in turn it will be passed down to those occupying either the houses or the commercial properties, and that makes the cost go up. The cost goes up to an indefinite amount—no-one knows what it will be.

We can talk about the housing to be constructed there, but we will not know the cost of the housing: it will be expensive housing, which will rule out many people living there. It will be expensive housing because we will not know the cost of foundations or the cost of siteworks required on such faulty ground. At the end of the day we will start to exclude people from the area because they will not be able to afford to live there.

Anyone who has lived in Port Pirie for 25 years as I have will know that people have to sleep under nets in the summer months if they live near the mangroves. I slept under nets for years and years, and as a kid I did not know any different. If we are to put high-cost housing onto the Gillman site—it might seem an irrelevant part of the debate—and if the Government puts 60 000 married people

at Gillman, in this day and age they will not want to live under nets in brand new accommodation.

If we spray the mangroves, which we can do, we will certainly kill off the mosquitoes but we will also stop the breeding of fish. The ecological balance will change and we will then have another problem on our hands. Whichever way we look at the project, we have a problem. If the Government had some commonsense, it would accept that it will not be criticised by the Opposition if it moves the MFP site elsewhere. We would applaud the Government for that.

We have a vision for this project in South Australia: we can see it going ahead, and it will bring benefits to this State. No-one denies that. This is a marvellous project for the State and Australia but, if we are not careful, we will lose it to Queensland, which is going ahead anyway with its MFP site, offering advantages and incentives to the Japanese and other countries, including the Germans and Italians, I believe, to come and invest in that State. New South Wales is hard at it. It has an MFP proposal, and it is trying to attract Euro dollars and American dollars for its project. Mark my words, this project will pass Adelaide by if the Government does not provide a suitable site which is attractive for setting up the development and which is aesthetically pleasing to live in. There is a lot more I would like to say, but I will keep it for the Committee stage of the debate.

There are three clauses with which I have some difficulty. I have just two minutes left to me, so I will refer to them briefly now and deal with them in more detail during the Committee stage. I am concerned about three clauses of the Bill. The member for Coles mentioned these three clauses, but I want my comments on them recorded in *Hansard*. Clause 3, linked with clause 12, means that without reference to Parliament the Government can compulsorily acquire any part of the State. That is a real problem and a matter that we will debate vigorously.

Clause 28 is also of great concern. It outlines the borrowing powers of the corporation; giving the Minister or the Government freedom to allow borrowing. Once the corporation has borrowed funds, if it goes bad, the taxpayer picks it up. It would be like 333 Collins Street. In this case, if the corporation purchases anything and it goes bad, the taxpayer picks it up. That is a travesty to impose on the taxpayers of this State. Finally, clause 33 exempts the corporation from the provisions of the Planning Act. We have great concerns about that clause. It should not be in the legislation, and we will certainly have a lot to say about it in Committee.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I am very pleased to take part in this debate, because the vast majority of the multifunction polis core site is in the electorate of Price. MFP Australia is one of the biggest and most significant projects in Australia's history. It is certainly the most significant project in South Australia since Colonel Light set about establishing the city of Adelaide. It is interesting to reflect on that. Originally Adelaide was set up as a model city in the new colony of South Australia. It was an experimental model city and its success can be seen to this day. One of the reasons why the people of South Australia, and of Adelaide in particular, have done things so well over the past 150 years is the fact that this model city was set up in special circumstances. People have tended to do things well in South Australia. I refer to such things as the Grand Prix, and so on.

History repeats itself in this regard, because the MFP comprises a model set of villages to reflect twenty-first

century living standards. The project addresses environmental control and sustainability of living. It takes into account new technologies relating to energy conservation and so on. As I said, history repeats itself, and this MFP is very much a model project.

The Bill provides the legislative framework to enable the project to go ahead in terms of the promotion and the continuing development of this exciting and forward-looking concept. I use the word 'concept' advisedly because, now that the draft EIS and the SDP have been released for public comment, people can see for themselves the zoning, the infrastructure and the plans of what the MFP will be.

A couple of years ago, when the MFP was very much just a concept, it generated considerable hostility, almost entirely due to the community's ignorance and failure to see what was involved. Progressively I have seen the community's attitude change as more information became available. At first the name multifunction polis worried people. They thought it would be an exclusive Japanese retirement enclave. They then thought that it would be a foreign owned and dominated area. Now that the community has much more information and there has been much consultation by way of information sessions and public meetings, the people can see what the project has to offer.

My perception is that the vast majority of people are, at best, extremely enthusiastic about the project and, at worst, hope that it will go ahead but have doubts about its becoming a reality. Once work has commenced on the core site, I am sure that those doubting Thomases will get behind the project with interest and enthusiasm. Of course, there are always people who will be opposed to the project. This is normal; some people cannot help themselves. They criticise everything. Not all but many of these people are greenies, very racist or just plain knockers, and there is evidence of bigots criticising the project on religious grounds.

It is true that the area has some environmental problems. The Government has never tried to hide them. These problems are fully identified in the draft EIS and will be dealt with in due course. This project presents a unique opportunity to clean up this area once and for all. I remember very clearly the knockers who surfaced when West Lakes was being discussed; they continued their knocking until the project was complete. They disappeared, a very disappointed lot, when they saw that they had lost the argument.

The success of the West Lakes project is there for everyone to see. That magnificent development is a jewel in South Australia's crown. MFP Australia will be even better than West Lakes. The MFP project involves all levels of government in Australia. It is a Federal-State joint venture, and as it develops the project will to a large extent include and involve local government. I am pleased that the amendments that the Premier has on file fully acknowledge and recognise the important role of local government in this great project.

The Bill sets up the various structures and bodies that are needed to allow the development of the MFP to proceed in a legal and orderly manner. It provides for the establishment of an MFP Development Corporation and sets out its composition, functions, powers and responsibilities. Also, the Bill provides for the establishment of an MFP Community Advisory Committee and sets out its composition, functions and powers. That committee will give information to and liaise with the corporation and, on its own initiative, will look at other issues such as programs that should be undertaken to ensure the appropriate infrastructure for community development in MFP development centres, the means of ensuring appropriate levels of community involve-

ment in the establishment of MFP development centres, and social issues that are raised by MFP development centres.

The committee will include people who have expertise in local government, education, community services and industry, and people who will appropriately represent the interests of employee bodies and local communities in the area of or adjacent to the MFP core site. The development corporation will be the heart of the project and will have power to control and acquire land as necessary. It is very important to ensure that the MFP is not perceived as a separate entity with an invisible wall around it so that existing local communities can feel part of it, get involved and have some input.

The establishment of the advisory committee will ensure that the resultant ongoing consultation, review and feedback will prevent any feeling of dissociation between the community and the MFP and, therefore, will blend the entire MFP into the Adelaide metropolitan area in every aspect. I also see the role of the MFP Community Advisory Committee as being one of cooperating with the corporation, local employers, schools, TAFE colleges and other training institutions to provide much needed jobs for local people.

This can easily be coordinated to ensure that, by planning ahead, local people can be trained and then employed to do the ongoing work as the MFP proceeds. The project will create many thousands of jobs, both during the construction stages and when the project is completed some 25 to 30 years down the track. This aspect of employing local people will give a real sense of ownership and worth to these people and thus ensure their full support and commitment to the project, as well as ensuring the success of the entire project. The Bill provides for the making of regulations to control all infrastructure, buildings, landscaping, land use, etc, in the MFP area, and also sets out in broad terms the objectives for the MFP. These are also spelt out in one of the clauses of the Bill.

The objects of the MFP are: to create a rational focus for economic, scientific and technological developments of international significance; to create leading centres of innovation in science, technology, education and the arts; to create a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies; to create a model of interaction between industries, research and development centres, educational institutions and community activities and of the use of advanced information and communication systems for that purpose; to create an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development and in the use of advanced science and technology to serve the community; and to create a model of conservation of the natural environment and resource management and equitable social and economic development in an urban context.

The history of the project has evolved over four overlapping stages: the concept stage, which went from January 1987 to mid 1988; the feasibility and site selection stage, which ran from mid 1988 to July 1990; the site feasibility of the MFP Adelaide stage, from August 1990 to May 1991; and the community consultation stage, from August 1990 to August 1991. The MFP concept originated in 1987 as a proposal from the Japanese Government for a cooperative effort to stimulate the development of modern industries and technologies important to the future of both countries. It also was a concept to set up new industries and a new way of living into the twenty-first century.

A very important aspect of the original concept was that it would be a collaborative effort between Australia's public, private and community sectors with international partners. The community consultation program started in August 1990, between the Commonwealth and South Australian

Governments, and a three member MFP community consultation panel was set up. I am surprised to hear Opposition members say that there has been no consultation and that not much information has been given to the public.

Many hundreds of these public consultation and information meetings were held around Australia, and I attended quite a few of them. At none of those meetings did I see any Opposition members. To learn about these things and to find out what is going on, one must go to these sorts of meetings. The consultation panel was chaired by Mr Robert Lansdown OA CBE. Bob Lansdown brought with him a fabulous wealth of experience and knowledge. I personally found him an excellent person to deal with, and a thorough gentleman.

His handling of some quite difficult public meetings was outstanding, and I believe that he and his co-panel members made an enormous impact on the way in which the community at large has been informed and has now accepted the MFP as a most credible, worthwhile and sustainable project. The core site area of the MFP is centred around Gillman and Dry Creek, and consists of an area of 2 343 hectares. The land is substantially undeveloped and principally owned by the Crown. This low lying land has been abused and largely ignored since the early days of the colony of South Australia. Early development took place all around this area because the land was higher or it was easier to build it up to a level above high tides.

I know the area well, Mr Speaker, as no doubt you do. I used to play there as a youngster and shoot there as a young adult. In recent times I have realised the importance and enormous potential of this land. Where else in the world can virtual virgin land be found right next to a major sea port, within a few kilometres of a major city and an international airport? Added to this is the fortuitous location of Technology Park, Science Park and other facilities and infrastructure. The whole area could hardly have been planned better if the MFP had been proposed 10 or 20 years before. I spoke in this House on 9 August 1988 about this area and its potential, well before the area was chosen as the site for the MFP. I will quote from part of that speech as follows:

An area of great future significance for not only the electorate of Price but also South Australia in general is the area north of Gillman and Wingfield, including Torrens and Garden Islands. A few months ago the Dean Rifle Range and overshoot area was placed on the market by the Federal Government as prime industrial land. This decision caused an outcry from local authorities and me. Because of the low lying nature of most of this land, an enormous amount of land build-up would be required before any sort of building work could be undertaken.

Two main stormwater drains run across this land—one to the east of the rifle range which flows into North Arm Creek and one to the west of the range running into North Arm itself. This latter drain in particular is very important as it carries not only stormwater for the North East Drainage Authority from the whole of the metropolitan area into the river and in turn out to sea, but also acts as a crucial buffer zone if any dangerous substances get into the drainage system. The buffer zone played a very vital role in the control of a dangerous copper oxychloride spill at Gillman a couple of years ago. This is another factor that needs to be considered in determining the future long-term use of this land.

The mangrove lined banks of the North Arm and North Arm Creek, Barker Inlet, Torrens Island and Garden Island form vital breeding grounds for fish in the gulf system and therefore this area must be protected at all costs; and the whole area also supports a wide variety of native birds. All of these aspects require careful consideration. Thankfully, however, this large parcel of land was recently purchased by the State Government and the immediate threat to the area was thus eliminated.

The South Australian Government now owns all the land in this region and will be undertaking thorough and detailed studies to ensure that any future use and development will be completely compatible with the ecology of the area as a whole. The studies will look at not only today's requirements and effects but at the future 100 years plus ahead. After the present environmental

problems with which I have had to deal in areas like Wingfield, Rosewater, Alberton, Queenstown, Cheltenham, and so on, it is great to know that for the first time in the 150 years since the colonisation of South Australia open virgin land like this will be developed in an orderly, sensitive and sensible way. The potential uses for this whole area are almost endless and with great care many quite diverse land uses can be made quite compatible with one another. The whole area has a tremendously exciting future if planned correctly.

Of course, of particular interest to me is the use of the existing estuaries as the basis for the whole system of interconnected lakes throughout the MFP area. They will be of varying water qualities to suit a whole range of activities, both leisure and management. Many of these lakes and waterways will be flushed every three to four days, and the whole system will be flushed every seven days. I compare that with West Lakes, where we know of some of the problems that exist, the area being flushed every 21 days. It can be seen that the whole lakes system will be flushed and kept very clean. This should overcome the algal bloom problem which flourishes in the Port River between late spring and early summer. Possible tertiary treatment of effluent or piping to Bolivar of this effluent will enable it to be used in wood lots, etc., in the future.

Three major projects that will contribute towards the MFP have been announced in recent times by the now defunct Public Works Standing Committee. One was the Salisbury Highway-South Road connector. Work is due to start on that project, and it will go right into the heart of the MFP. There will be an area suitable to tap off into a major infrastructure access to the MFP area. The second project was the setting up and approval of the sewage pipeline from the Glenelg sewage treatment works through to the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, piping the sludge from both of those works out to Bolivar for land disposal and hence overcoming the problem of disposing of that sludge out to sea.

The third major project involves a decision by the Public Works Standing Committee—I think it was the last project that it endorsed before it became defunct on 10 February this year—to approve the building of the Port Adelaide College of TAFE. That is a \$15 million world-class college which will not only greatly enhance Port Adelaide but be of tremendous benefit to the MFP through training people for the ongoing life of the MFP.

I have a lot more to say about the project, but time has beaten me. I conclude by saying that the draft environmental impact statement, which I have been through at great length, is an amazing document. There is so much detail and over 80 issues are identified involving the MFP area. These have all been identified, and management practices are being put in place to address these problems.

I congratulate PPK Consultants, supported by the Hassell Group and the CSIRO for a magnificent EIS. I also congratulate and commend the job done by Michael O'Connor, the chief planner of the Port Adelaide City Council, who was seconded by the consultants to the MFP to take part in the draft EIS. To sum up, this massive project will bring enormous benefits to the local economy and Australia in terms of the development of technology—

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I shall not reiterate many of the arguments that have been heard tonight and the analysis that has been provided particularly from this side of the House. I commend to all members of the House and those who read *Hansard* the exceptional efforts by my colleagues, particularly the members for Bragg, Heysen, Coles and Mount Gambier. They

have done an in-depth analysis of the suitability of the Gillman site, they have pointed out the difficulties that that site poses for anybody building there or having any form of development on the site, they have put it in the context of world developments and they have issued a challenge on some of the environmental issues that have to be sorted out before any development can take place. It is not my intention to go over that material, because it has already been outlined in great detail by the member for Bragg and others.

I should like to look at the way in which this project has developed and reflect on the Government's capacity to run anything. It could not run a chook raffle, let alone get the MFP up and running. I believe that everybody in this House has an aim and goal in life, and one of the items on everybody's agenda is to improve the fortunes of this State. I believe that the State has a tremendous future. I have always believed that South Australia has a tremendous capacity to attract the international community to its shores. We have some wonderful and unique advantages which cannot be claimed by many other places in the world. Everybody is well aware of how small and accessible Adelaide is. We tend to forget the great advantages of a cosmopolitan population and we tend to undersell the attractiveness of clement weather. We enjoy very clean air by world standards. There are many other wonderful advantages that this city and State enjoy which have been marketed very poorly over a long period. I can only cite now the Bannon Labor Government for its negligence in attracting people to this State, particularly those of international standing.

I would like to compare what happened with the Grand Prix with what is happening with the MFP site. The success of the Grand Prix was really entailed in South Australia capturing it in the first place. Back in the days of the Tonkin Government a number of people came to the then Premier and said, 'We believe that we can have a Grand Prix in this State. We believe in this State and we can make it work.' Those people talked to FISA and the other organisations involved in international Formula One Grand Prix racing with the aim of attracting this world-class event to Adelaide.

When the ALP and this Premier came to Government in 1982, they had a plan to attract the Grand Prix to this State. There were not any big announcements or clapping of hands; there was not any self-congratulation but simply a dedication to getting that project for South Australia. The Premier and the Government have been congratulated many times on this achievement. It is an achievement of which it can be rightly proud, just as I believe that if the Tonkin Liberal Government had continued in power it could have achieved the same.

However, it happened because people of goodwill and capacity negotiated behind closed doors to achieve that end. They did not pre-empt, they did not tell the world that they were going to negotiate; they did it by talking to the individuals and power brokers concerned, and they struck a bargain, a bargain that was possible because they had something to offer. They did not have to trade off against the rest of the world because they got to the right people first.

What has been the history of this MFP project? I would say quite the opposite. Over a period of time we have had successive announcements from a Government that is desperate for any project whatsoever. We have had successive attempts to beef up this project from its first inception. From the day that it was determined by the Federal Government that it would embark on an MFP as an Australian project at the instigation of the Japanese, South Australia

has been up front attempting to attract this development—and so it should.

However, we have struck some problems, which relate to the fact that the publicity that has been generated around this project has not matched our capacity to deliver. Another problem is that the quality of expertise necessary to get a project of this size and complexity simply has not existed in the form in which we need it. Finally, we have a Government whose record presents a very daunting picture to any potential investment in this State. Instead of negotiating behind closed doors and saying that South Australia had won the project, we have seen successive announcements about what the benefits to South Australia will be. We have not stitched up one contract. We have not even convinced the initiators of this project of the worth of the Gillman site and the MFP concept.

The question of what is an MFP has been raised on many occasions, but that question has still not been answered. It is not that the State Government should not have a dream or a vision. The fact is that, if this State is going to proceed, it must deliver, but it has not been able to do that. We have had rhetoric, words and reports, but not enough action to achieve the required end. We know also that the difficulties of the Gillman site are very compelling and that those questions were never really answered when the original feasibility studies were undertaken. I bet right now that if the Premier had his time over again he would choose another site or he would put forward a different concept to win the project.

When you are holding on to a lemon, sometimes you have to cut your losses, admit that you are wrong and say that you have an alternative vision or proposition. However, we have not. That is not to say that the Gillman site is hopeless. If we look at the situation in Singapore, we find that an extra 60 per cent of its land mass has come from land reclamation. So, Singapore has expanded its territory quite considerably due to its own endeavours. It is not impossible to do up the site that we are talking about, to get rid of the waste and overcome many of the environmental problems that have been notified tonight, but the costs of such a project are really quite extraordinary. The economics defy description. Unless we have an outside influence, an outside investor, it simply cannot survive.

Who will pay for the very large costs associated with this project? We still remain to be convinced about this project because, when the feasibility study for the MFP was done, many of the difficulties were overlooked. We have heard tonight about the pollution. We have seen the various reports, the questions about the impact of the surrounding manufacturing industry, the incidence of the gas pipeline and the impact of the Bolivar sewage works—all providing a micro study of pollution, degradation and perhaps problems that cannot really be overcome in the short term. I do not mean to say that they cannot be overcome in the long term, but it gets down to one basic commodity, namely, dollars. It is dollars that we do not have.

I remind the Government that we would have had a capacity to service the needs of the Gillman site had it not got itself so deeply into debt as a result of the State Bank fiasco. I pointed out to the House previously the impact of the \$2 200 million increased debt on the State budget and the extra \$200 million a year required to service that debt. That money could easily have met many of the challenges on the Gillman site, but that money is not available.

It has already been mentioned that, when we were wooing the Japanese, perhaps we did not get it quite right. I note that the member for Morphett alluded to the visit by the Japanese trade mission to Adelaide. Some of us attended

the dinner at which our guests were wined and dined. We found out that the Japanese delegation was here for one day, was staying in Sydney for one day and spending four days on the Gold Coast. One would have to question the priorities if this delegation was meant to thoroughly research and review the proposition before it. Having got them here, how were they treated? It has been mentioned that they were treated quite indifferently, that they were bussed to the site and that some of the people who assisted them during the visit to the site simply did not have much idea at all about what was planned.

The project lacks credibility and it is amateurish for us not to put our best foot forward and provide the strongest case possible if we are to woo the Japanese. It is not only the \$2 200 million State Bank debt that has set us back, but if people can remember back to the ASER fiasco they may get a reference point as to why the Japanese are iffy about the project. I have it on good authority that the Japanese investors Kumagai Gumi were absolutely horrified by the delays and cost blow-outs of the ASER development.

In very few places in the world in which it had invested had it seen such an extraordinary blowout in its original timetables and in its original costs. We are talking about a 50 per cent increase in the cost of the project and about the same magnitude of increase in the timeframe of the project. We in this State had a wonderful opportunity to show international investors exactly what we could do, just like the Grand Prix. However, Premier Bannon sat on his hands while the building unions destroyed the construction on that site: he sat idly by while it happened. From people to whom I have talked about this matter, I know that Kumagai Gumi and many people with whom it deals refuse to invest any money in this State. That is not negative: that is a fact of life. The Premier cannot stand up here and say that it is a wonderful project without having at least teased out some major investment.

Of course, that level of investment has been adversely affected by the events of recent times. For example, the Japanese would also have to be a little concerned about the management of State resources, given the State Bank fiasco. Initially this Labor Government showed some brightness—and I will not comment on some of the darknesses of its taxation policies in its early days—and it looked like it was going somewhere in its early days. However, we no longer have that: we now have a desperate attempt to signal that this project will be the sole saviour of our future.

In view of recent events, I find it incomprehensible and quite degrading that the Premier should say that the Liberal Opposition is opposed to this proposition. All along we have said that we have a vision for South Australia, and that involves attracting the international community. Many years ago, I wrote a paper on what we in South Australia could do to attract overseas people of a high academic and financial status. We can talk about the quaternary industry, atmospheric, biotechnology, enhancement in agriculture, wineries and vineyards, and about our South-East Asian markets. This State has marvellous potential to be able to improve our image on the overseas market and do something practical to attract new ventures and to project new opportunities for South Australians. Yet, we have a Premier who is hanging onto something which is flawed, something about which we do not know the ultimate cost.

I was astonished to hear that the Premier said, 'I have an open chequebook which runs to \$200 million.' We do not know whether that \$200 million is the start or the end of the project, because we were told that the infrastructure of this project could be in the order of \$2 000 million to \$5 000 million. The Premier has not told us whether this

open chequebook has extended that far and, indeed, who will finance that deal. Without some of those fundamental questions being answered and without some checks and balances, there is no way that the Liberal Opposition can sit idly by and allow this Bill to pass. We, too, want to see some new opportunities for South Australia.

We do not want a continuation of the unemployment rates that prevail at the moment, that is, 11.5 per cent soon to hit 12 per cent, and we do not want 83 000 people on the dole queue, which will soon be 100 000 people: we want new ventures for this State and we want new opportunities. However, they will not come from pushing dead horses or horses that have not been properly prepared for the course. In this case, we have a Government that will defy all the essential elements of good business practice and put together a proposition which is basically flawed without any specific answers. Of course, the Gillman problems can be solved, but at what cost? Would it not be far cheaper to think about the western areas of Adelaide which have huge potential for redevelopment? Would it not be better to think about some of our country or near Adelaide centres and look at the possibilities there?

Would it not be better to now say that, because we have so many difficulties that cannot be overcome simply by spending a reasonable amount of dollars, we have to reconsider our original stance? Eventually with technology and gradual development, I believe that we will overcome the Gillman problems. We have to overcome those problems: it is a blight on Adelaide. However, we cannot use the MFP to do it. We cannot use a flawed site to do it. We cannot use a bad product to sell our case because, at least in Australia and presumably overseas, we will be judged by the merits of our proposition, and the proposition is not looking too good at this stage.

If the Premier and Treasurer of this State wants to see some advancement in the MFP project, we are quite happy to accommodate him to the extent that we will allow the concept of the MFP to go forward, whatever it may be. However, we have to have fundamental guarantees, which are absolutely imperative if the taxpayers are to be protected. It will do no good if we throw millions of dollars at this site. We will be the laughing stock of the national and international community if we waste money to no good effect. The problems have been outlined and we expect some answers in Committee. If those answers are not forthcoming and we do not get the guarantees that are necessary to allow the MFP to continue in an objective fashion, obviously the Bill cannot be supported. We are relying on the Premier and Treasurer of this State to support the amendments which we will move and which are so necessary to keep a check and balance on this project while it is still evolving.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): In addressing the MFP Development Bill, I wish to make it quite clear that I support the goals of the multifunction polis, one of which is to see it become an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development. That clearly is a goal which every member of Parliament and, indeed, every South Australian and Australian would support. My query about that particular goal is why a model of urban development with innovation and excellence could not be focused on areas other than a swamp that will require so much work on it to make it habitable. I refer particularly to Port Adelaide where, in my view, there is enormous potential for development, given the infrastructure which is already in place and which is such an expensive part of the proposed development.

Another goal of the multifunction polis is to be a leading centre for innovation in science and technology, education and the arts. Who could argue against that? It is also to be a national focus for economic and technological development. Who could argue with that? It is to be a model of conservation and management of resources and the natural environment. I ask again: who could argue with that? One of its goals is to be a focus for investment based on new and emerging technologies. Who could argue with that? Clearly, no-one can argue with those goals because it is a bit like motherhood or, in America, apple pie. Those goals are definitely supported by me and, indeed, by the Liberal Party. However, we are not in favour of allowing a Government that has presided over Scrimber, SGIC, WorkCover and the State Bank, to name but four financial fiascos, to go into this project without specific goals, other than motherhood statements, and with an open chequebook.

In my view the people of South Australia do not understand what the MFP is all about, but they do understand that they do not want this Government, in particular, going blindly into such a project without specifics and without a limitation on the amount of taxpayers' money that can be spent on it. We have heard much about Japanese business support for this concept and, as we all know, a large amount of publicity was given to a busload of Japanese people who visited Adelaide—very much a big ticket item. Unfortunately, that visit was a damp squib. It was such a damp squib that the report had to be doctored, and that is an anxiety-provoking feature about the MFP, particularly when we associate such a doctored report with the desire for an open chequebook.

Having said that the Japanese business report was doctored, and perhaps in view of the environmental problems that have been so well identified, I should say that the report has been sanitised. As to the Japanese business people who visited Adelaide, taxpayers may well ask where is the investment that flowed from that visit, from the Messianic group of people coming down from the mountain to make the MFP work? Where is the security for the struggling taxpayer to offset the Government's attempt to get an open chequebook to finance this pipedream? Clearly, it is not there.

Mr Ferguson: Do you support it?

Dr ARMITAGE: The present member for Henley Beach has not been present during my whole speech and clearly missed the first part of it, so I will ignore any future interjections by him. I do not mind interjections when members know what I have said but, when they make fools of themselves, I will not bother with them. Amendments will be moved by the Liberal Party to ensure financial accountability such that the people of South Australia can expect that these laudable aims and goals will be achieved but with financial accountability. I mentioned the Japanese business report being sanitised because of some of the environmental problems, but I would like to address briefly the much lauded environmental impact statement.

I am surprised that a Party which sits opposite me in this House and which touts its environmental record like a spruiker at a sideshow and claims the environmental high ground has a Minister for Environment and Planning who uses rain forest timber for furniture and omits to participate in Trees for Life at any time other than when there is a media opportunity around. I absolve the Premier because the Premier and I collect our Trees for Life growing kits from the same location in my electorate.

However, for a Party claiming such a record, it tried to debate this important Bill before the EIS was even released. Now we have the debate being brought on in Parliament

before the EIS has been fully assessed. I put it to the House that this is exactly like having a diabetic patient in a coma in front of a doctor where one is faced with a situation of the patient having too much or too little sugar.

In such a situation one takes a blood sample, and that is exactly the equivalent of the EIS: let us find out what is going on in this patient who is lying comatose in front of us. Having taken the blood sample, the Government is saying, 'We have the blood in the bottle but, before we send it off to the laboratory to determine whether this patient is comatose because of too much or too little sugar, let us inject some insulin.' Let us not wait for the report to come back; let us go ahead without the information.

Mr Acting Speaker, this is simply intellectually impure because we do not yet have the assessment of the environmental impact statement. Environment matters are often related to health. I will quote a letter that has been sent to me by the Conservation Council of South Australia. Amongst other things, the council states:

The EIS is totally inadequate in addressing them [the problems]. . . . In particular, in relation to areas of contamination, the provision of data is woeful and should be properly assessed before the site can be regarded as safe for any development.

It also asks where the reports are on the possible health dangers of the site from experts in the Health Commission—our much vaunted Health Commission—and our excellent academic department of community health. They are not there, or we do not know that they are.

Given all these potential problems of toxicity and so on, it is very important that we know fully the results of the environmental impact statement because this Government, and successive Governments, will incur responsibility legally, morally and, dare I say, economically for any health problems that may arise. People may say that that is a very slight risk. That is exactly what was said when asbestos was first used in buildings. There may well be long-term consequences ecologically, responsibly, legally and, indeed, economically for any Government.

To advance further down this track without the information is, as I have said, like injecting a comatose diabetic with a slug of insulin and having no reason for doing so. The Conservation Council letter further states:

Contaminated soils at Gillman are a major problem and it is evident that the contaminants are considerable in concentration, but investigation of their extent is at present inadequate.

The letter further states:

Management strategies for containment or removal without having any idea of the extent of the problem.

That is why the people of South Australia are worried: there is no specific commitment to finding out the extent of the problems.

Further health problems relate to the mangroves and mosquitoes, as identified. As we know only too well, various viruses such as the Ross River virus and Murray Valley encephalitis are transmitted by that vector. To talk as the report blithely does about the development of a vaccine against this is to talk about a multi-million dollar escapade. The people of South Australia are asking, 'Where are the figures?' They are simply not there.

I now wish to address particular matters of health. This much vaunted health flow-on effect from the multifunction polis will occur at a time when there are major health problems with a number of people, such as those in the lower socioeconomic classes, older people, women and pensioners who are confined to waiting lists. Yet we are pouring an unlimited amount of money into this concept. We also do it when a group of people, such as Aborigines, have all of the health problems associated with poor hygiene and,

indeed, in many instances they cannot even get adequate clean water.

The building blocks, so termed, of MFP health were to be the CSIRO Division of Human Nutrition (and that is already there), a cooperative research centre (that is nice, I think that that is a good idea), the Flinders Medical Centre and Science Park Adelaide (and they are both there), optics and visions companies (and that is doing nothing more than piggybacking on Solar Optical, a marvellous South Australian company), the cranio-facial unit (that has been around for ages) and invitro fertilisation. This Government thinks so much of invitro fertilisation that one of its pioneers has gone to America because of the lack of support here.

The business opportunities that are supposedly to flow from MFP Adelaide in the health area are a tele-medicine centre (and that is pretty airy-fairy, but nevertheless I suppose that that will be a series of teleconferencing facilities somewhere in a building down there and no-one will quite know where it is) and a population health centre. That does not sound as if it will be too marvellous; I am sure that we can do that at any of the universities, and they would jump at the opportunity.

We then come to the lovely little line, 'A privately funded clinic linked to a major university hospital in Adelaide.' That does nothing more than tie in plans that a number of companies have investigated in relation to putting a privately funded hospital on the Flinders Medical Centre campus. That has been going on for years, and there is nothing new in it. Also, there will be training and education packages. I believe that training and education packages are essential and that there are enormous business opportunities for South Australia in that area. In my view, we have such excellent medical care here that we are able to export our medical expertise, technologies and so on.

I think that this is an opportunity that is lacking and if, from the MFP, it becomes a focus for the export of our medical technology and excellence, I applaud that. It will be a business opportunity that we should already have taken up. No-one yet knows quite how expensive this project will be, but it will be expensive. All we are told is that the problems can be overcome. Of course they can be overcome. However, what the people of South Australia want to know is how much it will cost. The Federal Government has been particularly magnanimous and has given \$40 million—straight from the Better Cities project. We all know that the Better Cities project is a baby of the present Deputy Prime Minister—and I stress 'present' because he will not be there for long. He went—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: His colleagues ridiculed him in Cabinet. They said that it was an appalling suggestion.

Dr ARMITAGE: Exactly. He took a submission to Cabinet for this Better Cities project, and his colleagues thought it was ludicrous and laughable. We all know that he was told that if he wanted funding for the project he could fund it out of his budget. So, the Deputy Prime Minister said, 'I have always been in favour of giving everyone free medical care, but what we will do is have a co-payment system.' So, they had a co-payment system but only for a short time. There was the Paul Keating challenge; Rosemary Crowley supported one and Brian Howe supported the other; there were factional battles; a change of leadership and suddenly we had a new Prime Minister. The Deputy Prime Minister had this wonderful project which everyone else thought was laughable. In fact, the Federal Government decided, having bought off the Prime Minister and the support of Rosemary Crowley, it would remove the co-payment. What we now have is an \$850 million project with no funding because

the co-payment has been removed, and of that \$850 million we get a \$40 million handout which was part of our money, anyway. I think the Federal Government has damned the South Australian Government's involvement with its faint support.

A number of other things have come to our notice such as business opportunities within tourism and leisure and a new port village project. I am sure that that could happen without the MFP. Here is a nice one: 'an integrated travel, accommodation and entertainment booking system'. I am surprised that people actually believe that we need an MFP in order to have an integrated travel, accommodation and entertainment booking system. And God help us if we do not get it because, according to the Premier in today's *News*, 'If we don't get the MFP legislation, God help South Australia' because we will not get our integrated travel, accommodation and entertainment booking system. What a disaster that would be! We would also not get our production and broadcasting of multilingual film and video for the Asia-Pacific market. God help South Australia if we did not get that. I am sure that South Australian visual arts people would be delighted to hear that we need an MFP in order to produce something they have been doing for absolutely ages.

Regarding urban form and development, urban planning issues to be considered include the promotion of a framework to encourage mixed land use. God help us if we do not get it because, if we do not get it, we will not have mixed land use and we will not have any framework. 'God help South Australia', the Premier says. Goodness gracious! We will not have potential markets and marketing strategies to achieve higher residential densities. God help us if we do not get this one: we will not have housing type densities, tenure and cost as determinants of social mix. God help us, if we do not get it, we will not have environmental and open space improvement programs. God help South Australia!

I clearly want the goals of the MFP for all South Australians, and I support them, but I have a duty to my constituents, who are already seeing teachers being removed from schools, nurses unemployed, waiting lists of up to 10 years for operations, increases in crime rates and unemployment at 11.5 per cent. They want to ensure that the Government is accountable.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I have great pleasure in supporting this piece of legislation and wish to remind members of what the Premier said in the opening remarks of his second reading explanation, that is, throughout the history of South Australia there have been many occasions on which the Parliament has been asked to provide a legislative framework on which to build projects of vision for the benefit of the State. From what I have been hearing from members opposite during the course of this debate so far, there has been a marked lack of vision.

All I have heard from members opposite is the voices of bigots who are against any form of vision as far as this State is concerned which will benefit the ordinary people of this State. It reminds me very much of when I was a young man and was not living in this country and when the immigration debate was raging in the United Kingdom, mainly against West Indians and Asians. From the Conservative ranks, all one was hearing in relation to West

Indians and Asians was, 'I have got nothing against them, but . . .'. Then we had a tirade about what the West Indians and Asians were doing to Great Britain.

It is a totally different subject, but that is all we have heard. They agree with the concept—they are always very careful to lay that on the line—or they support with reservations. Members opposite get that out quick smart and then move in to can this piece of legislation. This legislation is doomed. It will get through this House, but it will not get through the Upper House. Why? Because those members opposite will whip up such a storm that ordinary people will be confused. They are already confused to a certain extent, despite the mass of information that has been put out, but these members opposite have just created a smoke screen to ensure that they will put up so many arguments that they will confuse the ordinary people.

When they join forces with the Democrats in the Upper House and ensure that this legislation is either defeated or amended in such a way that the Government will not accept it, they will stand there with their arms open wide and say, 'Look: we tried our hardest. We were just pointing out the pitfalls.' Sure, there are problems. If they have read the report, as they all claim to have done, they would understand why the Gillman site was chosen. It was not chosen because it was on a swamp or because it was an area where there had been pollution over the years: it was chosen because it met the requirements of Adelaide as a capital city, with the transport hub, Technology Park and all those other aspects which have been set in place and which sold that particular site to the Australian Government and the other countries that wanted to get involved with this exciting concept.

Members opposite are not fools. They know that. They have read the report. They must have read it, because all they have been doing is quoting from it. They knew that, but they ignore it. They just pick up the environmental concerns. We have heard before all the arguments that have been put up today. Any time a major development has been pursued by this Government, no matter what it is, we get the same old argument—'We support it, but . . .' It is worth reminding members opposite that we heard it regarding the ASER development, the Casino, the Entertainment Centre, the submarine contract and the Grand Prix.

The one thing that frightens me is that John Olsen is due to come back here and lead them again. He was the one man who actually would have obtained a degree in knocking. He made knocking a fine art. Tombstones Olsen, they used to call him, because that was his vision for this State—to turn us all into a cemetery. He is the man who will lead this Party opposite in its opposition to the MFP. However, eventually, when this Government refuses to bow down to some of the amendments that will be forced on it in the Upper House, members of the opposition will stand up as did Pontius Pilate and say, 'It has nothing to do with us.' It has everything to do with them.

You cannot tell me that every member opposite shares the same concerns. Of course they do not. They are obeying a script that has been written for them. To stand up and say that they speak as one collective voice is just gobbledegook. My colleagues on this side have actually dealt with what the members for Bragg and Coles, the main speakers opposite, have said, but I will pick up one aspect of this legislation that the member for Coles thought was so important that she should argue against it. I refer to clause 33 regarding exemption from planning regulations. The member for Coles quoted two examples where this Government had granted an exemption from planning controls under local government as proof why this would be a disaster: the

ASER development and Wilpena Pound. She referred to Wilpena Pound because I would dare to say that the member for Coles is completely biased. No matter what we had done with Wilpena Pound, the member for Coles would have found an argument against it completely, even against her own Party.

Let us take the ASER development. The reason why exemption from planning controls was granted to the ASER developers is that most of the building techniques in that development were not even covered in the planning or building regulations which came under the control of local government. The member for Coles knows that and, as a result of that exemption from planning and building regulations for the ASER development, the project went through very well. The developers did not ride roughshod over the views of local government—in this case, the City of Adelaide. In fact, they worked together.

As a result of those exemptions a better building code is now operating for the benefit of local and State Governments not only throughout this State, but throughout the rest of Australia. The member for Coles knows that, but she uses clause 33 as if there is a hidden agenda that the State Government is trying to inflict upon local government in the area in which the MFP site is located.

Let us move on to the environmental concerns. I found it rather touching that members opposite had these environmental concerns about the Gillman area. The member for Adelaide referred to the low socioeconomic groups in our society. He could not even get his tongue around the word 'poor'. That does not come into his vocabulary. What would members opposite do about those people if the MFP were not envisaged? They could not care a damn. Those people could still live in those polluted areas and it would not worry them. They do not get any votes there. It does not affect their Burnside blue rinse set. What they cannot understand is that, as a result of that site being chosen for the MFP, this State, this Government and the Federal Government are going to do something to improve the lot of those people who live in that area. For that alone I should have thought we would have got applause.

We all agree that people who live in that part of the western suburbs suffer more from chest problems and all the other things. They die earlier because of the pollution that has been pumped out of that area since there has been industry there. But, as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, that can stay and those people can continue to live under those conditions. Because this Government is trying to do something as a result of the MFP, it is wrong. I am sure that the member for Culance will provide a very sound argument for the MFP going to Angaston. We have heard all those arguments. We shall have the Democrats choosing the area where they think the MFP should go and they will promote an argument. Obviously they have not read the report.

I am proud to be a member of a Party that is trying to improve the lot of those who live in the western suburbs. I am proud to be part of a Government that is trying to do something to increase the long-term employment chances and quality of life of people who live in the western suburbs. Obviously my sentiments are not the same as those of members opposite. Really I should not expect anything else. However, I would like to hear just one person, instead of saying, 'I support the concept' or 'I support the concept with reservations,' put forward an argument in support of the whole concept of a multifunction polis. This is not a little plot that has been dreamt up by the Bannon Government to bolster its flagging electoral chances; it has not been picked up by the Federal Government, in effect, to give

Bannon a bit of a boost. It is a particular concept and project that has been thought out over the years, and it will provide benefits for the people of this State.

In the early 1950s Sir Thomas Playford looked at the industrialisation of this State. If I read my history correctly, that was attacked even by members of Sir Thomas Playford's own Party. They just did not like it. The member for Coles knows that I am right. However, it proceeded. That provided the basis of the industrial development of this State. This is a natural extension of that.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Murray-Mallee can bray on if he wants to. I expect that when he speaks he will parrot the same old line that his Party room

has dictated. I hope that the member for Murray-Mallee, and other members opposite when this legislation is defeated or is not proceeded with because of the amendments, will be able to tell the people of this State why he voted against it in order to justify his position. I doubt very much that he will be able to, and I hope that commonsense will prevail and that this legislation will be adopted.

Mr MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 18 March at 2 p.m.